INTRODUCTION

Thinking about language in Indian intellectual tradition has its roots in vedas. The term that is often used for language in Vedic literature is Vāk. Vāk is situated in Sarasvatī. Sarasvatī means one that contains flow. Sarasvatī controls Vāk. It is indicated in Yajurveda and Atharvaveda. Sarasvati purifies, protects intelligence, and promotes truth. This quality of flow is the eternal feature of caitanya and Vāk. Bhartrhari indicated it.

Vāksūkta of Rgveda reflects the vedic vision of language. In this Sūkta Vāgāmbrīnī has directly realized ātman and described it. The special feature of this sūkta is the use of first person, rarely found elsewhere in vedas. This supports the theory of self realization.

In process of creation, it creates space and then enters every created being. The notion that whole creation emerged from Vāk is reiterated by Bharata and Bhartrhari.

---

1 (a) Vāk vai sarasvatī – (SB 1.1.4.6, 3.9.1.7, 5.2.2.14), (TB 16.5.16), (EB 3.1.10) (KYV 1.1.77) (KB 5.2, 14.5) (SNB 5.7)
(b) Vācāsarasvatī bhīṣagindrāyendriyāni dadhātah (YVJ 19.12)
2 (a) Sarasvatyai vāco yauturyantrīye dadhāmi (YV 9.30)
(b) Sarasvatyā vācamuphayāmahe manoṣyā (AV 5.10.8)
3 Pāvakā naḥ sarasvatī vājebhirvājiniḥvaṭi yajñari vaṣṭu dhiyā vasuḥ (RV 1.3.10 & YV 20.84)
4 (a) Prāno devi sarasvatī vājebhirvājiniḥvaṭi dhīnāmvitryavatva (RV 6.61.4)
(b) Sarasvatī Sādhayamantvi dhiyam naḥ (RV 2.3.8)
5 Codhayātī vūntānāṁ cetanāṁ suṣmatānāṁ yajñam dadhe sarasvatī (RV 1.3.11 & YV 20.85)
6 (a) Caitanyamiva yascayamavicchedena vartate (VP 1.141)
(b) Ajasra-vṛtīr yādhiḥ sabdā Śukṣmatvānnapalabhyate, (VP 1.116)
(c) Sājas sārisāṁśām sarūjīḥ bhairantasca vartate

---

7 Vāgāmbrīnī Rṣīḥ. Ātma devarā
8 (a) Ṛṣirdarśanāt - Durgavṛttil on Nirukta (2.11)
(b) Śākṣātṛtadharmaḥ rṣayo babhūvuh - Nirukta (1.19)
(c) Athādhyātmyikya uttamapuruṣayogā ahamitī
caitena sarvanāṁmā yathaitadindro vaikuṇṭho
Lavasūktaṁ Vāgāmbrīnīyāmīti – Nirukta (7.2)
(d) Parokṣākṛtāḥ pratyakṣaśeckōsa mantrāḥ
bhūyatiṣṭha alpaśa ādhyātmikāḥ - Nirukta (7.3)
9 (a) Vāgeva viśvā bhuvanāṇi jajñe – (Svopajñavṛttil, VP 1.120)
(b) ahameva vītamiva pravāṃyārhabhamāṇā bhuvanāṇi viśvā- (Rgveda 10.125.8)
10 Ahaṁ suve pitaramyasu mūrdhan....... tato viśṭhe bhuvanānu viśvō ......... (RV 10.125.7)
see commentary of Sāyana on this mantra - Pitarīm divaṁtī........
Bharata says that Śastra-s are interwoven by vāk and situated in vāk. There is nothing superior than vāk and vāk is cause of all. Bhāṛṭhari says that scholars of Vedas know that this is the parināma of Sabda and this world emerged from Vedas. Veda-s are here denoting subtle essence of vāk that is in form of atoms. That is why plural number "chandobhyāḥ" has been used. Ultimate source of vāk is intelligence. This is the explanation of Sāyana. 3

The sun holds vāk by virtue of intelligence. Gandharva (Prāṇa vāyu) causes the expression of vāk. 4 Vāk is expressed by seven types of tones or metres. Sāyana explains them as seven metres (Gāyatṛī etc.) Musicians can also interpret them as seven notes (Saptasvara) of the gamut. Vāk is situated in Rṣi-s and only intelligent (Dhīrā) can find it. 5 Mention of purification of speech so that quality of welfare already hidden there is revealed, is an indication of vyākaraṇa. Vyākaraṇa means separation of correct words from incorrect words. This is quite evident from the simile of sieve (Titau). 6

Patañjali quotes and explains this verse in his great work Mahābhāṣya in paspaśā from the grammatical perspective. There he holds the view that only meditative persons with the help of intelligence, can separate correct words from incorrect words and thus can purify the speech. 7

vitiṣṭhe vividhaṁ vyāpya tiṣṭhāmi

1 Vāṁmayāṁhi śastraṁ hi vaṁśiṭhāni tathāvai ca tasmād vācaḥ paramāh nāsti vāghi sarvasya kāraṇam (NS 14.3)
2 Śabdasya parinamo' yamityāṁmnāyavido viduḥ
   Chandobhya eva prathamaṁ hyetad viśvaṁ vyavartata (VP 1.120)
3 Mama yonirapsvantah samudre (RV 10.125.7)
   commentary of Sāyana on this portion-
   Mama ca yoniḥ kāraṇam Samudre suvāntyaśyasmād bhūtajātāni iti samudraḥ paramātmā tasmin
   apsu vyāpānāśīlāsu dhiṣṭīṣu antarmadhye yadbhava caitanyāḥ tanmama kāraṇaṁityarthāḥ
4 Patango vācaḥ manasā bibhahiti tāṁ gandharvo vadadgarbe antaḥ
   Tāṁ dyotamanāṁ svaryāṁ mantṣāṁṭatasya pade kavayo nipānti (RV 10.177.2)
   See commentary of Sāyana on this mantra.
5 Yajñena vācaḥ padadvayāṁyam tamanvavindannṛśupraṇvistāṁ
   Tāṁ śabdāḥyā vyadadhuḥ purutā tāṁ Sapta rebhā abhi samnavante. (RV 10.71.3)
6 Saktumiva titauṁ puṇanto yatram dhīrā manasā vācakrata
   Atra Sakhāyaḥ sakhyāṁ jānate bhadrāiśā lakṣmīṁhitādhivāci (RV 10.71.2)
7 Dhīrāḥ dhyaṇavantah manasā praṇājana - Paspaśā, Mahābhāṣya
We can see from the explanation that what kind of grammarian (vaiyakarāṇa) is intended here. Words of the same tone have been used by Patañjali for Pāṇini where quality of contemplation, purity of the place and great care have been indicated.¹

Four levels of speech (vāk) are indicated in veda-s. Patañjali quotes and comments two verses in this connection.² These two verses are also quoted and commented by Yāska in his Nirukta.³

In one verse speech has been described as an ox (vr̥ṣabha). This verse has been explained by Patañjali in favour of vāk but Yāska explains it in favour of yajña. Superficially it may seem contradictory but there is an interrelation between yajña and vāk because through yajña speech was traced.⁴ This also shows that only human beings are able to realize self and paramātman. This indication of veda-s is further elaborated by Purāna-s.⁵

Among human beings, seers (Ṛṣi-s) are seat of vāk as they realized it with all four dimensions. It seems that Maniśi Brāhmaṇa is one who controlled his mind and realized the speech through meditation. Sāyaṇa explained Brāhmaṇa as knower of veda or knower of speech.⁶ Maniśi is explained by Sāyana as intelligent (Medhāvin) or controller of mind.

To know speech and to articulate speech are different. They may or may not be together in a person. One verse of veda shows it well by using two adjectives together.⁷

---

¹ Pramāṇabhūta ācāryo darbhapavitrapāṇiṣu sūcā
   vavakāṣe prāṇmukha upaviṣya mahatā
   Prayatnena sūtraṇi praṇayati sma tatrāśāyaḥ
   Varṇenāpyanarthakhena bhavitum kīṁ punarīyatā sūtrena - Mahābhāṣya (1.1.1)

² (a) catvāri Śṛṅgā trayo asya āśā (RV 4.58.3)
   (b) catvāri vākparimitā padāṁi (RV 1.164.45)

³ See Nirukta (13.9) & (13.7)

⁴ Yajñena vācaḥ padaviyamāṇaḥ (RV 10.71.3)

⁵ Śṛṣṭvā purāṇī ... brahmāvalokadhiṣṭaḥ mudamāpadevaḥ (Bh 11.9.28)

⁶ Brāhmaṇaḥ vedavidaḥ ... brāhmaṇā vācyasya
   Sabdwabrahmaḥ adhigantāro yogināḥ ... maniśīno
   manasa śiśno medhāvino viduḥ ... maniśīno
   Manasaḥ svāmināḥ svādhinamānaskā - Sāyaṇa on RV (1.164.45)

⁷ Vacovidam vācamudārāntīṁ (RV 8.101.16)
The faculty of speech is within all creatures (visvarūpa paśu). It may be articulate or inarticulate. This faculty of speech is expressed in universe by gods.\(^1\) One verse of Rgveda indicates that unconscious beings also speak. Sāyaṅa explains that speech (Vāk) expresses some unintelligible ideas. Sāyaṅa's explanation also hints that normal speech is not being discussed in this verse.\(^2\)

Some type of communication has been traced in plants. Scientists have found some evidences of chemical communication among plants. Over three seasons spanning 1996 through 1998, researchers from the university of California in Davis monitored wild tobacco plants growing near sagebrush. They clipped the leaves of some of the sagebrush plants to mimic the damage caused by insects. The sagebrush plants responded with a puff of a chemical called methyl jasmonate. In response, tobacco plants downwind immediately begin boosting the level of an enzyme called PPO that makes their leaves less tasty to plant-eating insects. Within minutes of the clipping of the sagebrush the plants' PPO levels quadrupled. It worked too. Tobacco plants next to the clipped sagebrush suffered sixty percent less damage from grasshoppers and caterpillars than tobacco plants next to unclipped sagebrush.

Then, last fall, scientists at Kyoto University in Japan let spider mites loose on lima-bean plants and tracked the plants' responses. They found five different defense mechanisms. First, each injured plant released a chemical that changed its flavour, making it less attractive to the mites. Then the plants released other chemicals that drifted away. Other lima bean plants received the chemical and immediately begin giving off the same chemicals, making themselves less tasty and warning still more lima bean plants, before the mites even reached them. Most amazingly, some of the released chemicals had the effect of summoning a whole new batch of mites who preferred to eat the spider mites attacking the lima bean plants rather than eating lima been plants.

\(^1\) Deviṁ vācamajanayanta devāstāṁ visvarūpāṁ paśavo vadanti (RV 8.100.11)
\(^2\) Yadvāgyvadantyavicetanāṁ – (RV 8.100.15)

Sāyaṅa- Avicetanāṁ vijānarahitāṁ aprajñātāṁ arthāṁ vadantī prajñāpayantī ....
The Japanese researchers even found that the plants could distinguish between insect damage and crushing damage. They crushed some leaves and stems and found that although the injured plants released chemicals, the surrounding plants ignored them, somehow recognizing no real danger existed. It appears that substances in the attacking insects' saliva are required to trigger the anti-insect chemical response in the plant.

Other examples from agriculture are also known. Corn under attack from army worms, for instance, puts out a chemical signal that attracts a predatory wasp. The wasp lays its eggs inside the army worm. When they hatch, the wasp larva eat the army worm. And a study released last week shows that this kind of signaling exists not only in agricultural situations and in labs but in the wild situations also which means it is likely widespread throughout the plant kingdom. Researchers from the Max Planck institute for chemical ecology in Jena, Germany, discovered that when a species of wild tobacco plant that grows in the southwestern United States is damaged by horn worms (the larva of the hawkmoth) it releases chemicals that attract predatory insects that kill the larva.

Such chemical calls for help benefit both the plant being attacked and the predators, who would otherwise find it very difficult to find the larva, which are camouflaged and also tend to feed on the underside of leaves, where they cannot be seen. Most likely the plant developed a chemical defense that predators evolved to take advantage of but the result is the same as if the plant consciously sent out a cry for help.

Agricultural scientists are already looking for ways to use this new understanding of plant communication to improve the way farmers fight pests.¹

Plants use volatile signaling compounds to tend off attack and possibly warn nearby plants. Plants do not use such signals without cause,² plants have a network of communication to convey important information.³ Plants communicate to warn against danger. A new research (Posted on 08 October 2008 08:07 am ET) suggested that plants

---

² For details visit: http://pubs.acs.org/cen/critter/plantsbugs.html (Accessed on 08-07-08)
chatter amongst themselves to spread information a lot like humans and other animals. An unique internal network apparently allows greens to warn each other against predators and potential enemies.¹ Many herbal plants such as strawberry, clover, reed and ground elder naturally form a set of connections to share information with each other through channels known as runners – horizontal stems that physically bond the plants like tubes or cables along the soil surface and underground. Though connected to vertical stems, runners eventually from new buds at the tips and ultimately form a network of plants. If one of the network plants is attacked by cater pillars, the other members of the network are warned via an internal signal to upgrade their chemical and mechanical resistance – making their leaves hard to chew on and less desirable.

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa tells about four types of vāk.² This description of Brāhmaṇa is in line of description with vedas. Availability of faculty of speech in birds, frogs and rivers has been indicated in Rgveda. Yāska quotes and comments verses in this regard.³ Kapīṇjala, a kind of bird, spoke to Gṛṣṇamada.⁴ Maṇḍūka endorsed the stuti of Vaśiṣṭha for rain.⁵ In nāḍi-viṣvāmitra sūkta, viṣvāmitra requests rivers to be low to give him an easy passage. Rivers reply to this request.⁶

All this conversation shows that faculty of speech is available with rivers also. Stones (Grāvan) also are shown with speech in Rgveda.⁷ Now the question arises how it is possible. What is the evidence of communication between a human being and frog, river, and stones. Till it is not verifiable, we have to satisfy ourselves by saying that this is a description representing figurative speech. But we know that Yogadārśana describes the

¹ source: http://www.livescience.com/animals/07/008-plants -communicate.html (Accessed on 08-07-08)
² Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (4.1.3.16)
³ Nirukta (9.1.3)
⁴ Bhadraril. varia... Nirukta (9.1.4)
⁵ Nirukta (9.1.3, 6)
⁶ Nirukta (2.7.24), Nadyah pratyucuḥ - Nirukta (2.7.26)
⁷ Praite vadantu pra vayam vadāmā grāvabhyo vācaṁ vadaṁ vadadbhyāḥ (RV 10.94.1), See also commentary of Sāyaṇa and Nirukta (9.1.8)
power of a yogī through saṁyama to know the meaning of speech of all creatures.\(^1\) There is also a story in Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa that Father of Kaikeyī was knower of speech of all creatures including birds.\(^2\) Herbs were also described with intelligence as they disappeared having known that someone seeking them has come when Hanumān reached the Himalayas to carry those herbs.\(^3\) The ocean asked the mountain named Maināka to entertain Hanumān.\(^4\) How is it possible because sea and mountain –both are unconscious? unconscious? The same question comes to the mind when Laṅkāni introduces herself as city of Laṅkā.\(^5\) When we investigate about the mention of vākya and its components in vedic literature some important references are found in saṁhitā and upaniṣada texts. Prātiśākhya texts also mention about saṁhitā (togetherness) as padaprakṛti that is the origin of the debate of divisibility and indivisibility of vākya as mentioned by Bhartrhari. Rkprātiśākhya mentions about four fold division of words as nāma, ākhyāta, upsarga and nipāta.

In Chāndogyopanisat Nārada mentions vākovākya among the branches of knowledge he knows.\(^6\) Śaṅkara, while commenting on this reference in his bhāṣya says that it means tarkaśāstra (logic). In Mahābhāṣya, Patañjali also mentions it in the same sense.\(^7\) Kaiyāta Kaiyata commenting on it says that vākovākya is the name of that type of work which consists of questions and answers.\(^8\) It indicates the importance of vākya because it is a branch of knowledge. The direct use of vākya in the name vākovākya and the fact that

\(^1\) Šabdārthapratyayānāmitaretarādhyāśatsamkarastatpra
vibhāgasamayāmsarvabhūtarutajñānam (YS 3.17)

\(^2\) Sarvabhūtarutai tasmāt saṁjñajñē vasudhādhipah (VR 2.35.19)
Mahausadhyastataḥ... (VR 6.74.66)

\(^3\) Samudrāśchannamambhāsī...mainākamuvāca girisattamam (VR 5.1.89)

\(^4\) Aham hi nāgan lanka svayameva plavaṅgama (VR 5.3.30)

\(^5\) Chāndogyopanisat (7.1.2.4)&(7.2.1)

\(^6\) Mbh.paspaśā, vol.1,1,p.62.

\(^7\) Mbhpra on ibid.

\(^8\) Chāndogyopanisat (7.1.2.4)&(7.2.1)

\(^8\) Mbh.paspaśā,vol.1,1,p.62.
questions and answers can neither be structured nor can convey their sense without the structuring of a vākyā, indicates the place of vākyā in this branch of learning. This is the important reference related to vākyā in Upanisat texts.

Nāma as a component of sentence-structure has not been mentioned clearly but it is mentioned in Rgveda in Jnānasūkta (10.71) as first expression of speech. Though other categories of sentence-structure are not clearly expressed but indicated by mentioning the nāmadheya as the first expression of speech. We know that a child utters names first while learning to speak. It can be concluded that other categories of speech are also meant here because first is a relative term and indicates second expression necessarily.