INTRODUCTION

Vāk (speech) is one of the fundamental component and centre of Indian speculations from the Vedic period to present day theorizations. There are number of clues confirming it, for example; several of the Rigveda hymns are very much focused and devoted to Vāk and same can be seen in Brahmanas and the Upanisad. Patañjali, in his Mahābhshya, comments on these earlier ideas establishing the basic formulations for a philosophy of language. These powerful formulations are given further development by both the Mīmāṁsā and the grammar schools, with the latter producing the Sphoṭa theory.

Glancing at Indian philosophy, it is noticed that Grammar is the most important outcome as a comprehension discipline which has evolved from the Vedas. Bhartrhari is well known name which stands for Sanskrit Grammar and Vākyapadīya. Grammar leads one to the comprehension of Brahman in the form of the supreme word.1 In day to day life it is the essay way to understand the truth about things through words, but this truth which we want to understand about words, that truth only can be understood, through grammar. Definitely, grammar is the cleanest outfit in our speech and mind. Words are too special and the supreme word forms the real meaning of the Brahman which is devoid of all characteristics. In this chapter the aim is to discuss mainly the concept of Sphoṭa and the relationship between Sphoṭa and Pratibhā.

Some views of Bhartrihari - a selected exposition

The history reveals that the grammatical studies of Hindus were not so good. The credits’ go to the Śābdikas (grammarians), they formulated a path of spiritual discipline even though the complicated mass of grammatical rumors. While exploring the ultimate nature of Vāk (speech) the Śābdikas got the path which led them to an
inspiring region of Sādhanā a region of perfect bliss and pleasure. The cultivation of grammar gave rise to a spiritual vision which, enabled the Vāgyegavid (knower of secret of speech) to visualize Brahman in the Varṇamālā (wreath of letters). Letters are denoted in Sanskrit by the same term Aksara as is often applied to Brahman. A glimpse into the words in which Aksara has been interpreted by grammarians of old will serve to open our eyes to the supreme importance of Varṇas (letters).

The very first and second chapters of Vākyapadīya, give birth to ample of questions such as what is the nature of creation. What is the relationship of Brahman, world, language, the individual soul (Jīva)? And one of the most important questions is, what is the relationship between the appearance and understanding of the significations of words and sentences? More importantly, his philosophical work was recognized and addressed by schools of Hindu scriptural exegesis Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta and Buddhism.

In the study of the first two chapters of Vākyapadīya, lots of questions are found like

- What is the nature of creation?
- What is the relationship of Brahman, world, language, the individual soul (Jīva)?
- And what is the relationship between the manifestation and understanding of the significations of words and sentences?

More importantly, his philosophical work was recognized and addressed by schools of Hindu scriptural exegesis (Mīmāṃsā), Vedānta (mystical Vedism) and Buddhism.

This principle accounts for creation on a number of levels: it is the origin of consciousness, of cognition, sensation, and language use, cognitive and experiential aspects of the world. In other words, objects of consideration and their cross-relations are word-determined, regardless of whether they are objects of perception, inference or any other kind of knowledge. When we perceptually capture external reality, we always do so in terms of names, for without names; objects are neither identifiable nor knowable.

Moreover, when it is considered as a phenomenal concepts, we see that they do not exist or hold any meaning beside from the words through which they are
expressed; it can be said that these concepts are ‘word-loaded’ and from this it can be understood that the main cause of the world is the principle of the word. Bhartṛhari’s asserts on having the traditional philosophical discussions on the nature of causality and inference.

Like other thinkers, while explaining causality saw that the properties of cause carry on in the effect. Furthermore, in the scriptures also, the word in which the power of Enjoyer and Enjoyed are hollow has been declared as the cause of the world. Bhartṛhari explain the absolute is unlike from that of others. According to his interpretation, reality is beyond the boundary of language. As cognition exposed by words, we cognize only the beings exposed in the mind by language. The indivisible Śabda-Brahman is inferred as the ontological substratum of indivisible and is not a construction of a collection of external things or their qualities. Cognitively, external things are known by implication as creation by permission and prevention of the time-power, but it and its time-power are not subject to the sentence in his philosophy is indivisible, a unit of consciousness in nature that is manifested by utterances. Bhartṛhari has taken the word eternal in two senses. According to the first, eternal is the absolute–Śabda-Brahman (the absolute being) which is not subject to birth and death. According to the second, the Śabda is eternal in the sense of the meaninglessness of communication.

In the development of grammatical speculation, spiritual significance of the study of grammar is the basic issue that often needs interrogative clarification. There are people who do not take grammar seriously and they suppose that grammar is not problematic. These kinds of people have to suffer and they work under a pitiful fantasy. It was left to Patañjali and his followers to unfold a new kingdom of thought, so as to throw light upon the ultimate end of all enquiries into words. The Mahābhāṣya portended the birth of a form of Sādhanā in which Śabda as Sphoṭa or eternal verbatim had to be worshipped with all the reverence of a divinity. In order to attain union with Brahman or to get oneself completely merged in the Absolute, one is directed to take up the mystic path of Śabda Sādhanā.

It can be said with full certainty that Vākyapadīya is the first rounded statement and discussion of philosophy of grammar which introduces linguistic philosophy incidentally. Vākyapadīya’s first four Kārikās talk about that the supreme
word principle of the Śabdabrahman in Sanskrit text right from the Vedas downwards. It is held equivalent to mind, matter and Prajāpati. Further, it is described in terms like Vāk and Prajāpati since the other self of Prajāpati speech functioned as the source of all universes.

Word is held as encompass of not only expression but also loaded with power. Grammarians have different viewpoints in their attempts to explain the word-meaning-object relation. Indian poetic has rightly accepted Dhvani-Kāvyā as the best form of Kāvyā as the meaning suggested by such poetry is not literal. Similarly, we find grammarians exploring different levels and usages of word with their different shades of meanings.

The aim of the present chapter is to focus on the following questions:

1. How does our aesthetic experience form its experience through the words? In other words, aesthetic experience is only through words like any other experience but words and their meanings and the point of contention is their meanings when rightly held by Indian poets as the body and soul of Kāvyā respectively, direct us to develop a particular kind of understanding regarding aesthetic experience and treat it as different, separate and unique from rest of the experiences.

2. Another pertinent question that needs to be addressed is that if the words we choose to depict our experiences completely portrays or is able to depict our experience in totality, the experience we have gone through.

3. The nature of word and its relation with its meaning plays a vital role in developing our thesis that the concept of Pratibha bears the same connotations in the field of art as the concept of Śphoṭa in Grammar.

4. Why and how Śabda-Tattva as Kāvyā is considered equivalent to Brahmānubhāva. Precisely, the aim is to dwell the inter-relation-between the nature of experience of those having similar roots in aesthetic experience that is conveyed, communicated and understood only through the words.

The spiritual insight lying under the phenomena of speech was undoubtedly the aspect which made the deepest impression upon the grammarian. The utterance of sound is to him a vivid materialization of consciousness. To the grammarian Śabda
Artha (meaning), and what we call Vāk as the vehicle of communication, is nothing but another expression of Caitanya (spirit) that is lying within.

LEVELS OF SPEECH

In advancing the Sphoṭa theory of language, Bhartṛhari speaks of levels of language in the Vākyāpadiya. There are three stages of language of speech through which Śabda or Vāk passes whenever one speaks. The first stage is where there is a complete identity of language and thought is called the Paśyanti stage; at the ‘intermediate’ stage, there is complete identity of Thought and Language yet their difference is discernable, it can be called the ‘pre-verbal’ stage. It is at this stage that the speaker sees Thought and Language as differentiable and this perception impels the speaker to speak. Then the second stage is the Vāikhari stage, the ‘verbal’ stage. And the third stage, there is speculation of yet another higher level of language, that is, Parāvāk. According to Bhartrhari, there cannot be any cognitive state in this world without the impression of words. Word is “the implicit speech element”. It is the Bijā (seed) which enlightens our consciousness of the object. The latent word in the speaker generates the cognition when he is conscious of some object and by expressing that word he awakens the dormant word in the mind of the hearer and in this way the latter becomes conscious of that object. If consciousness were to function without our linguistic effectiveness, we would be left with an impotent consciousness which would not let us to known any object.

It is argued that ‘implicit speech’ is intrinsic in the nature of our cognitive states just as illumination is in the nature of fire. One cannot be separated from the other, and hence the two are indistinguishable. Even our perceptual consciousness of an object interpretation, and hence can hardly be differentiated from our linguistic habit which goes with it. Conceptualization and interpretation operate with words and names, which may be either uttered or unuttered. Whenever our ‘pure’ sensation penetrates into the cognitive level, it invariably penetrates, according to Bhartrhari, into the linguistic level or our ‘implicit speech’ level.

There are two kinds of words which have been taken by Patañjali, first one is Nitya (eternal) and other one is Kārya (created). Bhartṛhari understands the supreme reality that transcends all limitations of time and space. The attributes whereby the Vedāntins explain Brahman or the Absolute have all been used by Patañjali in his
explanation of Nittya-Śabda. He has more than once drawn our attention to this eternal character of Śabda.

The idea about eternal character of word gives us some idea of the scale in which Śabda was understood by the hypothetical grammarian whom tradition makes an incarnations of the Lord. His practical explanation of Varṇas (letters), to which we have already referred, best illustrates the spiritual outlook of his mind. From what he has quoted from the Vedas in laudation of Vāk and Vyākaraṇa (word and grammar), it is sufficiently clear that he was an ardent and devout worshipper of Vāk belonging to that class of mystics who in their spiritual experience make no distinction between Parāvāc and Parama Brahman. Patañjali used to look upon Śabda as a Mahādevas (great divinity) that makes its presence felt by every act of utterance. He is considered to be a Yogin who’s Pratibhā-Jñāna (intuitive vision) permitted him to have a look into that internal flow of pure consciousness undisturbed from outside he was a true type of Brahman who visualized the ultimate nature of Vāk by dispelling the darkness of ignorance through the aid of his illuminating knowledge of Śabda-Tattva. The worship of Vāk with its origin in the Upaniṣads, which found so prominent an expression in Āgamas, was earnestly followed up by the Śabdikā, particularly by Patañjali and Bhartrihari.\(^7\) Language may be seen to operate on at least two levels. Having talked of language and its two levels as;

i. First level is Pratibhā or the intuitive flash-like understanding of the sentence-meaning as a whole.

ii. Second level- there is the uttered words of the sentence; it is intended to understand the types of speech.

Three Types of Speech

After talking about the levels of speech we are going to talk about the types of speech. There are three types of speech, in Indian aesthetic. These three types of speech are more important for art, like, poetry and theater. And this concept of speech also worked on language and grammar. The concept will be discussed respectively. Bhartrihari calls the latter Vaikharī-Vāk (over or elaborated speech), while the previous is aptly-designated as Paśyantī-VĀk (speech which through Pratibhā sees or perceives reality). Between these two levels of speech there is Madhyamā-Vāk equivalent to the Vākyā Sphoṭa. It’s a mental division into sentence-meaning and a
sequence of manifesting word-sounds, none of which have yet been uttered. These are the three levels of language through which Śabda or Vāk passes whenever one speaks. Śabda, which is at first fairly internal, is gradually externalized for the purpose of communication. In this way Bhartṛhari accounts for all cognition as being necessarily identified with language, since these levels of language span the complete continuum of cognition. This is clearly expressed in one of Bhartṛhari’s basic tenets: “There is no cognition in the world in which the word does not figure. All knowledge is, as it were, intertwined with the word”. For Bhartṛhari there can not be cognition possible without the operation of Śabda. His conception of the levels of language seems quite logical once this presupposition is accepted. Thought at the Buddhi or differentiated stage of word-sequences is perhaps best understood as internal speaking. And Pratibhā or intuition may be seen as a kind of muted speaking. The point being emphasized is that for Bhartṛhari speaking is the essence of consciousness, and the means to all knowledge. And it must also be clearly understood that by “speaking”, “language”, or “thought” what is meant is the conveyance of meaning. “Thinking” here does not primarily refer to concept formation, the drawing of inferences, etc., all of which would exist at the two levels Vaikharī and Madhyamā only. But when “meaning” is identified as intertwined with consciousness, this satisfies instances of Pratibhā as well as instances of more commonplace cognition, and therefore can be held to be logically possible at all levels of Vākym including even the very highest.

Having seen how the levels of language fit into and categorize Bhartṛhari’s overall metaphysics, let us now examine each level in somewhat more detail.

1. Paśyantī

Paśyantī is the pure consciousness level of speech and is known by implication as the substratum of other levels of speech. It is an ontic substratum of cognition revealed by language in the mind. It is the direct experience of Vākya-Sphoṭa, of meaning as a noumenal whole. At this level there is no distinction between the word and the meaning and there is no temporal sequence. All such phenomenal differentiations plunge away with the intuition of pure meaning in itself. Yet there is present at this level a kind or “going-out” or desire for expression. This is the Pratibhā “instinct”, referred to above, which in one sense may be said to motivate the phenomenalization into sentences and words of the Paśyantī apparition, so that
communication may occur. There is a sense in which Veda and Pratibhā are identified as Paśyantī-Vāk. Since Paśyantī is, by definition beyond the level of differentiated cognition, it is impossible to define it in word-sentences. It is at the level of direct intuition and therefore, must finally be understood through experience.

On the other hand there is controversy among the interpreters of Bhartṛhari on the issue of Parā-Vāk as one of the levels of speech. According to the philosophies of Tantra and Vedānta, Parā-Vāk is the subtlest form of speech, subtler than Paśyantī. Paśyantī is the pure consciousness level of speech and is known by implication as the substratum of cognition revealed by language in the mind.

2. Madhyamā

Madhyamā is inner-Śabda, the being revealed in the mind when manifested by articulate utterances. It figures in or is revealed in the mind of the hearer after hearing the verbal-noises and in the mind of speakers when they intend to speak (Antaḥ Sanniveśinī Śabda). Śabda in mind of speaker may be sequence or without sequence. When it assumes sequence after being revealed in the mind, it is Madhyamā-Śabda. In other words, what is understood by the word ‘thinking and reflecting’ may be called Madhyamā-Śabda. It is subtler than Vaikharī and inaudible to the audience, unless manifested through articulated utterances.

3. Vaikharī

Vaikharī (Articulated speech) is the most external and differentiated level in which Vāk is commonly uttered by the speaker and heard by the hearer. It is Prāṇa or breath that enables the organs of articulation and hearing to produce and perceive sounds in a temporal sequence. Prāṇa may therefore, be taken as the instrumental cause of Vaikharī-Vāk. The chief characteristic of Vaikharī-Vāk is that it has a fully developed temporal sequence. At this level individual peculiarities of the speaker are present along with the linguistically relevant parts of speech. Vaikharī are audible utterances articulated by men to communicate meaning in usual life. Men speak letters, words and sentences formed by association of such words. In the term ‘Vaikharī-Śabda’ the word ‘Śabda’ is used for expression in the form of sentential gesture, and this expression is explained as a whole constituted by the association of spoken words, that is articulated utterances. Language is uttered in a sequence, and the hearer hears those utterances in the sequence they are uttered. Those utterances are
understood as fixed words, and then the set of words as a sentence express the complete meaning.

There are three chief components of such a sentence, namely (i) denoting figured out Siddha (character), (ii) denoting unfigured out character, (iii) that is to be figured out as Sādhyā and Sadhana are connected for a single expression conveying a unit meaning. The components are also called by the term Śabda, because they are taken as parts of it and denote a meaning fixed conventionally. At this level, a variety of manifestation is possible. The same Sphoṭa or meaning is capable of being revealed by a variety of forms of Madhyamā, depending on the language adopted.

This is subtler of the three forms of speech. As it is subtle, there is no occasion for any distinction of language and meaning at the Paśyantī level of speech. It is sequence less, pure unity and is manifested, at the level of Madhyamā first and then is articulated at the level of Vaikhari.

After discussing the types of speech here we will discuss about different kind of Vāk speech which through Pratibhā sees or perceives reality. This deepest stage of speech is Paśyantī Vāk. For grammarians it is Paśyantīkāyā Pratibhā. Paśyantī is the direct experience of the Vākyā-Sphoṭa of meaning as a supposed whole. At this level there is no difference between the word and the meaning and there is no sequence. All such phenomenal differentiations drop away with the intuition of the pure meaning itself. Yet there is present at this level a going out or a desire for expression. This is the telos inherent in the Paśyantī vision that may be said to motivate the phenomenalization into sentences and words so that communication occurs. As Paśyantī is, by definition, beyond the level of differentiated cognition, it is impossible to define it in word-sentences. It is at the level of direct intuition and therefore must be finally understood through experience.

Word: A Form of Air or of Knowledge

The Vedic idea of transcendental Vāk is that which manifest itself in the phenomenal world by the virtue of the seer and the inspired poets. It gives insights into the great secret of existence. But seer and poets can express it only if they have some natural creative power. The grammarians were convinced that the eternal word is Mahāsattā (pure being). The self-revelation of Śabda-Brahman is equal with Pratibhā. The first grammarian who uses this term Pratibhānam is Bhartṛhari. He
defines Pratibhā as a flash of intuition that illuminates the meaning of whole sentence.
He maintains that the completeness of the sentence-meaning can be experienced only
through this special kind of intuition called Pratibhā. When we read a sentence, we
grasp the whole meaning in a flash. It is quite different from the meaning of the
individual words. Sphoṭa, for Vaiyakarans, is an inseparable, complete meaning
enlightening unit, the expresser that is sentence.

The Sanskrit word Śabda is generally translated into English as ‘word’ and the
question which arises here is that whether word is a form of air or of knowledge?
Whether Sphoṭa is a word or a sentence? The answer to the first question is that there
are two aspects of words (i) sound; it is based on air, (ii) meaning; it is based on
mind.17 And the next question is Sphoṭa is a word or a sentence. According to
Bhartrhari, Sphoṭa, being a complete connotation revealing unit, is a sentence. It is
added that, as a sentence is an inner and indivisible unit, it is difficult for ignorant and
children to appreciate and in order to make it comprehensible to them, it is divided,
artificially, into different components of it by the process of grammatical analysis.

Now we will examine the different functions of words. There are three uses of
words that are well recognized in the world, (i) The common or Prasiddha (ii) the
secondary or Laksana, and (iii) based on similar qualities or Guṇa. What is meant by
the word “common” is the Mukhya use. Whenever there is a word which is obsessed
of a known denotative capacity revealed in the exchanges of those who are
experienced in the manner of expressing its meaning, then its use with respect to its
own object through that very cause or Prayojaka is its primary use.

Here on this discussion we are taking an example, the use of the word “cow”,
which has a known denotative ability about a shape which is possessed by things such
as dewlap, only then it is, used in respect to that object, as in such general usages as
“bring the cow.” On the other hand, the secondary usages is that usage with respect to
a different sense on the basis of a connection with the primary sense, when the
understanding of the contradicted by other valid means of knowledge. For example, in
the statement “The village of Ram is located on the Ganges”, the use of the word
“Ganges” intend the banks of the Ganges through is link with the Ganges River,
which is the primary sense of the word. And the usage based on similar qualities is
that usage which occurs when the accepted primary sense is contradicted by other
means of valid knowledge, and which indicates a sense different from the primary sense on account of a connection with qualities found in the primary sense. For this primary and secondary sense we can see the next example in this expression, “Dara Singh was a loin”, when we use this word “loin” is owing to the connection with the qualities of a lion such fierceness and courage. Even if the basic form ‘usages of a exacting word to mean an object different from its primary sense’ is the same for both the secondary usage and the usage based on similar qualities, still there is a difference between them because their specific definitions are different. Thus the three usages of words have been explained.

As we have seen the uses of different kind of senses in different way. From this discussion we conclude three types of senses; (i) Mukhyavr̥tti, (ii) Guṇavr̥tti and (iii) Laksana. Mukhyavr̥tti and Guṇavr̥tti have only one form. On the other hand, Lakṣaṇa is threefold, namely, non-inclusive secondary usage Jahallakṣaṇa, inclusive secondary usage (Jahallakṣaṇa), and partially non-inclusive and partially inclusive secondary usage (Jahallakṣaṇa). In respect to this, the one called Jahallakṣaṇa is the usage of a word in a different sense by abandoning its Mukhyārtha; just as the word “Ganges” in the sentence, “The village of Ram is located on the Ganges”, is used to mean only the banks of the river by abandoning its primary sense completely. A Jahallakṣaṇa, on the other hand, is the use of word to mean a different sense while not abandoning its primary sense, and retaining its entire primary sense; just as when there is the secondary indication of a horse in the phrase, “the red stands there”, the word “red” is used to mean the individual object – horse, while retaining, its original sense of “redness”. And Jahadajahallakṣaṇa is the use of a word, while retaining its primary sense and abandoning one portion of it, to mean the other portion of its primary sense, just as in the statement, “This is that Dara singh”, the two words “this” and “that”, which express different times and places, are used to mean an individual called Dara singh by abandoning that piece consisting of those times and places. These are the three types of Lakṣaṇa that are well known in the world.

On the other hand, we can use this concept of word in deferent way that is the concept of Śabda as creative-force.

Sarvomamāyam Vibhāvam Ityevam Parijānataḥ
Viśvātmano Vikalpānām Prasarepi Maheśatā.

(Isvarapratybhijnā)
The concept of word as the creating-force is inevitably a logical necessity for the interpretation of the problem of diversity in a holistic philosophy, for which the same reality by its divergent powers is taken as creator of all the diversity. According to Kashmir Śaivism of the Āgamika tradition, Śiva is dynamic and out of its spontaneity diversities come into existence. The word ‘Śabda’ itself signifies that reality is power. Śabda has his own creative power it can create anything through his Śakti. It is power, on account of which it expresses itself differently in the different capacities of verb, substantive, adjective and so on.

In other words the metaphysical thought of Bhartrhari is that doesn’t matter what is called Śabda, Vāk and Artha, ‘meaning’, ‘thought’ or ‘things-meant’, are one and undifferentiated in their pre-verbal or potential state. Before the utterance, it is argued, the languages which do not convey its meaning is like the yolk of a peahen’s egg. In that state all the variegated colors of a full grown peacock lie dormant in potential form. Later these colors are actualized. Similarly, in the self of the speaker or the hearer, or whoever is gifted with linguistic capacity, all the variety and differentiation of linguistic items and their meanings exist as potentialities, and language and thought are identical at that stage.

The primary meaning of word is that sense which is understood by the listener, however opposing it may be with orientation to outside reality. Thus, a speaker may use one word in the sense of another word, deliberately as if by his own effort. So one may say Ghaṭam Ānaya ‘bring a pot’ with the word Ghaṭa in the sense of Paṭa ‘cloth’, and the listener has to understand it only as Paṭa, for it is the intended meaning of the speaker. However, for practical expediency the meaning of a word is divided into primary and secondary on the basis of predominance or Prasiddhi, and non-predominance or Aprasiddhi. Thus every meaning which is well-known in usage and understood by the listener immediately after hearing it called Mukhyārtha, and that meaning which is understood with the help of context, etc. is called the secondary meaning (Gauna).

Here it may be noted that the conceptual referent Bauddha-Padārtha for the words is based on the declaration of Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya: Śabdapramāṇakā-Vayam. We are upholders of the authority of the word; what the word says is our authority. Bhartrhari comments on this in following words;
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Kim Asmākaṃ Vastugatena Vicāreṇa?

"Arthas Tv Asmākaṃ Yaḥ Śabdenābhidhīyate"

What is the use of discussion on the nature of things? The object for us is what it expresses. Bharṭṛhari calls the sense of this sentence as Pratibhā.²²

The Word Theory of Naiyayikas

The Naiya School also fined three different type of word relation: Abhidhā, Paribhāṣa, and Lakṣaṇā. ²³

i. Abhidhā

Abhidhā refers to the primary meaning of a word. The relation between the primary meaning and the word may be either direct or indirect. If direct it leads immediately from the word to the knowledge of its meaning. Such a direct relation may be either eternal or non-eternal. When eternal it is called Śakti or the intrinsic potency of the word. The Naiya maintain that this eternal Śakti is due to god’s volition which ordained that the particular fixed order of letter sounds ‘jar’ should mean the object now called jar. Thus, for Naiyas, the meaning of a word even at its most primary level is judged to be conventional (that is established by the will of god) and not natural as was maintained by the schools of the Brāhmaṇical tradition, especially the Mīmāṃsā.

ii. Paribhāṣa

Paribhāṣa refers to the non-eternal or changeable relation between a word and its meaning when that convention is established by man rather that God. Proper names and technical terms are examples of this type.

iii. Lakṣaṇā

The third kind of relation is Lakṣaṇā to the secondary meaning to a word. It is the indirect or implied meaning which must be assumed (when the Abhidhā or primary meaning does not make sense) in order that the word will fit into the context in which it is found. For example, in the sentence ‘the house is not on the Ganges’, the word “Ganges” is taken in its secondary meaning of “the bank of the Ganges” rather than its primary meaning of “the stream of water”.

After reviewing the many ways in which we learn the meanings of words, the Naiyas bring close that the abundance of different ways of coming to know the
meanings of words proves that the relation between words and their meanings is not natural but conventional. If there were a natural relation fixed between a word and its meaning, as exists for example between fire and burning, then the word should have always co-existed with its referent and that given relation should be known simply by perception. But the word “fire” does not coexist with the object “fire” and produce any burning sensation in us when we speak the word. Further evidence for the conventional nature of the word is the fact that the same word is used by different people with different meanings.

THE THEORY OF SPHÔTA

The theory of Sphoṭa is the main concept of Bharṭṛhari; he holds the peak point of the philosophical views of the Indian grammarians. The doctrine of Sphoṭa as described by Bharṭṛhari with the aid of the five means to validate comprehension treats the indivisible Vākya-Sphoṭa (sentence meaning) and the absolute truth. The production of Śabdāvirbhava (sound), Grahaṇa (comprehension) and Vinimaya (communication) are the concepts that enthuse this great grammarian-philosopher, whose analytical study resulted in the intellectual doctrine namely the Sphoṭa-Vāda. From the linguistic point of view this speech main is a masterly exhibition by Bharṭṛhari, which logically analyses the central idea of Artha Vijnāṇa (semantics).

The Sphoṭa theorists, along with the Mīmāṃsakas, believe that Śabda is both divine in origin and it is the means by which the divine may be known. Vaiśeṣikas also believe Śabda as a Pramāṇa (valid source of knowledge). The Vaiśeṣikas comprise Śabda within inference since the ground of knowledge is the same in both the cases. In Jaina thought Śabda is recognized as a separate Pramāṇa which comes, at its highest level, form a perfected and omniscient finite self. Both Sāṅkhya and yoga yield acceptance to Śabda as Pramāṇa. On the other hand, Nyāya, consider that the Vedas have been created by God and as much as any other forms of knowledge, must be proven by reason. Mīmāṃsā thought, although containing differences of opinion on the nature of Pauruṣeya (personal) Śabda, agrees that Apauruṣeya (impersonal) or scriptural Śabda provides valid knowledge of supersensuous realities, like the Mīmāṃsā, the Vedāntists view Vedic Śabda as impersonal – revealed but not created by god – and Pramāṇa.24
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Sphoṭa is a Sanskrit word. The word Sphoṭa is derived from the root ‘Sphut’. The verbal form ‘Sphutati’, which means manifested, displayed, to burst, opened, expanded, expressed, etc. In different derivations it is taken for different meanings.25 Mādhavacārya derives the word in two ways. Firstly Sphoṭa is ‘that which expresses a meaning’. Secondly Sphoṭa is ‘that which is manifested by letters’

“Sphutābhavaty Asmād Artha Iti Sphoṭo Rthapratyāyakāḥ”

“Phuṭyate Vyajyate Varṇair Iti Sphoṭo Varṇābhivyāṅgyaḥ”26

These definitions are offered keeping in view the process of communication through language. Hence, the first definition is with reference to the speaker and the second with reference to the listener. Sphoṭa entails a kind of mental perception which is described as a moment of recognition, an instantaneous Pratibhā (flash), whereby the hearer is made conscious, through hearing sounds, of the latent meaning unit already present in his consciousness or unconscious. The sentence employs analyzable units to express its meaning, but that meaning emerges out of the particular concatenation of those units, not because those units are meaningful in themselves. We analyze language by splitting it up into words, prefixes, suffixes, etc….but this is indicative of the fact that we “misunderstand” the fundamental oneness of the speech-unit. Words are only abstracted meaning possibilities in this sense, whereas the uttered sentence is the realization of a meaning-whole irreducible to those parts in themselves. This fundamental unity seems to apply, also, to any language taken as a whole. Bhartrihari's believes that the theoretical indivisibility of the sentence resonates with the contemporary linguistic view of learning sentences.

There are three stages of the process of statement through language. In the first stage the speaker conceives in his mind the sentence in a pattern with a specific sequence. And in the stage he translates the sentence he has constructed in mind into speech sounds through articulation. The listener has also to pass through these three stages in a reverse order. So he listens first the articulated speech sounds of the speaker. Then he gets a complete impression of the sentence. In the third stage he cognizes a single and indivisible sentence by which he gets the meaning.27

These three stages in the process of communication are called by different names, each one describing a particular characteristic feature. In the first stage, with reference to the speaker, the word is called Sphoṭa and the second and third stages it is called Dhvani or Nāda. The Sphoṭa and Dhvani are two forms of the word;
The Sphoṭa is the underlying cause of the Dhvani.

The latter is the cause of communication of meaning.

The Dhvani in the second stage gets the distinctions of duration called Hrasva (short), Dīrgha (long), and Pluta (extra-long) and it is called Prākṛta-Dhvani. The same Dhvani in the third stage gets the distinctions of Druta (rapidity), Madhyama (medium) and Vilambita (slowness) and it is called Vaikṛṭa-Dhvani.²⁸

According to Bhartrhari, these three stages have self expressive names Paramopāṁṣu, Upāṁśu and Saṁhṛṭa-Krama.²⁹

i. Paramopāṁṣu

The first stage is Paramopāṁṣu stage. In this stage the Sphoṭa-Śabda is still in the mind and the process of expression has not started up till now. And the words are grasped only in the mind of the speaker. And in this stage the Sphoṭa called as Paśyantī.

ii. Upāṁśu

The second stage is Upāṁśu stage; this stage is the next part and in this stage the word in the speaker’s mind is externalized by the implementation of Prāṇa and the expression of the word begins. However this expression of the word cannot be heard by others. In this stage words cannot be heard by the other person; it can be heard only to the speaker. The speaker is aware of time sequence and the phonological pattern. This is called Prākṛṭa-Dhvani and Madhyamā Vāk.

iii. Saṁhṛṭakrama

The last stage of externalization of word is called Saṁhṛṭakrama. In this stage, the Vāk takes the separate form and becomes audible to the listener also. On the other hand this stage of words can be listening by the speaker. It is the real speech sounds distinct by expression by the speaker and heard by the listener.

Thus this is called Vaikṛṭa-Dhvani and Vaikhaṛī Vāk. The Vaikṛṭa-Dhvani is fleeting in contradistinction to the permanent Sphoṭa. The eternal Sphoṭa, however, does not differ in its nature from the destructible Dhvani.

How can the permanent Sphoṭa be no different from the destructible Dhvani? Bhartrhari resorts to the philosophical doctrine of change called Vivarta, which is the
very establishment of his śabdavaita. He defines Vivarta as ‘the supposition of one thing as something else without losing its inherent Tattva through apparent diversity of different unreal forms. We can see the following Sutra which is given by Bhartrhari;

“Ekasya Tattvād Apracyutasya
Bhedānuṃkāreṣātāvibhaktānyāṣyopopagrāhitā Vivartaḥ”
(Vākyapādiya. 1.1)

The Sphota-Śabda, which is nothing but the consciousness of the speaker appears in the form of Prākṛta-Dhvani and Vaikṛta-Dhvani by taking on it the character of the sound. Now as the reflection of the moon in water appears as moving because of the movement of water, the Sphota-Śabda also appears to have divisibility, duration and speed.30

After this discussion about externalization the word, we understood the whole process of communication as inverted in the case of the listener; here we can observe in these three stages the grammarian has to clarify the role of the different sounds in the manifestation of the Sphota-Śabda. In other words, when the Vaikṛta-Dhvani and the Prākṛta-Dhvani are only appearance or Vivarta of Sphota, one word in a sentence, or one phoneme in a word should be enough to communicate the Sphota-Śabda in the mind of the listener.

Sphota, for Bhartrihari, is an indivisible flash. As it is manifested through language symbol, it is taken differently as: (1) Varna-Sphota (2) Pada-Sphota (3) Vākya-Sphota. But it is not a fixed rule that a Vākya-Sphota is called so because it is manifested by a sentence symbol and similar is the case with Varna-Sphota and Pada-Sphota because in some cases a sentence (Vākya-Sphota) may be manifested by a letter or by a single a word symbol and letter or word may require a number or sentence symbol. Manifestation of Sphota, by them, varies from person to person as it depends on the fact as to how far the person is versed in communication. The basic reasoning of Bhartrihari is that the long or short size and shape of the symbol are not significant in communication.31 Hence, the word ‘Sphota’ means what is made explicit by letters on one hand and what being explicit, makes the meaning explicit on the other hand. Therefore the Sphota manifested by letters or sounds and conveys the meaning to the hearer. From linguistic point of view, Sphota is manifested by letters or sounds and conveys the meaning to the hearer.
Bhartrhari holds that word and meaning is indivisible unit corresponding to each meaningful word, then, there exists a Sphota, which is a universal, eternal and indivisible symbol or idea, which is also called Pratibhā.

**SPHOṬA AS ŠABDA-BRAHMAN**

The next concept is Sphota as Šabda-Brahman. The Sphota is ultimately said to be in every conscious being. It is the linguistic capability of man, which is essentially intertwined with Consciousness. The ultimate reality for Bhartrhari is the Absolute Consciousness which is identical with Šabdabrahman, the Eternal Verbum. Within this theory consciousness and thought are intertwined, and language is the base of all human activity. Here we come across the philosophical controversy as to whether Šabda is Nitya or Kārya (permanent or transient). Bhartṛhari believes that Brahman, the basis of reality, to be

"Anādi Nidhānam Brahman Šabda Tattvam Adaksaram"

As a concept that is not subject to the attributes of temporal chains of events. The word principle, Šabda-Brahman, is not defined in terms of the chronological nature of our cognitive states, since it functions as the inherent, primeval ground of all cognitions. There has been important philosophical debate concerning the meaning of the term Nitya (eternal) or Akṣara (character) as Bhartṛhari applies it to the word-principle. Nitya in philosophy is that which has neither a beginning nor an end. And that which cannot subject to beginning and end is an indestructible Akṣara. Here, it is an addition that we can understand this word Nitya in two senses. In the first sense, Nitya is the absolute – Šabda-Brahman, which is not subject to birth and death. In the second sense, the Šabda is Nitya in the sense of the beginninglessness of communication.

Whereas some understand this as an all-pervading thing, existing in opposition to the multiplicity of objects with Spacio-temporal significations, others see it as Bhartṛhari specialized way of referring to phonemes, the minimal units of meaningful sound. It seems that phonemes explain how it is the case that Word appears as object. In Indian philosophy, it is accepted that the whole Spacio-temporal phenomenon is subject to birth and perish. Eternity is "that which appears as objects, and from whom the creation of the world precedes." Phonemes are thus the eternally possible elements that can be combined in unlimited ways to signify the plurality of nature.
As an ontic substratum of Sphoṭa as awareness, Bhartṛhari, particularly in the first part of his Vākyapadīya, has explained it as the substratum of cognition and has called it Śabda-Brahman (the ultimate principle). The concept of God manifest as the word is known as Śabda-Brahman. Indian grammarians hold that all sounds have inherent meaning or Ārtha, which is revealed through a process known as Sphoṭa. As Brahman, in the philosophy of Advaita Vesānta is characterized as Bīja (microspore) of the macrocosm and microcosm.37 For the Advaita metaphysics is the ultimate reality of the universe. Śabda (language), for Bhartṛhari, as a philosopher of language, is the ultimate principle of the world. Harivṛtti quotes a very enlightening poetry from Śruti, according to which there are three sorts of illuminating principles, which illuminate themselves and others.38 The first of the illuminating principles is the light of sun, etc., that belong to fire. The second belongs to Svāntara (the self) and the third is language itself that illuminates not only Prakāśa (light) but Aprakāśa (non-light) as well. Fire, self, etc. are also known as they are presented by language. All those beings are cognized as language (Śabda) presents them. Śabda being the illuminating principle of all occupies the ultimate position. It is Brahman, philosophically, as Śabda is the sole reality of the world of communication or that of the beings that is language and meaning (Upacāra-Sattā), Bhartṛhari designates it Brahman.39

Characteristics of SPHOṬA

The philosophical background of the Sphoṭa doctrine introduced by Bhartṛhari, goes through an analysis of two aspects of Upādana Śabda (the significant word), the first aspect is (i) the sound patterns and (ii) the second aspect is that the meaning bearing symbol. Bhartṛhari says: “in meaningful language, linguists recognize two entities, both of which may be called words; one is the underlying cause of the articulated sound, while the other is attached to the meaning. Bhartṛhari further describes that the real word has two aspects; (i) the external and (ii) the internal. The former one denotes the sound pattern, while the latter one stands to vindicate the semantic fact. To be explicit, whatever sound in the form of Sphoṭa abides in the mind, there is an external effect of Sphoṭa and its manifestation in the form of Dhvani. Thus, Sphoṭa is Upādānakāraṇa or the real cause of sound. The fundamental grammatical view on Sphoṭa as given by Bhartṛhari, had already been analyzed earlier in his grammatical rule by Pāṇini himself. Pāṇini explains that “word
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is not a technical term which denotes its own form.” On the basis of this Sūtra, Katyāyana, the author of Vārttika says:

Śabda-pūrva-koharthe Sampratyaṁ Tasmād Artha Nivṛttuh ||

Thus, the understanding, of the thing meant is preceded by that of the word, hence in the grammatical context; the question of the thing meant does not arise. The Buddhist philosophers have also accepted this twofold power of words to express their own identity as well as the things symbolized by them; but this character is cognized only when they became the subject of conventional relation, and not at the time of perception. This is mainly because, when the perception of the sound occurs in words, the sound becomes knowledge. Meanwhile, the force that expresses the sound has no connection with the sound already expressed. We see the following three aspects of the language situation: (i) the Prākṛta-Dhvani, (ii) the Vaikṛta-Dhvani and (iii) the Sphoṭa. The Vaikṛta-Dhvani is the example of the purely phonetic term used by grammarians. It is “the acoustic image of the normal expression or the expression in the mind keeping the time order with it. The Sphoṭa is the integral linguistic ‘symbol’ which is the unit of meaning, but which cannot be pronounced or written. This is manifested by the Prākṛta-Dhvani, when considered as an integral meaning-bearing linguistic sign. 41 There are some main characteristics of the concept of Sphoṭa;

i. Sphoṭa: a unity whole

According Bhartrhari, the Sphoṭa is indivisible; the isolated words do not occur as meaningful units in ordinary language. Sentence is universally accepted as the unit of expression and the division of sentence into words and that of words into phonemes does not exist. According to him, the meaningful speech unit cannot be correlated to the plurality of phonemes. The meaning bearing units viz. Pada and Vākya, cannot be divided into smaller significant units.

ii. Sphoṭa: A Symbol

The Sphoṭa aspect of the word which has two more aspects namely significant (that which means) and signified (that which is meant). These two aspects are dependent on each other. Among these two aspects of Sphoṭa the significant one represents the phonetic Patten of sounds are the conceptual entity of the
actual uttered sound. Thus both the sound image and the idea constitute the super-structure of Sphota as a sign. He adds that the Sphota is somewhat different from the sign. It is a time-less, indivisible meaning-bearing symbol. The features of the sounds are super-imposed upon the Sphota because of our inability to distinguish between sound and symbol.

iii. Sphota: An Auditory Image
Bhartrhari’s statement points out that the Šabda is self-revealing character of a word has been wrongly applied to Šphota by the later grammarians. But Bhartrhari does not say that Sphota is self-revealing. According to Joshi the Sphota is comprehend by the listener through the sound produced by the speaker. The Sphota represents a particular sound. The Sphota is a sound or type of sound which may or may not be meaningful. The Sphota of Bhartrhari stands for an auditory image of the sound or sound-pattern or phonetic pattern of the sound.

iv. Sphofa: Distinctive and Significative Levels of Language
Here it can be said that language may be brought under two levels i.e. significative level and distinctive level. The signigicative level includes meaningful elements of language in form of words, sentences, suffixes and roots etc. Bhartrhari’s statement suggests that when one hears or speaks a sentence in ordinary conversation, a sentence is not taken into account in terms of a series of meaningful units. These units only complete the structure of the sentence and the sentence as an absolute linguistic unit brings meaning to comprehension through the sounds uttered by the speaker. The listener in the reverse process, first receives the sounds, and then translates the sounds into linguistic thoughts. The signigicative level deals with morphemic structure of the language which is constituted of smaller meaning-bearing speech-unit of language.

v. Sphoța: The Material Cause of Šabdatattva
By the manifestation of Vācyā (Artha) and Vācaka (Šabda) every object of the word emanates from Brahma i.e. Šabdatattva. The ancient phoneticians (Śikṣākārāḥ) have speculated much on this point. Some held that words or sounds were transformations of air; others held that they were transformations
of knowledge or consciousness. The Sāṃkhya recognizes five kinds of Tanmātra of which Śabda is one and some scholars like Nāgeśa are of the view that the word anu refers to Śabdatanmātra. It is stated when the Śabdaparamāṇus are prompted by the inner air expelled by the speaker at the time when their power to produce their effect is mature, they are transformed into gross speech.

According to Bhartṛhari the Śabdatattva within us is Sphoṭa. This inner principle which is manifested by the sound is the integrated word the expressive element Vācaka and Prakāśaka). Because the integrated word is eternally associated with the integrated meaning, the two may be taken together. That would mean that the integrated word and the integrated meaning differentiated in the mind and facing each other rather the two side of the same coin, constitute the Sphoṭa. From some passages, however, one gets the impression that the word stands only for the integrated word differentiated in the mind that is for the expressive only.

Types of Sphoṭa

Bhartṛhari in Kārikās of Vākyapadīya has mentioned the term Sphoṭa, in general, without any distinction of its kinds. It is only in his Vṛtti that three kinds of it are clearly mentioned as ascriptions on it due to its connection with language through which it is manifested. Actually all Sphoṭa are indivisible flashes and it is on the basis of sets of gestures, that is letters, words, and sentences, through which it is manifested, that they are classified in different kinds of Varna-Sphoṭa, Pada-Sphoṭa, and Vākya-Sphoṭa. A Varna-Sphoṭa is accepted as the cause of identical cognition of a letter in all its occurrences and instances. Similar is the reason behind Pada-Sphoṭa, and Vākya- Sphoṭa.42

Bhartṛhari the later grammarians like Bhattoji Diksita, Kondubhatta, and Nāgeśa evolved several subcategories. This divides sphoṭa into eight different varieties. Bhartrihari mentions only three stages of Sphoṭa.43 This division of Sphoṭa is based on the two basic Sphoṭa. These two primaries Sphoṭa are first is Vyakti and other is Jāti. This Vyakti Sphoṭa is divided in two another part one is Sakhaṇḍa and other is Akhaṇḍa, after this division the Sakhaṇḍa Sphoṭa divided in three i) Vārṇa-Sphoṭa, ii) Pada-Sphoṭa, iii) Vākya-Sphoṭa. the other one Jāti-Sphoṭa also divided in three parts i) Vārṇa-Sphoṭa, ii) Pada-Sphoṭa, and iii) Vākya-Sphoṭa.44 The basic logic behind this
division of Sphota is based on Vyakti-Sphota. Bhartrhari seems to have held the Akhaṇḍavākya-Sphota, the indivisible sentence Sphota of Vyakti type, as the real Sphota. Thus, we may consider either the letter or the word or the sentence as the meaning bearing unit and we get respectively the Varṇa-Sphota, the Pada-Sphota, or the Vākya-Sphota.

Before the division of the theory of Sphota, there is a question about this concept as like the question is in the minds of Indian grammarians that what is the nature of Sphota is particular or universal? According to Nāgeśa Sphota is resent in the particular rather than in the universal. The ancient grammarians like Bhartrhari, Bhattoji Diksita, Kondubhatta, and Nāgeśa and others accept the primacy of Vyakti-Sphota. The sphota – word may be particular or universal. The word concept Gotva does not mean the individual word-event spoken with varied tones and accents, but the class into which all the individual word-events are included.45

(i) **The Varṇa - Sphota**

The Varṇa-Sphota theory maintains that the phonemes constitution either a stem or a suffix are regarded as Varṇa-Sphota. According to this theory, when a single phoneme or a stem or a suffix is found to be denotative, it is regarded as Vācaka. According to Bhartrhari, and Patajali the term Varṇ-Sphota need not necessarily involve consideration of meaning. They used the term Sphota always in its relation with sound. Patañjali himself has stated that from one point of view the individual letters may be considered to have meaning, since roots, suffixes and particles of a single letter are meaningful. But like Ghaṭena te etc. it is very difficult to ascertain what part of the word actually conveys the meaning. Further there is no criterion to arrive at the conclusion that the particular portion Ghaṭa is stem and the other portion in is the suffix.46

(ii) **The Pada-Sphota**

According to this theory, the real constituents of speech are words. However, this theory presents a difficulty in analyzing sentence such as Hare’va (o’Hari, protect me), where a person ignorant of euphonic combination is unable to recognize the two separate components like Hare and Ava.47 Hence the grammarians contend that the sentence should be considered as a single unit for the purpose of communication.
The Vākya - Sphoṭa

The Vākya-Sphoṭa theory assumes the sentence as a unique entity which conveys the meaning. So the sentence is a unit of expression. The main purpose of this theory is that the meaning of word remains always apart from a complete sentence. The grammarians argue that words have meaning only when they form a part of a sentence. After these three types of Sphoṭa, here we can talk about another division of Sphoṭa, which is related with these three that are Akhandapada-Sphoṭa and Akhandavākya-Sphoṭa. These are the two parts of theory of Sphoṭa. Akhandapada maintains that the listener when hears the word as an undivided linguistic unit and does not identify the grammatical-constituents like stem, suffix etc. which constitute the word, he grasps the words undivided and understands their meaning as undelivered. And the Akhandavākya-Sphoṭa theory means the words do not mean the same things in one relation and thus their meanings depend upon the sentence as whole.

THE CONCEPT PRATIBHĀ AND SPHOṬA: Philosophical Reflection

The expressive word called Sphoṭa is the meaning as flash of understanding. Another meaning of Sphoṭa according to the grammarians is Pratibhā. These two are closely related to the most important cause of creation called of Śabdatattva. The Sphoṭa, the Pratibhā and the Brahman are shown as divisible for the convenience of teaching. The Brahman is also inseparable with Vidyā as its principal capacity of the same Brahman the whole world appears or Vivarta as existing and real. It is an appearance because it does not lead to Mokṣa from the cycle of birth and death. Just as the places seen in a dream is not fit to dwell in the awaken state of just as silver cognized in a sea – case during bright day light is not useful when the Brahman is realized. It is in this state the world becomes an appearance. One can realize this truth by the analysis of the language. Thus the unification of the Sphoṭa and the Pratibhā itself leads the soul to liberation.

The Sphoṭa and the Pratibhā are closely connected with the speculative concept Śabdatattva; ‘word principle’. This word principle is the underlying knowledge, which is ultimately identified with the Brahman. It is impossible to have cognition of the pure object without the knowledge of its name. Bhartrḥhari identifies
the word with its referent. Thus all thought and all knowledge are intertwined with the language. All culture, all arts, and all sciences are based on language and the development of arts and sciences depend upon the successful communication through the language. Consciousness in all human beings does not go beyond the language. In fact for Bhartrhari the consciousness itself is the Brahman. The new born babies even make movements and their residual traces are called Šabdabhāvanā of its knowledge of the language in previous birth.

The Pratibhā as a flash of sympathetic arises when the meaning bearer Sphoṭa is burst forth by the Prākṛta and Vaikṛta-Dhvanis. The concept of Pratibhā as the sentence meaning is introduced as an attendant to maintain the sentence as a linguistic component. So the meaning of the sentence is held as flashing in the mind and understood intuitively and immediately. Just as the Prākṛta-Dhvani and Vaikṛta-Dhvanī appear as if intertwined with sphoṭa, the meanings of the words also appear to cause Pratibhā. So in this theory it is maintained that the sense of the complete sentence, which is totally diverse from the knowledge of the meanings of the individual words. In the other words it can be said that the meanings of individual words manifest the Pratibhā. According to Bhartrhari if Pratibhā is implicit wrongly it seems to have been made by the combination of the meanings of individuals. After these words about Pratibhā, Bhartrhari gives some more visions on Partibhā according to him that the true nature of Pratibhā remains Anakhyeya (mysterious) to others and even the experience cannot account for its own existence even to the experiences. Therefore, Bhartrhari holds that the Pratibhā results in human beings because of Svabhāva of the beings, adherence to one’s own Acarana (conduct), Abhyasa (practice), Yoga, Adṛṣṭa ‘destiny’ and the intervention of specially Visistopahita (qualified persons).

Here one more thing is that these two words Sphoṭa and Pratibhā are connected through the relation of individuality as between Saḥ and Ayam in So’yām Devadattaḥ. According to this connection as first relation is cognized so as the second one is also mechanically cognized. The inseparable sentence is of the temperament of light and conveys the sentence sense as light illuminates the object; same as the Pratibhā is the temperament of light. The actual meanings of these concepts the Sphoṭa and the Pratibhā can be recognized only are read collectively with the Brahman, Atman and Mokṣa.
According to Bharthṛari the language is to be examined always from the point of view of meaningfulness and hence the sentence is the primary unit of language. The words are extracted from the indivisible sentence by analysis, so also the meanings of words are extracted through the indivisible ‘sentence meaning’. Just as the constituent phonemes are not meaningful in the word sense, the words are also not meaningful in the sentence sense. Thus corresponding to the meaning bearer Sphota, the grammarians recognize Pratibhā as the meaning of the sentence. Bharthṛari uses the Pratibhā in two shades of meaning, namely intuition which is responsible of the knowledge in all living beings in a general sense, and ‘the flash of understanding’ for the comprehension of the sentence sense in a specialized sense. All living beings, from the lowest to the highest including animals and birds have the Bhāvaba (intuition). This intuition bursts like a flash spontaneously in all beings. It is like a power of intoxication when certain substances develop when they grow ripe without any special effort, like the singing of cuckoo in spring. Thus without being prompted by any external force, the birds and the animals engage themselves in their natural activities like building their nests. In other words the Pratibhā is the reliable means for action in everyday life of all living beings.

Different from the views mentioned above, a sentence for Vaiyākaraṇas, is an inner, indivisible and a real unit of awareness in nature, Sphota and a sentential-meaning is that which it reveals non-differently; a flash of awareness in the mind, for which Bharthṛari uses the word ‘Pratibhā’.

After this complete meaning of Pratibhā, to be cognized through mediums like feeling and gestures in normal communication, Bharthṛari has mentioned six other kinds of Pratibhā; Savbhāva-Pratibhā, Caraṇa-Pratibhā, Yoganimitta-Pratibhā, Adṛṣṭa-Pratibhā, Abhyāsanimitta-Pratibhā, Viṣiṣṭopahita-Pratibhā. These six kinds of Pratibhā which are used in normal life, we are always conscious that Pratibhā in the present talk is taken as ‘meaning’ and not as ‘intellect’, ‘mental power’ or ‘faculty of intuition’. Our argument is that Pratibhā is confined to cognition that make communication possible and that communication is cognition by language and is not confined only to uttering and hearing as we find in the cases of newly born babies who cries and laughs. Not only that, we also distinguish its communication organs vibrating. Now here a question which we found in this discussion that is, What except Pratibhā is the cause of these activities? For this it can believes in the idea of previous
births and elucidates that language temperament in a new baby is given its birth. From the birth of all babies, they cannot speak for the reason that their audio visual organs are not mature enough for speaking, but they transmit meaning by crying and other activates. Now here a next question is that, how is this transmission possible? Bhartrhari says, it is due to Šabdabhāvanā-Saṁskāra (precept) given in beings, even in babies and mutes, that Pratibhā is revealed in them. 54

In this Kārika, Bhartrhari is giving a universal definition about Sphota and Pratibhā, according to him:-

\[
\text{Saksāt Šabdena Janitām Bhāvanānugamena\/vā} \\
\text{Iti Kartabyatāyām Tām Na Kaścidativartate} \]

Here according to Bhartrhari Pratibhā is showing by Sphota when the latter is manifested by verbal-noises, by Sphota as in cases of Yogi, it may be showing by precept manifested not by verbal-noises, but by the imitation of past lives, as we can see in the cases of babies. However, in all the cases, it is showing by Šābda (Sphota).

Now here we are going to talk in detail about the six types of Pratibhāin in order to clarify their significance and nature, a brief account of these kinds of specific Pratibhā (flashes) is presented here below: 56

i. Savbhāva-Pratibhā

In the first stage, it is not shown by verbal-noises, but by their Savbhāva or nature and is incidental on the basis of actions performed by them. It is shown by animals and birds by their very nature; as one cognizes without the help of verbal-noises and communication is accomplished. Pratibhā is nature and cannot be identified as instinct. It is better to say that Pratibhā in lower beings functions for their instinctive activities and is observed as their very nature. 57

ii. Caraṇa-Pratibhā

This is the stage those who can act the stable practice of moral behavior acquire a highly cultivated stage of spirituality, a special kind of Pratibhā is showing, which is not possible otherwise. It is showing in persons realizing their well-being by steady moral practices. These supra-ordinary flashes, for example the Pratibhā of seers like Vaśiśṭha, etc., make their supra-ordinary activates possible.
iii. Yoganimitta-Pratibhā

The next stage is Yoga. In this stage the cause of Pratibhā is Yoga. It is said that through Yoga one can know what is going on in other people’s mind. But the term Yoga-Nimitta Pratibhā is not used here in the sense mentioned above. Yogins possess super-human power, on account of which super human flashes are revealed in their mind without any mediation of verbal-noises, gestures, etc.⁵⁸ Here, it can be said that Yoga-Nimtta have rejected to use as a tool but as a exact sort of Pratibhā.

iv. Adṛṣṭa-Pratibhā

The next cause of Pratibhā is Adṛṣṭa. It is an invisible force generated by one’s own deeds in the previous lives. It is showing to one by his Adṛṣṭa. Bhartrhari believes that life is determined by the unseen impressions of the actions of past lives. It is showing to the Yogins without any medium. This unseen impression, in the same person, causes revelation of extra-ordinary flashes. Pratibhā like Adṛṣṭa is the result of the force created by their deeds in the previous lives of Pitṛs, Rākṣasas and the Piśācas. There two kind of Adṛṣṭa one is intuitive knowledge of a situation and other one is the capacity to act in that situation.⁵⁹

v. Abhyāsanimitta-Pratibhā

Here in this stage of Pratibhā comes through Abhyāsa. It can be said that the knowledge of experts, who can tell the genuineness of precious stones and coins, is of a superior nature. The flashes in the mind of a jewel-smith, on account of which he directly apprehends the worth a jewels, are exposed in him by an exacting sort of parental training. It cannot be identified with inferential knowledge. This kind of knowledge can acquire through Abhyāsa. Musicians know tonal differences by flashes revealed in their minds through Abhyāsa. These are examples of Pratibhā caused by training.

vi. Viśiṣṭopahita-Pratibhā

At last we find that there is a cause of the Pratibhā is grace of a Viśiṣṭopahita (special person). Pratibhā revealed by the power handed down to some by seer, sages and gods. Such a power, as we learn from history, was granted to Sanjaya, the charioteer of Dhṛtarāṣṭra by the sage Kṛṣṇa.
Dvaipayana, on the basis of which he was capable of visualizing the Great War in the Mahābhārata, expanded in wide range, without the help of eyes. In Indian theology, it is accepted that God, out of generosity, grant such powers to devotees that reveal to them the flashes by which they perceive God and attain liberation. Rāma Kṛṣṇa Paramhamsa endowed such a power to his disciple Vivekananda, which revealed to him flashes of the goddess.

Apart from this discussion which were based on different kinds of Pratibhā, Bhartrhari finds himself in a position to give explanation not only the cognition revealed by language through feeling and gesture in communication and the cognition of Lakṣaikacakṣuṣkas (seer and sages) showing directly by Sphoṭa, without a arbitration of language feeling in their minds, but also the actions of birds, insects, animals, jewel-smiths, diggers and strange activities performed by gifted persons. In this case Bhartrhari accepted that all cognition is cognition by Sphoṭa. This Sphoṭa, being a principle, is everywhere and is present in all living creatures, on the basis of which incentives to do something or not to do are aroused in them. Thus, he propounds that the world of knowledge is the world of flashes figuring in the mind. It is the Pratibhā, which in all animates serves as the cause of the incentive to all sorts of action (Pratibhāmayam Ayam Viśvam).

Pratibhā, as meaning, should not be misconceived as mind, Prajñā or the capacity to directly grasp the meaning. It figures in mind when communicated and grasped by hearers as a flash revealed in mind by Sphoṭa. This meaning, in lower beings, is taken as the cause of their instinctive activities, in super conscious beings it is their super-sensuous cognition, and in human being it is the object of cognition figured in the mind by language. A number of scholars of Bhartrhari’s philosophy have taken Pratibhā non-discriminately as mind or Prajñā, but as we have clarified, Pratibhā as meaning cannot be taken as mind.

Therefore, in the discussion of the kinds of Partibhā, we found a combined definition of this concept Pratibhā as meaning is a ‘cognitive unit’ and Pratibhā as ‘mind’ or ‘Prajñā’ suggests an ontic character. Meaning and mind ontologically may be identical, because ontologically Bhartrhari maintains ‘one is all’, but cognitively, meaning is cognized as that revealed non-differently by Sphoṭa in the mind and mind is know by implication as an ontic base of the meaning cognized.
SPHOTA AND DHVANI

Sphota is the cause of manifested language, which is meant to convey meaning. Sphota is more specifically identified as the underlying totality of linguistic capability, or “potency” and secondarily as the cause of two differentiated aspects of manifested meaning: applied meaning expressed as Dhvani, the audible sound patterns of speech and Artha bearing. The grammatical parts of the underlying Sphota can only be heard and understood through its phonetic elements. Bhartrihari explains that the apparent difference between Sphota and Dhvani arises as we utter words. Initially, the word exists in the mind of the speaker as a unity but is manifested as a sequence of different sounds—thus giving the appearance of differentiation. Dhvanis may be more specifically described as merely the audible possibility of meaning, a necessary but hardly sufficient condition of meaning.

According to Bhartrihari Sphota is instinctively related to sound (Dhvani). On the other hand the physical audible sound manifests the Sphota, which is nothing but the mental articulated image of the sound through which the meaning is conveyed to the listener. Thus, Dhvani is the physical body of the word, whereas sphota is the conceptual entity of sound. We cannot have Sphota without sound. The sounds which are produced at the contact of articulatory organs manifest Sphota. As soon as the sounds are produced the Sphota is cognized instantly since the sounds reveal sphota, they are manifestors and sphota is manifested. According to Bhartrihari, there are two types of sound that is primary sound, Prākṛta-Dhvani and secondary sound, Vaikṛta-Dhvani. 

Primary Sound

Primary sounds are those, without which the form of Sphota would remain unmanifested and therefore unperceived. Primary sounds are considered to be the root cause of Sphota, because, as soon as we hear the primary sounds, Sphota is perceived. Due to this close relationship between the two, the features of primary sounds are often attributed to the Sphota.

According to him, primary sounds are classified into three, namely, Apacita, Pracita and Pracitatara. When a primary sound is Apacita (brief in duration), it manifests a short vowel; when it is Pracita (long in duration), it manifests a long
vowel; when it is Pracitatara (longer in duration), and it manifests a prolated (extended or elongated) vowel.

**Secondary Sound**

The second type of sound is called Vaikrta Dhvani. It arises out of the primary sounds after the manifestation of Sphoṭa, and therefore does not affect the quality of Sphoṭa. It can be perceived again and again uninterruptedly for a longer period of time. The duration of the period depends upon the tempo, (Vṛtti of the speaker). Drtatva (rapidity) and Vilambita are the properties of secondary sound. These qualities depend on the movements of the vocal organ from one position to another at slower or faster rate.

Primary sounds are produced by the initial vibration of articulatory organs which in turn reveal Sphoṭa. But when vibration stops, the production of sounds does not cease. At this stage, a series of sounds come out from the initial sounds which are identified as “secondary sounds”. These secondary sounds help in the continued perception of Sphoṭa. It is explained by the analogy of a flame. As one flame lights another flame and that flame still another and the process goes on, similarly one sound which manifests Sphoṭa produces another sound and that sound produces still another. Each subsequent stage in the chain of sounds continues to reveal the same Sphoṭa. The secondary sounds which cause the manifestation of sfoṭa are affected by the difference in the utterance. They have short, middle or longer duration. But Sphoṭas are mains unaffected by such differences.

According to another view, Sphoṭa is the first sound. It results from the conjunction and disjunction of the vocal organs with points of articulations. On the other hand, sounds, which originate from the first sound and spread in all directions and travel over a certain range, are the Dhvanis. In short, the articulated sound is Sphoṭa, and its continuation in the form of sound-waves is called Dhvani. The concept of Dhvani and its deep study will be discussed in the next chapter Rasa and Dhvani in Aesthetic Experience.

The grammarians differ from other philosophers in the method of their inquiry. They are prepared to examine and appraise all the possible theories on a given topic without discrimination with a view to sharpen the mind to arrive at truth. This open-mindedness has broadened the horizon of the grammarian’s interpretation.
Thus, the germs of philosophical concepts of every school like the Buddhism, Jainism, Mimamsa, Advaita and Nyāya find place in the grammatical works. The Vākyapadīya is a storehouse for the contemporary thoughts which were crystallized and canonized in different systems of philosophy, even though Bhartrhari, as he himself confesses, might not be the innovator of several linguistic and philosophical speculations. Therefore, several passages of the Vākyapadīya are similar to those of other schools of philosophy both in thought and expression.

As a conclusive remark it can be said that the concept of Pratibhā being the nature of light or consciousness is not only eternal and undivided but also devoid of succession. It is of the nature of continuous intuition. The semantic and psychological study of Pratibhā by Bhartṛhari becomes a source of inspiration to the rhetoricians. Unlike Prajñā it offers multitudinal innovations to the rhetoricians. It appears from the nature of Pasyantī characterized by luminosity. In other words it stands as the inner light of the very nature of the self, the ceaseless flux of the phenomenal world.
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