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PHILOSOPHY

A principle of significant association among language, thought and reality is a conspicuous theme of Śākta and Śaiva philosophical systems, the two sectarian divisions of Āgama. Āgama is the rich tradition concerning different disciplines like aesthetics, science, śilpa śāstra, psychology, philosophy of language and others. Among these areas, Philosophy of language is unconcerned still, due to paucity of awareness of scholars. It has remained a neglected branch of study, in spite of the fact that schools of Śaiva and Śākta include a very considerable number of texts loaded with deeper conceptions. Most of them are still in manuscript, varying in the date from the fifth century to the nineteenth. All the schools of Tantra or Āgama concentrate on sādhanā and jagat primarily. Language is placed as essential element in both principles. Some schools of Śaiva philosophy, prominently Śaiva-Siddhānta and Kashmir Śaiva is pertinent to philosophy of language. Along with, Śākta School pursues the same course. Both schools share common traits with Kashmir Śaiva philosophy, since their origin is from Āgama. Thus, considering the Western tradition, Āstika and Nāstika schools of Oriental tradition, both tantric schools, Dualistic Śaiva Siddhānta and Non-Dualistic Śākta, is being started to examine. The issues are shaped in different manner on the base of their basic nature of dual and non-dual.

Śaiva philosophy is an outgrowth of the religion characterized by the worship of the phallic form of Parama Śiva. Śaivism is persisted since the pre-historic time of the archaeological finds of Harrappa and Mohenjodaro. It has continuous history of at least five thousand years. The available literature shows that there are eight systems of the Śaiva philosophy1 –

1. Pāśupata Śaiva

---

1 An Outline of History of Śaiva Philosophy
2. Siddhānta Śaiva
3. Lakulīsa pāśupata
4. Viśiṣṭadvaita Śaiva
5. Dvaitādvaita of Vīra Śaiva
6. Nandikeśvara Śaiva
7. Raseśvara Śaiva
8. Advaita Śaiva of Kashmir

Abhinavagupta figures out in the *Tantrāloka* all Śaiva philosophical systems into three genre according to the metaphysical outlines. These ramifications are-

1. Dvaita
2. Dvaitādvaita
3. Advaita.

These categories are based upon ten, eighteen and sixty-four Āgamas, respectively. Thus, thought system of Śaiva tradition starts to develop from Dvaita and reach at Advaita, through Dvaitādvaita. K.C. Pandey defines their nature—

A group is called dualistic, because it deals with such aspects of the Reality as pre-suppose diversity; namely, action, knowledge and will, (Kriyā, Jnāna and Icchā). Another is called dualistic-cum-monistic, because it is concerned with the self and the self-awareness (cit and ānanda) as essentially identical but logically and formally different. And the third is called monistic, because it presents a spiritual level, which is beyond the reach of will, knowledge and action, where logical and formal diversities disappear, where the Real shines in itself, by itself and to itself. It is believed that the sixty-four Bhairava-Āgamas, which issues form the yogini face of Śiva are non-dualistic, the ten Śaiva-Āgamas ware dualistic and the eighteen Raudra-Āgamas are of a mixed character.

In this way, the branches of Tantras and Āgamas are the source of all the dualistic, non-dualistic and dualistic cum non-dualistic schools. The historical and conceptual detail of these schools is available into the *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta precisely.

---

3 See Jayaratha in *Tantrāloka*, 1.18. There is reference to sixty-four Tantras in Śankara's Saundarya lahirī—V.37. lakṣmīdhara's commentary gives a list of the names. Other list is found in the Sarvollāsa and Vāmakesvara Tantra.
1. RATIONALE OF ŚAIWA-SIDDHĀNTA & ŚĀKTA SCHOOL

In this chapter, the Siddhānta Śaiva has been preferred regarding the philosophy of language from all the eight branches of Śaiva on the ground of these reasons-

1. The entire Śaiva philosophy with its branches are wider in range, thus, discussion on every school regarding the philosophy of language is not possible in a thesis. By cause of this, only one branch of Śaiva philosophy has been picked up since it builds up theorem of language. Although, the other branches of the Śaiva school have been untouched by now by the researchers, which also provide wider scope for revealing new dimensions in different. Like the area of philosophy of language, śilpa śāstra, psychology, aesthetics, cognitive science, philosophy of mind and some other can be examined by the Śaiva philosophical schools.

2. Siddhānta Śaiva is the dualistic branch of Śaiva philosophy, Ramkaṇṭha II in his Nāḍakārikā and Śrikaṇṭha in his Ratnatraya deal with this problem of language with the approach of duality. The structure and methodology of arguments are shaped in different way, which is not similar to non-dual Kashmir Śaiva. Thus, the argumentative aspects of the principle of language provide different nature of philosophy of language in Siddhānta Śaiva.

Akin to Śaiva philosophy, Śaktism is also important religion among the Hindus of the present day all over India. Those who worship the supreme deity as Female principle are called Śākta. The Śākta conceive their Great Goddess as the personification of primordial energy and the source of all divine and cosmic evolution. She is identified with the Supreme Being conceived as the source and spring as well as the controller of all the forces and potentialities of nature. Nonetheless, Śākta philosophy has been overlooked as a philosophical system yet, as it is accepted-

In spite of the antiquity of Śākta culture and of its philosophical traditions no serious attempt seems to have been made in the past to systematize them and give them a definite shape. The result was that though the culture was held in great esteem as embodying the secret wisdom of the
elect it did not find its proper place in any of the compendia of India a philosophy, including the Sarvadaśanasangraha of Mādhvācārya.⁴

This school also has been remained quite ignored area like to other schools of Tantras, particularly Kashmir Śaiva philosophy and Tantra. The philosophical texts are also evidence of this ignorance. The Śākta literature is extensive, though most of the texts have mixed nature. Śiva and Śakti being intimately related concept. Śaiva and Śākta cultural background are same in not only in practices but in philosophical concepts as well. Kashmir Śaiva and Śākta philosophy have approximately same approach to the reality, their methodology is same in general. However, Non-dualistic and dualistic Śaiva and Śākta get demarcation on the problem of the concept of metaphysical traits, like non-dualistic Kashmir Śaiva accepts Parama Śiva, dualistic Śaiva Siddhānta embraces pati as metaphysical element. The non-dualistic Śākta trimurtic tradition, which is similar but not identified with the Kashmir Śaiva, establishes Śakti as the highest entity.

Both schools have common source of Āgama, there are some problems is faced in case of analyzing and criticizing the principles in general. The problems are-

1. Śaiva and Śākta traditions use almost same nomenclatures, but not necessarily with the same approach. These common nomenclatures have same characteristics to some extent in both systems, but at times these nomenclatures have somehow odd traits at altered juncture.
2. These schools use same terms with different meanings for the concepts in their own philosophy, in spite of richness of the words and their available synonyms in Sanskrit language. Like there are many technical words, which is made of mṛṣḍhātu, some of them are vimarṣa, pratyavamarṣa, āmarṣa, parāmarṣa. These terms are very much similar in conceptual interpretation. In spite of that, they have different nature on different levels. Thus, the different meanings of the same term within the same system demands careful study of the terminologies through the help of Vyākaraṇa.

⁴ Aspects of Indian Thought, p. 174.
The issues of philosophy of language have not been dealt directly and consciously in Śaiva Siddhāna and Śākta schools of philosophy. Nonetheless, the methodology and the approach, is followed by the Śaiva and Śākta philosophies, relate language to thought and reality and co-relate to the problems of philosophy of language. Their conceptual vision regarding language raises many problems and deals without premeditation. Śaivism and Śāktism confront to the problems of language, during dealing with the most concerned subject of śādhana and srṣṭi prakriya in general. Besides these general issues, there are some given unique contributions—

1. The very important contribution of Indic tradition, in general, is the establishment of language as eternal and divine as well. But these characteristics of language have been highlighted deeply in tantric schools.

2. However the tantric tradition adds some new concepts like fourth and subtlest level of language, although three levels of language is discussed in the philosophy of Bhartrhari, who is accepted as a devotee of Śaiva tantric tradition. Nonetheless, the most subtle level i.e. fourth level is the contribution of Kashmir Śaiva and Śākta philosophy. Both systems present eternality and reality of language with different arguments, which are not similar to other Indian schools.

3. Mantra is a non-linguistic element. It is devoid of meaning but deemed to be imbued with supernatural power and efficacy. Whereas in Kashmir Śaiva and Śākta, it is consciousness. Thus, here, language is not the mere means of communication; it is designated as devi, sakti. These words measure the importance of language not only in the context of material world but also in relation to metaphysic. Mantra, in Siddhānta Śaiva, is called anu, limited spiritual entities.
2 SIDDHĀNTA ŚAIVA PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

Dualistic Siddhānta Śaiva philosophy explains the doctrine of language in a quite different way. The bindu is very active participant in most of the theories in this school. Various names of bindu are the attestation of its stands for different conceptions in this philosophy. It is called 1. sabda tattva, 2. amogha vāk, 3. brahma, 4. kundalini, 5. vidyā, 6. sakti, 7. para nāda, 8. mahāmāyā, 9. anāhatavyoma. The very paradoxical role is that it is the material cause of world as well as it is the cause of the impurity. The school stands for three primary categories, pati, paśu and pāśa, where language, in the form of bindu, is one of the chains between the pati and paśu. The deeper concept bindu is used under the realm of parā vāk very frequently in the Kashmir Śaiva and Śākta philosophy. But, contrarily, Siddhānta Śaiva adopts bindu term independently. The first primary category śiva (Paramaśiva) is addressed as para bindu. The third category pāśa binds the soul and is responsible for the distinction of paśu from pati. Its fifth and the last category is bindu. Francesco Sferra indicates towards the references and sources, related to bindu and levels of sounds in Śaiva-Siddhānta.

References to different levels of sound (nāda) or of word (vāc) appear in several early Śaivasiddhānta scriptures, commentaries and independent works. The argument is usually treated when dealing with principles (tattva) or categories (padartha) in particular bindu, or mahāmāyā, and while explaining the nature and formation of mantras. Scriptural sources differ to various degrees in their accounts. Apart from the context and from the coverage that each work devotes to this topic, the main difference between texts lies in the name and the numbers of the levels of sound and, in general, the way in which the sonic emanation is described.

Thus, bindu is the key concept of this school in general and in the context of philosophy of language also. It is the source for the descending levels of sound, which are related to the nāda, tattvas, padartha and so on. Furthermore, in this same article, Francesco Sferra furnishes subtle description of about levels of sound. The article provides

---

1 Evabhūtamupādānārtipam mahāmāyākhyam śivatattvaṁcāryaṁ jagaduritī. Natviyamāryā Paramāśivaviśayatāya tacchaktivisayatāya vā vyākhīyeyā. Śivādhvīptivyanataśīvalakṣaṇaprastēve tattvādyayorātṛprastuttatvāt. T. P., 26

translation of unpublished commentary *Ullekhini of Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*. His article throws light into some important observations about the development of principle of language.

The differences we find in Āgamas and in early Śaivasiddhānta literature regarding the status of words/sound and its differentiation in levels, undoubtedly reflect those extant in other Indian traditions and, to some extent, reveal a desire and an effort to test and develop the śaivasiddhānta in the arena of the dialectical debate with other traditions. With regard to speculation on vāc, Śrīkāṇṭha addresses his critique implicitly to Bhārṭhrā (c.450-510) and/or his followers and explicitly to advaita thinkers, while Rāmakaṇṭha and Aghoraśiva, especially in the Nādaśārikā and its commentary, also confront their ideas with those of the mīmāṃsakas and the nāyāvikas.\(^7\)

The literature of Siddhānta Śaiva provides the rich material for the philosophy of language. There is systematic argumentative concepts which are parallel to the philosophy of language of Bhārṭhrā.

The *tattvas* are significant to the philosophy of language. Numbers of *tattvas* are thirty-six\(^8\), which emerges at two levels of *śuddha* and *aśuddha adhvā*. It is the level of indeterminate and determinate. These are the stages of creation, not forms of language. *Bindu* is the material cause of the *śuddha adhvā* i.e. pure world. It is also cause of the *nāda*. In relation to *nāda*, *bindu* is called *para nāda*\(^9\). The theory of *nāda*, as elaborated by Rāmakaṇṭha, can be seen as the result of an attempt to assimilate the *sphoṭa* theory according to Śaivasiddhāntin tenets. Anyway, *śuddhādhvā*\(^10\) is the direct creation of Śīva. The material cause is *bindu*. *Bindu* is the source wherefrom *tattvas* are emerging. Here, *vidyā* evolves out of *bindu*, through the successive stages of modification such as *nāda* etc. Language stays here but not in emerged form, this is the reason that it is called indeterminate. Indeterminate word shows the existence of language in essence, not as

\(^7\) *Ibid*, p. 447.

\(^8\) *Apralayam yatīṭha sarveṣāṁ bhogadāyi bhūtānām*,  
*Tattatvamiti prakram na śārīraghatādi tattvamataḥ*. T. P., 56

\(^9\) *Sa binduh paramādākhyah nādavindvarjyakāraṇyam*,  
*Vinduṣcā tatākhyah mayūrādurasabinduvadavapadeśyah parāmarśajñānaramūrphah akṣarabinduh tatraiva sūkṣmatvenoktaḥ arnaśca varṇah*. R.T.11

\(^10\) *Śuddhe’dvani śivah kartā prakto ‘nanto’ site prabhuh*. T. P., 9
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developed form. The pure creation is characterized by indeterminacy, because it belongs to a higher level than that at which language evolves. And because determinacy consists in the affection of citi by the words i.e. so long as the affection of consciousness is not associated with the words, there is no determinacy. Therefore, the pure creation belongs to the level of indeterminacy. Here, the affection of consciousness by language is not possible. Bindu as the first dependent category is called śiva. The word śiva, however, is very often used for the first primary category, pati, also. Bindu or śiva, the first dependent category, is the material cause of the pure creation and as such it is also called mahāmāyā. It is eternal like māyā. The four categories (tattva) śakti, sadāśiva, īśvara and vidyā11 are the effects or evolutes of it. It pervades the entire creation, it is one. It reveals the powers of knowledge and action to those who enter into the pure world by subjecting themselves to spiritual discipline. The sphere of śuddha adhvā is unlimited. Indeterminacy shows again pati as limitless, extremely subtle as determinate language always indicates limitedness. Impure world is the realm of material world. Its material cause is māyā and also herein the bound live. It is characterized by determinacy, because it evolves after the evolution of language

The conception of bindu as an impurity is closely connected with the view that mukti (liberation), which is of two types, para and apara. Bindu is one of the categories of pāśa- 1. mala, 2. rodaśakti, 3. karma, 4. māyā, 5. bindu. There is lack of definiteness, precision and uniformity in all the statements about pāśa. The number of the dependent categories of pāśa, ordinarily stated, is five. But very often bindu is not included and the number is stated to be four12. And the reason for its non-inclusion is that of the two types of liberation-

1. Para, higher

---

11 Śivatatvam bindvātmakam ādyam pradhānamupādānam smaranti pūrvācāryāḥ. Paramopādānatenaitva cāsya māyāvannityatvam siddhamityuktam atascānyāni catvāri tāni tatākṣāyāyibi bhāvah. Ibid., 22:

12 Nanu prāgarthapaṅcakam pāśā ityuktam atra caturvedātaktaḥ akṣaraḥ. Bindormahāmāyāmanah paramuktyapekṣayā pāśatvepi taddhyogaḥ
vidyeśvarādipadaprāptihetutvenaḥparamuktītvādatra pāśatvenānupādānityavīrodhah. T.P., 18
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2. *apara*, lower.

The latter is attended, even when there is the bondage of *bindu*. And the liberated souls with this bondage are called mantra and the *mantreśa* etc., who belong to the pure creation. Even after a soul has got freedom from the bondages of karma and *māyā*, it is not perfectly free. It has freedom of the lower type only. The impurity of *mala*, which is also called *paśutvamala*, is still here. The souls, who get freedom from the bondages of *māyā* and *karma*, are called *vijñānākevalas*, live in them. Such souls are of three types\(^{13}\), according to the higher stages of maturity of their *paśutvamala*. They are called, *Mantramahesa*, *Mantresa*, *Mantra*.

*Nādakārikā* throws questions and possible solutions for arising of meaning in the words and sentences. K.C. Pandey elaborates three possible solutions—

1. The letters of a word, which are the objects of sense of hearing, come in succession one after another, are lost no sooner than they are uttered and do not affect one another. They therefore cannot be spoken of as the cause of the rise of the consciousness of meaning.

2. Nor can word or sentence be said to be the cause. For the words and sentences have no being apart from the letters, such as may be the object of perception.

3. For a word is said to be a collection of letters. But the letters being successive and momentary, there can never be a collection of them. And because word and sentence are never perceived, they cannot, therefore be known through inference either\(^{14}\). Nor can the rise of the consciousness of meaning be said to be due to the last letter of a word\(^{15}\).

\(^{13}\) *Uttirṇamāyāṃbudhayo bhagnakarmamahārgalāḥ, Aprāptaśivahmānastriyā vijñānākevalah. R. T.*

\(^{14}\) *Padavākyaikadesabhūtānām varṇānām kṣapavidhvamsitvena parasparopakārakatvābhāvasyoktatvāttadhyatiriktyāścā padavākyayorbhoudarśadādāh nācayorapi abhidhāyakatvamiti pratyakṣanirākṛttatvenānumāṇaṃ api na tayoḥ sadbhāvaḥ. N. K., 3*
Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy accepts nāda as basic element for the theory of meaning. An external object, which is grasped by the determinative judgment, is related to the buddhi, but, is not the product of the buddhi itself. On the contrary it has external existence and as such is perceived through one of the senses. The internal object, which is the reflection of an external object on buddhi, is determinately judged by the buddhi. Therefore, it must be something that has already been indeterminately grasped. The object has two aspects-

1. External
2. Internal

Word has direct relationship with the internal meaning, which is also determinative. Here, object or meaning has again two aspects-

1. Indeterminate
2. Determinate

But word has capacity to grasp only determinative aspect of object. The process of getting meaning passes from the indeterminate to determinate. Nāda\textsuperscript{16} gives the subtle inner word to buddhi, by means of which it determinately grasps the object, reflected in. The nāda is the cause of inner speech, which is nothing more than aksara bindu. Nāda really arouses the consciousness of meaning because it is the cause of inner speech, in terms of which the determinative judgment is formed. The external articulated sounds are only external forms of it. Therefore they are not real causes of rising of the consciousness of meaning in the hearer. Thus, nāda is an undifferentiated cause of the subtle inner speech. It is nothing but an embodiment of all the words and their meanings. All of which exists in the state of undifferentiated unity, exactly as the different colors exists in the yolk of peacock’s egg. After the affection of a sense by an external object, nāda that is in

\textsuperscript{15}Gauriti nāmadipadam śrotryagrāhyam sadasti cennaivam.
Na gābāruakāravarjanīyabāhyam yadato nyadstralī.
Teṣām yugapadbābhābhāvāt pariṣṭalambhe na pūrvayorbhāvāh.
Prāptadvvisarnīyāt khurakambalalakṣaṇā na cidvayakīḥ. Ibid, 3

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid, 8, 94.
the speaker and an objects that is undifferentiated unity of the word and its meaning, presents for the determinative judgment of the buddhi in the form of inner speech. The buddhi judges. The judgment is expressed in articulated audible sounds. They manifest the nāda in the hearer. It presents an object which is undifferentiated unity of subtle word and the indeterminate object to buddhi. Buddhi judges in as far as, it differentiates between the two, and relates them as signifier and signified. This arouses the consciousness of meaning. This judgment is expressed in articulated sounds. Similarly at the stimulation of the sense of hearing by an uttered word, the corresponding word and its meaning as an undifferentiated unity is given rise by the nāda. This forms the object of judgment by buddhi and the consciousness of definite meaning as distinct from the word arises. Speaker determinately apprehends objects by means of buddhi, recollects the word that stands for it and then utters the gross word. Thus, a form of buddhi which is due to its affection by an object is associated with the remembered word that stands for it. It is the cause of the utterance of the gross word. It is ‘arouser’ of the meaning in the consciousness of that hearer, in whose mind the heard word is associated with the particular meaning. The dualistic Śaiva holds the soul to be different from the nāda. It is because of this nāda, that is the cause of akṣara bindu, that there is no confusion in the meaning. It is separate in the case of each individual. It is not identical with the self or its powers, because they are unchanging, but the nāda changes. It is a distinct associate of each limited self.

Dualistic Śaiva asserts that the one who grasps the statement of the Āgama thoroughly, realizes Śabdabrahman. Śabdabrahman is nothing more than nāda, an embodiment of all words and their meanings in an undifferentiated unity. There are innumerable nādas, as innumerable are the souls. Nāda is the necessary condition of each soul. Theory of nāda-brahmanvāda develops the philosophy of music. Siddhāntin holds nāda to be reality, which is to be grasped through the medium of music. It is the original motion. It is the unity of all thoughts and expressions. It is the root or the seed, from which all words and meanings spring or to put it in terms of music, it is the original

17 Vyaktaṃ hi tāvattuhrakambalākṣaṇaṃamarthaṃ buddhyā dhivyavasya tadanugṛham gaurityādi padam cintayaivānusamdhāya tatah śhūlaśabdham prayunkte. Ibid, 6
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vibration from which all musical vibrations and their meanings arise from. Nāda is the original vibration that the art of music represents and suggests.

Dualistic Siddhānta-Śaiva philosophy keeps some different notion in the context of the relation between the individual-self and the empirical knowledge. K.C Pandey explains epistemology of the same school through the comparing with dualistic Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Accordingly, the relation cannot be admitted to be that of inherence, since knowledge of the same individual grows and decays. The admission of the relation of inherence between knowledge and soul, as admitted by the Vaiśeṣika, therefore, would mean that soul changes and therefore is transient. This is against the fundamental assumption of the eternality of the soul. Siddhānta Śaiva dualism therefore maintains that the growing and decaying empirical knowledge of the individual subject belong to him, not directly or inherently, but to a condition of his and that this condition is constituted by nāda. The nāda, as a condition of the individual, is an evolution of bindu. It is as innumerable as are the souls, a limiting condition of each of which it forms separately. It is like a seed of ‘knowledge’ which is signified by words at the empirical level. The power of knowledge of each individual self is related to the nāda and as it grasps the objects determinately at the level of māyā. The determinate knowledge cannot be explained in terms of buddhi, because determinacy is found in those levels, which are beyond to māyā also. Ananta for instance, belongs to the level of īśvara, but he also has a kind of determinate knowledge, otherwise the creation of the empirical world would not be possible. Further, buddhi employs words and presupposes their existence. Bindu, as the cause of the words, through nāda and lower bindu is necessary.

Similar to Kashmir Śaiva philosophy, the four levels of language are the subject of Siddhānta Śaiva also. Śrikantha deals with the different stages of separation of meaning and expression from the stage of their undifferentiated unity in nāda, under the

---

18 An Outline of History of Śaiva Philosophy

19 Kīnca upādānam hi pariṇāmena vā karyamatpādayati yathā kṣīraśya dadhibhāvah. Vṛtirūpeṣa vā yathā pañyasya grhādibhāvah. Śīvādīnāmeṣaṁ tu vṛtipariṇāmau na sambhavataḥ avikārtvāt, vikāritve jadatvānityatvāddidoṣaprasangāt. R.T., 23
nāda, ṛaṅga-bṁdu and varṇa. Similarly, he deals with the problem of the rise of gross audible word from the most subtle, through different stages of grossification, under the heads of suksamā, paśyanti, madhyamā and vaikhari.

Francesco comments on the theoretical development of these levels-

Commentarial tradition from Śrikaśtha (9th -10th cent.?) to Nārāyaṇakaśtha (first half of the 10th cent.), his son Rāmakṛṣṇa (c. 950-1000) and later, Aghoraśiva (12th cent.), attempts to systematize the doctrine on the emanation of sound in accordance with the Śaivasiddhānta explanation of principles, and by fixing four levels of it. The standard series is bindu/kundalini=>nāda=>bindu=>śabdāraśī/arṇa, however, as far as we can say at that moment, this does not correspond perfectly to any of the lists given in the scriptures.20

The levels are significant in the context of manifestation of language. Bindu, nāda, bindu, śabdāraśī are showing the systematic order of the appearance of language. In the terminology of Śrikaśtha, suksamā is the highest. He identifies parā as suksamā, with nāda21. Sūkṣmā stands for highest aspect of speech that is distinct from the higher than paśyanti. Francesco notices this theoretical development, in his words-

Especially Śrikaśtha and later masters of the 14th century-adopt another series, the one starting with suksamā and ending with vaikhari, referred to above. This series was probably already widespread in advaita circles of time. Since all the Śaivasiddhānta authors that make use of it, whether they adopt it or simply mention it, refers to its ‘wrong’ interpretation in an advaita perspective, equating the higher level with Consciousness. In point of fact this series is the most frequently used in Pratyabhijñākārikā (1.5.13) by Utpaladeva (c.925-975), where we usually find parā instead of sūkṣmā.22

As it has been already said that the schools of Tantra use same nomenclatures in general, the term sūkṣmā is one of them. The term sūkṣmā is used in both the schools of Kashmir Śaiva and Siddhānta-Śaiva, which comes at the level of parā in Kashmir Śaiva philosophy. Bhartrhari identifies suksamā with paśyanti, holding that the word

---

20 Sferra, Francesco, “Material for the study of the levels of sounds in the Sanskrit sources of the Śaivasiddhānta” in 'Tantric Studies in Memory of Helene Brunner', p. 446.

21 Ātmasvārūpa vidastu śaivāṁ tāṁ sūkṣmākhyām bindukāryabhūtā Śabdāvṛtttimeva manyante na tu puṇḍrasanavavāyīnīm. R.T.32.33

22 Sferra, Francesco, “Material for the study of the levels of sounds in the Sanskrit sources of the Śaivasiddhānta” in 'Tantric Studies in Memory of Helene Brunner', p., 446.
sukṣmā does not stand for an aspect of speech, higher than paśyantī, but it is simply an adjunct, qualifying paśyantī. Paśyantī is identified with aksara-bindu. It is exactly what nāda is according to the Śrikanṭha. According to Bhartrhari, it is sentiency itself (sarvavidrupa) while Śrikanṭha says it as insentient, because it is an evolution of mahāmāyā. Further, Śrikanṭha identifies paśyantī with aksara-bindu. His conception of paśyantī is fundamentally different. It is unity not of all words and meaning but of a particular word and its meaning. And the word also at this stage is not split up into letters. It is therefore marked by the absence of all duality and succession. It is what is manifested by nāda, in consequence of affection of a sense by an object. It is responsible for the sound picture of a particular word, detailed into distinct letters, which controls the movement of vital air to definite places of articulation, the speech-organs. It is the cause of madhyamā. Paśyantī, that is identical with nāda, is the first evolution of bindu or mahāmāyā. It is insentient because the principle of sentiency, paśu, is a distinct and separate entity from it. Bhartrhari holds that the realization of paśyantī is the realization of the ultimate, because paśyantī is the Brahman. But Śrikanṭha holds that the realization of distinction of suksmā from puruṣa frees a man from subjection to limited experiences.

Madhyamā is nothing but a clear mental picture of the successive letters, which constitute the word. It is prior to the activity of the vital air, which is the cause of the gross audible word. Similarly vaikharī, the gross audible word, is due to vital air, which being checked at different places of articulation and then let off, produces the word, which is audible.

Siddhānta Śaiva philosophy presents language with different approach, its basic terminologies are also not analogous with the Śākta philosophy. Here, Language is structured system in the form of bindu. It is the cause of the bondage and of the freedom from pāśa. Its ontological status and acts are proving that language is the central faculty in this school also. Anyway, Theory of ontology is related to the epistemology in this school. And the same relation is seen in the Śākta school also between ontology and epistemology. There are some important points to be noted-

---

23 Avibhāgena varṣāṃ sarvatah samhṛṭikramāta' Svayamprakāśā paśyantī mayūraṇaṃdarasopamā. Iyun ca aksarabindurūpetyuktam. R.T., 31
1. The principle of language is examined mainly in epistemology and ontology in Śaiva and Śākta philosophy, because they are not separate principles in the schools in essence. They are two aspects of the language. Language constructs the world as well as it gives name to the world also. Thus, the task of naming and shaping are done by the language. In this stage, both processes cannot be act independently.

2. Here, the ultimate reality itself acts. It does not take help of any external agent. This characteristic of the metaphysical principle is accepted in tantric schools particularly. That's why the terms, principles are common in epistemology as well as in ontology. The harmony, among all the elements, principles remains at the same position.

3. The correlation of non-distinguished epistemology and ontology establishes the fact that epistemology does not revolve around the material world only. The metaphysical theory empowers the constituents of knowledge process unconditionally. Here, the same key nomenclatures play the role in the epistemology also as well as in ontology. These theories have common source i.e. Ultimate Reality, thus epistemology and ontology cannot be deal separated.

3 ŚAKTA PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE

Unlike to the dualistic Siddhānta Śaiva, Śākta philosophy defines language as citi śakti. Language is constituted as power and consciousness. There are some other concepts also which are the key principles regarding the characterization of language, like prakāśa-vimāraṣa and parā vāk. Prakāśa and vimāraṣa are the most basic constituents of Śākta philosophy. Prakāśa and vimāraṣa, the united concepts, act at the immanent level of the Paramaśiva. Sculpture of material world is explained through them. In the context of language, vimāraṣa is foreground for the development of language. Vimāraṣa is the cause of four types of srṣṭi, Bhāskararāya points out toward these four classified
śṛṣṭi. She is said to be the means of knowledge because she gives self-consciousness to prakāśa, which is itself a conscious. The vimarśa sakti possesses some fundamental saktis, which are-ści, ānanda, icchā, jñāna and kriya. These elements are designated as five saktis which are none other than diversified nature of vimarśa saktī. These saktis indicate the different nature of vimarśa. These five aspects give the strength to the vimarśa sakti for the ontological and cognitive role. Prakāśa experiences its existence with the notion of sarvajñatva, sarveśwartva, sarvakartṛtvā, purṇatva and vyāpakatva. Vimarśa is called sphuraṇā, naisargika. The word naisargika shows that vimarśa is spontaneous sakti of prakāśa, sphuraṇā which means according to Monniar Williams-glittering, sparkling, vibration, manifestation and so on. All meanings indicate ontological aspect of that sphuraṇā. Basically this is the tendency of creation of world, thus vimarśa has natural tendency of manifestation the world. Vāk is the other form of vimarśa. Vimarśa theory of Śākta tradition prepares basic ground for ontology and epistemology of language. She is self consciousness of prakāśa, self consciousness is the awareness of self-existence. Awareness term has relationship with epistemological concept knowledge and its means. Vimarśa as the cause of world is related to the ontological aspect of language. Śākta philosophy emits adequate material for the philosophy of language. Further, theories like śṛṣṭi prakriyā, mantrārtha bodha, nāda, bija, bindu etc. provide rich material for the philosophy of language. Śākta philosophy is itself a source of the study of language from the ontological and epistemological point of view.

Śākta philosophy elaborates language in this way-

1. Language is consciousness, cītī.

---

24 Sāvaṇyam vijñeyā yatpariṇāmādabhūdeṣā, arthamayā śabdamayā cakramayā dehamayyāpi ca sṛṣṭih. Vvr., com. on 1.5

25 Icchāmi, jānāmi ityādāvattamapurusānabhāsamanam sphuraṇānvaṣi jīnānameva prakāśābhidham. Taccā sarvajñatvasarveśwartvasarvakartṛtvāpurṇatvavvāryāpaktōḍīśāksaisamvallitam. Ibid, com. on 1.3

26 Tasya cānandarupāṃśa eva sphuraṇā parā ahantā, vimarśah, parālalitā Bhartrhariṇībhātā, tripurasundarīyādipadaivṛtvahyate. Ibid
2. Language is power, śakti.

3. Language is cognitive faculty.

4. Language is a system, which is the cause of creation.

All characteristics are explained by the theories of Prakāśa-vimarśa and parā vāk. These śaktis are fundamental principles of the school. The cognitive process is occurred by the expansion of citi and śakti. Citi and śakti are not two separate principles, they are one in essence. Their appearance in the form of citi and śakti is showing different aspects. They are closely related to the principle of language. Language is established as centric phenomena. The empirical world appears through the light of language. It is the most pervasive element of the world, as the epistemological and ontological process sets out under its sphere. Language is the faculty of cognition so structure of world is determined by its cognitive activity. In the form of śakti, it creates the world and makes the world conscious. World possesses multiplicity through the language because naming process diversifies the world, it differentiates waves and ocean, blue and green water, lake and river. If it had not been for language, it would have been impossible to recognize the world with variation. Language is the essence of world, because subtlest form of world is bindu, wherein everything is in the state of submerging.

The ontology of Śākta philosophy is developed absolutely on the basis of language. In this context, there are some key nomenclatures, like mahā bindu, bindu, parā vāk, nāda, jyoti, bīja, paśvantī, madhyamā, vaikhari. Bindu is the most basic point of srṣṭi prakṛtyā, since before the manifestation, the whole world stays in the form of bindu. Jñātā, jñāna and jñeya are submerged state; none of them can be recognized separately here. According to Monniar Williams, bindu is made of /bid, bid means split and meaning of bindu is drop, spot and dot, the very first, meaning of bindu i.e. drop. Dot supports the theory of srṣṭi prakṛtyā, as the dot or drop shows oneness, absence of diversification, lack of multiplicity. There are four types of srṣṭi- arthamayī, sahdamayī, cakramayī and dehamayī sojourn in the bindu as assimilated form. The first two types of srṣṭi are relevant to the philosophy of language. There are 36 tattvās under the arthamayī
sṛṣṭi. Parā, paśyantī, madhyamā, vaikharī come under the domain of śabdamayi sṛṣṭi.

Now, the second meaning is applied at this place i.e. split, bindu splits into three-

4 Kārya bindu

5 Nāda

6 Bija

Intrinsically, bindu, kārya bindu, nāda and bija are the respective stratum of vāk i.e. language. The articulated language is the grossest as well as last developed level of the vāk. addition to the grossest form of language, there are some subtle levels of language also, which can be experienced only through the intuition. Sādhanā, bindu, kārya bindu, nāda and bija are forms of language, starts from subtlest to grossest. At other side, parā, paśyantī, madhyamā and vaikharī are the stages of language, through which bindu to vaikharī passes.

Bindu and Her Descending Levels in Terms of Parā and Her Descending Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of language</th>
<th>Levels of language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karāṇa bindu</td>
<td>Parā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārya bindu</td>
<td>Paśyantī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāda</td>
<td>Madhyamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bija</td>
<td>Vaikharī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Karaṇa bindu is called mahābindu and samaśṭigata bindu. This bindu is the unified form of prakāśa and vimarśa. Prakāśa represents aspect of existence and consciousness and

27 Arthamayi śivādiśityanṣattrinṣattatvarupā. Ibid, com. on 1.5

28 Śabdamayi parādivaikharyāntā. Ibid
vimarśa represents the aspect of self awareness. Prakāśa and vimarśa are not two principles denotationally. They are discussed as two principles connotatively. Three separate aspects of both elements emerge during the manifestation process. They have direct relationship to each other. Their hierarchical status are-

Aspects of Prakāśa and Vimarśa into The form of Śaktis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prakāśa</th>
<th>Vimarśa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vāmā</td>
<td>Icchā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyeṣṭhā</td>
<td>Jñāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raudri</td>
<td>Kriyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actually, these six, the manifested forms of both elements are the śaktis, unity of the vāmā and icchā manifests paśyatī, unity of jyeṣṭhā and jñāna manifests madhyamĀ, unity of raudrī and kriyā manifests vaikhāri.

Unity of Śaktis and Levels of Parā Vāk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unity of vāmā and iccha = paśyatī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity of jyeṣṭhā and jñāna = madhyamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of raudrī and kriyā = vaikhāri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relation of Śaktis, Bindu and her levels and Levels of Parā vāk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unity of vāmā and iccha</th>
<th>Kārtya bindu</th>
<th>Paśyantī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity of jyeṣṭhā and jñāna</td>
<td>Nāda</td>
<td>Madhyamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of raudri and kriyā</td>
<td>Bija</td>
<td>Vaikhari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are simultaneous and expeditious actions are performed. The way they are connected mutually, shows that their mechanism is completely adjoined and interdependent to each other. Concerning to śabda srṣṭi, bindu can be said as the basic unit which grows with branches simultaneously. The very first bindu splits into kārtya bindu. This kārtya bindu manifests into the form of nāda. Nāda is the important concept regarding philosophy of language because it is the stage where, śabda and artha appear separate in existence, although, śabda and artha exist from the beginning, but at the highest level, they are united. Their united-transcendental stage does not deal with the worldly affairs. These are previous steps which prepare the ground for the nāda. Monniar Williams\textsuperscript{29} translates it into a loud sound, any sound or tone. Here another element is attached with nāda which is called jyoti. Jyoti represents the aspect of artha means mental meaning. Actually artha word is used in two senses in philosophy of language:

1. Mental meaning
2. External meaning i.e. objects or referents.

Both meanings are supported by Monier Williams\textsuperscript{30} as the meaning s, which he presents are such as- ‘thing, object, object of the senses, sense, meaning and notion’. At the one side, 36 tattvas are present in the form of external objects; this artha comes under the arthmayi srṣṭi. The other side all meanings ideas, concept etc. are apprehended in the

\textsuperscript{29} Monniar Williams, Sanskrit English Dictionary.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
form of nāda and jyoti. This is the place where unified jñātā, jñāna and jñeya fall into split forms at the mental level. Bindu, ardhacandra, rodhini, nāda, nādānta, sakti, vyāpinī, samanā and unmanā, group of these nine dhvanis are called nāda. These dhvanis stay at the subtle level. They are inherent in subtle form which cannot be experienced by the sense-organs. These are the subjects of sādhaka, in spite of their inaccessibility, these elusive concepts are not relevant only in the context of sādhaka, but these are relevant to the philosophy of language also. The group of nine is the attestation of existence of language at the mental level and proofs that language is not only way of communication, but it is the cognitive faculty. The last and the grossest stage is bija, which is defined by Monier Williams as- semen, seed, grain, any germ, element, primary cause or principle or source, origin.

The nature of inquiry is diagnostic, reasonable, perspicacious, symbolic and mystic in Tantra. The interesting fact is that their methodology is full of aesthetic vision. Its theories are intricate to each other; there are profuse terms and theories to respond in retaliation, regarding every problem. Language is not as simple as it is grasped by the linguistic who studies mostly the articulated languages. The theory of bindu and theory of parā vāk is assuredly intricate to each other, one cannot be complete without other. However, the difference between them is that bindu and others are categories of subtle dhvanis and varṇa, while the later are the levels of the formers, bindu, nāda and bija manifest at the levels of parā, paśyantī, madhyama and vaikharī. The very first

31 Hṛllekhāyāḥ svārmapam tu vyomāgnirvāmalocanā,  
Bindvardhacandrarodhinyo nādanadāntasastraṇaḥ.  
Vyāpiksamānamanyā iti dvādaśasamhatih,  
Bindvādinām navānām tu sāmaṣṭirnāda ucyate. Ibid., 1.12-13

32 Bindvādayo navāpi sūkṣmasūkṣmatarasuṣuṣmatamatamābhājaśā cc ādhvanīśeṣah, varṇaviśeṣaḥ vā. Ibid, com. on 12-13

33 Monier Williams, A Sanskrit English Dictionary.

34 Na ca tālavādiparigānitaasthānānabhiṇaṇaṇyaatvaṁ na varṇatvam, tadanabhiṇaṇyaatvastyā pariṇavāyāyāt, ca iti śrutiḥ vā varṇasamāhātmaṇapadatvastyā spaṭamuktvāc. Ibid, com. on 12-13
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level is *parā* which is parallel to *bindu*, there is no *sṛṣṭi*, it is the state of *ātmaspuruṇa* where the universe is not distinct, it is incorporated in *parā vāk* and she is like womb. She concerns with two types of act-

1. **Svarūpācchādana**

2. **Vikalpapraṇaṭikaṇaṇa.**

These two elements are prevalent notion in Indian philosophical tradition. Schools like Vedānta use these concepts in the context of material world. Both of the concepts are the main problem of Indian philosophical schools. The reason of the common problem is related to the cultural value of India which is rooted in Nigama and Āgama, knowledge tradition. Their generic concept is unity and identity in unity ultimately, which indicates that the whole world is basically one, but due to our nature of ignorance, we divide ourselves as individual phenomena. We are ignoring our reality i.e. *svarūpācchādana* and feel ourselves as multiple individuals i.e. *vikalpapraṇaṭikaṇaṇa*. Again the question is that what is the role of language in ignorance and individuality? In reply- it is the language which differentiates the world in the form of first person *aham* and third person *idam*.


36 *Tatsamaśīśeṇā nādadha nyāḍipadavācyā nāṭisūkṣmā parāvannātisthūlā vaikharivadato madhyāṃkhyā mātṛkā madhyāṃvāyaunārāpamāvakṛtya-śūnyaśparṣaṇādādhvānibhāṣākṣājākāryāvāhānādāvānādhvānādāvānāṃ mūlādādīśaṅke nāde nādānte brahmaramadhiro ca sthitam. Ibid

37 *Navabhīrīdairakacatapayaśaṭkhyavarganavākancvātī vaikharivākhyā mātṛkā jātā, vai niścayena spaṣṭaṣṭaratvāt kham karpavivaravartinaḥḥorūpaḥprorṭrdriyam rāti gacchati, tajjanyajñānāvijayo bhavatī t vṛttibhāvahādhyāyayato vistarah. Evam ca kakārādau kavyādhvāṃadharmāṃ Śudajātāvādādhvānadharmāṃ cānubhyāmānātvyāt pariṇāme pariṇāmino ‘nusyatātāyā maṛddhāte darśanācācā varṇātāṃ nādev ‘nusyatāh. Ibid

38 *Atreyam sābdaṣṭriṇiprakriyā-vaṭāvijāntargatavaṭāvajyāṣyaśūkṣmarūpapatulyaśaśabdaṣṭrisukṣmarūpāpaśalinī pūrvvoktarāpa tripūrasundaryavā tādṛśa kṣūmarūpavatvapraṇātinimittakaparāpadavācyā. Ibid*
Language creates new words, new identity, new feeling in the form of multiplicity. The common example of the multiplicity is 'thesaurus' which provides multiple different word and meaning. Aligned, it is updating individual one through giving information, but updating information is nothing but a way to differentiate. The root of the differentiated world is stayed in the ontological category of language i.e. parā vāk. Thus, parā vāk, the highest level of language, is the cause of the whole world. Parā vāk has predilection of manifesting the world. She develops herself as mātrkā\(^{39}\) for accomplish her desire. Mātrkā is nirvikāra in herself, but still she has tendency of creating the world. She complies her wish through the manifesting of levels and sounds.

One of the main features of philosophy of Tantras is acknowledging the whole world as real because the empirical cosmos is the appearance of the metaphysical element. Thus, the concepts which have been discussed yet, is not only a simple theory for explaining the world, but they can be experienced at material world also. Parā, paśyanti, madhyamā and vaikhari are also real and have permanent abide in the human body. From this way, Tantras, including Śākta connect the transcendental entity to material world. Thus, language with all levels and all forms are connected with the material world. Language is spoken by the articulated elements; it is well accepted without any dispute. But the problem is that how does articulated language come into existence? Is there any root? Where does it come from? In reply- it is rooted in the metaphysical element. Śākta philosophy accepts that whatever exists in world in any

\(^{39}\) Saiva ca māti tarati kāyatiti ca vaśpatyā mātrketyucyate. Tasyam ca nirvikārayāmapanātisidhayaprānyadrṣṭavaśāt svāntah-samhrtavāsīsāsottapadyate. Ibid., 1.21
form, must exists in the form of seed in the metaphysical element. Human body is accepted as the epitome for the ontological categories. Thus parā, paśyanti, madhyamā and vaikharī have particular stations in the human body, which are called cakra. So parāvāk stays in mūlādhāra cakra, paśyanti stays in svādhiṣṭāna, madhyamā stays in anāhata and at last vaikharī stays at viśuddha cakra. When the speaker tends for speaking, the process starts from the first cakra and gets its goal at the last cakra. Through these cakrās, para vāk or bindu manifests her in the form of vaikharī or bija.

Vāk and Its Levels in Relation to Cakras

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cakra</th>
<th>Vāk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mūlādhāra cakra</td>
<td>Parā vāk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svādhiṣṭāna cakra</td>
<td>Paśyanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anāhata cakra</td>
<td>Madhyamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśuddha cakra</td>
<td>vaikharī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fundamental nature of vāk prepares the base for the development of language or for the appearance of the grosser language (articulated language). It provides the theory of meaning also, accordingly, śabda (signifier) and artha (signified) are eternally identical and manifests as separate elements by passing on the levels of paśyanti, madhyamā and vaikharī. In this way, the subtlest language becomes the subject of mental state and connects with the world which may be said linguistic world. The linguistic world is the result of the process of cognition and manifestation. The cognition and manifestation, both activities are occurred by the vāk. The vāk is the creative principle in the Śākta philosophy. She is established as essential nature of Paramaśiva in the form of śakti i.e. vimarśa and parā vāk. Whatever is in the world, is not supplementary either emotions, or object or anything else. Everything is the partial aspect of Paramaśiva and
its šakti. In another way, the thirty six tattvas are manifested by the šakti, these tattvas live intricately in Paramaśiva. Whatever is said 'afresh', is not new, it is just appearance, which has been manifested. The empirical world is just an image of Paramaśiva. Articulated language is also an image of Parama Śiva. It has the superior position as it is connected with the parā vāk, that's why this centrodial element stays in the controlling position.

The next question is that what is the relationship between śabda and artha? Before answering this question, it is necessary to understand that what is conveyed by the word artha? Now the purpose of this question is pulling the attention on the two meanings of artha, mental meaning and object. What is denoted by the artha? Artha comes under the domain of the levels of language i.e. parā vāk, paśyanti, madhyamā and vaikharī. All these layers indicate towards 'mental meaning'. What is the meaning of mental meaning? In rely- language appears at only levels of paśyanti, madhyamā and vaikharī. At the last level of vaikharī, it appears distinctly and shows relation with the object by the naming process. The objects are not independent categories because it is recognized by the naming process. The word and mental meaning have eternal relationship, both are united elements. Any idea comes first in mind is made of united aspect of śabda and artha, thereafter one tries to bring this idea outside extrinsically, either panting, or any action or emotion or intention.

The levels are the stations for gradual development of the articulated language, which starts from the parā vāk and gets full development at the level of vaikharī. The intention of language is to impart worldly knowledge and to signify empirical world. Vācaka has capacity to signify the vācyā since the parā vāk. But, at this level, both are unseparated, so in this stage, it is not possible to signify the vācyā as separate entity. The vācyā and vācaka are in the same position at the level of paśyanti also. Thus, at the level of parā vāk and paśyanti, word and meaning are eternally identical, that is their real position. But, at the next two levels, they appear separate entity this is the mental level only. At this stage, there are three elements which are related to the vācyā and vācaka-these element are word, meaning and referent. The existence of referent is very much
clear at the level of vaikharī. Here, a word is articulated with the combined help of articulated organs like throat, lips, tongue and the ābhyantarā and bāhya prayatna. Afterwards, the inner meaning which is the ‘real’ alone is connected with the outer meaning i.e. object or meant. In the view of all these causes, it is said that sabda and artha have abedha sambandha. This abedha sambandha reflects some points that if there is a word, it should have some meaning. But the problem comes in the context of sounds. Every sound has some meaning, may be hidden meaning, because sounds is the another distinct form of nāda, so, sound is also meaningful.

Now the question is that how to relate to one word to the one meaning? What are the factors which are essential for determining the meaning? Theory of meaning is elaborated by the Śākta School in the context of mantra also. Thus, it is tough to relate the theory of meaning of mantra with the simple types of sentences and word-meaning. Nonetheless, there are enough references which are capable to show the vision of Śākta towards the theory of meaning. The school does not accept word without meaning. A meaning have to be there. In the absence of meaning or knowledge of meaning, word has no value. Either speaker or listener who does not have sense or attend knowledge of meaning, must not be able to convey and make understand anything, at least through the unit of spoken language.

Tantra śāstra provides different categories of meaning, although all the categories are not related to the general language. The reason is that these categories of meaning are described in the context of mantra, which has absolutely different nature to the general language. The meaning s is classified into fifteen categories. All the categories are

---

40 Kanṭhe ca kaṇṭhatāluni danteṣu mūrdhni nāsāyām,
Śṛṣṭavivārādhāntara bāhyairlaistadakṣarotpattih. Ibid, 1.19

41 Janyajanakarorhahāvād vācyasya vācakenāpi,
Brhaṇi jagato jagati vidyābhedadastu sampradāyārthaḥ. Ibid, 2.81

42 Nārhajāṇānavihiṁam śabdasyoccārapam phalati, bhasmani vahñivihīne na prakṣiptam havirjvalati. Ibid, 2.54

43 Athātah pūrṇagāyātryāḥ pratipadvo 'ṛtha ādīmah,
Bhāvārtha sampradāyortho nigarbhārthasturyakāh. Kaulikārtho rahasyārtho mahāstavārtha eva ca,
related to the mantra. There are fifteen categories of mantra. The categories of meaning are:


Among these categories of meaning, five categories may be related with the sentential-unit. These five categories are:

1. Mantra
2. Avāntara vākyā
3. Eka vākyā
4. Samāsa vākyā
5. Mahā vākyā.

The categories of meaning and categories of sentence are related to three types of meaning which are popular among the other Indian philosophical schools, schools of literature as well as schools of literary theory. These meanings are:

1. Abhidhā,
2. Laksanā and
3. Isvarecchā.

Abhidhā and laksanā are the category of direct meaning and indirect meaning respectively. Isvarecchā also produce direct meaning that is always undisputable and opposite element. The icchā of isvara always relates one word to the one meaning. It

Nāmārthah Šabdārūpārthaścārtho nāmaikadesāgah,
Śāktārthah śāmarasyārthah samastasāṅgūṭhārthakau,
Mahāvākyaārthah ityarthah paścadasāyāh svasamāntāh. Ibid, 2.57-58-59

44 Yatra pratipadamarthastān pratyayāstu vākyatvam,
Kkacanāvāntaram samāsavākyam mahāvākyam. Vṛt, 2.155
must be authenticity always. The other two factors are also valid since the nature of their authenticity is \textit{pratyakṣa}⁴⁵. At the time of grasping the meaning, speaker and listener use \textit{abhidhā} very first. He uses second one and third one⁴⁶ also, provided that meaning would not be conveyed by \textit{abhidhā}. These rules are applicable on \textit{mantra}⁴⁷ as well as on spoken language. If the listener does not know meaning of the words which are used in particular sentence or in \textit{mantra}, then meaning can be conveyed as unified⁴⁸. Unified means meaning as whole that type of meaning comes through the \textit{akhaṇḍa vākyā}⁴⁹ i.e. complete sentence or \textit{mantra}. The unified meaning is independent from the \textit{varṇas}. The other two elements in the same position are \textit{prakaraṇa} and \textit{tātparya}⁵⁰.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[45] \textit{Śaktyā lakṣaṇayā vā ye ye 'rthā dārśitā manorasya,Teṣu na ko 'pi vivādah pratyekṣeṇaiva siddhatvāt. Ibid, 2.148}
\item[46] \textit{Etasmādayamartho bodhhasva itiśvareccihatvāt, Pratipadamarthaviśeṣajñāne 'pyāstāmakhāṇḍavākyasya. Ibid, 2. 151:}
\item[47] \textit{Ye punarih bhāvārthadayahādārthā manorūktāh, Teṣu yadi śaktibhakto na hi sambhavastadāpi kā hānih. Ibid, 2.149}
\item[48] \textit{Artho 'pyakhaṇḍarūpo viśiṣṭamātriktamiti hi siddhāntah, āśecanakavyātyādipadavadāstāṃ padatvamiti. Ibid, 2.152}
\item[49] \textit{Etasmādayamartho bodhavya itiśvareccihatvāt, Pratipadamarthaviśeṣajñāne 'pyāstāmakhāṇḍavākyasya. Ibid, 2.151}
\item[50] \textit{Ekasyānekārthā dṛṣṭā harisaḍhavādhiṣu padeṣu,}
\end{footnotes}
Śākta school also acknowledges the role of language in the form of vimarśa, parā vāk, nāda and bindu. Most of the terms are found in Siddhānta Śaiva also, but the explanation is quite different, since fundamental thought is quite different. The principles of Kashmir Śaiva philosophy is also explained with the similar terms, but with different description. But the Kashmir Śaiva school has dissimilarity only with the Siddhānta Śaiva school, while it is almost very similar to the Śākta philosophical school in the context of philosophical thoughts. The reason to the similarity of these terms is that all the three philosophical schools are the branches of the Tantra. However, language is the creative principle in all the three schools. The principle of language is the principle of unity and multiplicity. Basically there is unity in multiplicity, which is done by the vāk. It seems that the vāk is dividing the world at the empirical level, but it unifies the reality into the relation of sabda and artha.

The Siddhānta Śaiva and Śākta school provide the introduction of the theories of Tantras as well as prepare the background for the Kashmir Śaiva philosophy. Almost all the terms are used in the Kashmir Śaiva philosophy also, although the argumentative aspects are different. Now, the next two chapters-3rd and 4th are related to the Kashmir Śaiva philosophy. The introductory notes regarding the Kashmir Śaiva philosophy and its philosophy of language have been already given in the ‘Introduction’ of the thesis. In the chapter 3rd, the very first, nature of parā vāk and her knowledge theory will be examined, since the linguistic world is connected to the limited knowledge i.e. apūrṇa jñāna. And this is rooted into the pūrṇa jñāna or nirvikalpaka jñāna. When pūrṇa jñāna contracts itself, becomes apūrṇa jñāna and manifests as vikalpaka rūpa, which is determined world. Thus, all the aspects of epistemology of vāk has been tried to give in this chapter. The epistemology of vāk is the first principle in the sense of that it is the result of the creativity of vāk. On the basis of the cognitive process, the ontology is

_Anyatamaikāvagatau prakaraṇatātparyayorviṣeṣakatā._

_Praκṛte tu sarvabodhayate śatvānno viṣeṣakākāṅkṣā._

_Atha vā sakalārtheṣvapi śaktyaikyam puspavantapadavadiḥ Ṣbid, 2.153-154:_
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occurred because cognition is the internal process and manifestation is the appearance of this internal into the form of external tattvas and ābhāsas.