

## Chapter-I

### INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I have dealt with the concept of *Śabdabrahman* as it is discussed in *Vākyapadīya* by Bhartṛhari. I have tried to explain the cognitive background of Bhartṛhari's philosophy. Bhartṛhari is one of the greatest linguistic philosophers and he is a monist. According to him there is only one reality i.e. *Śabdabrahman*. For him, *Śabdabrahman* is the ultimate reality and the world and everything in this world are manifestations of *Śabdabrahman*<sup>1</sup>. One and the same *Śabda Aum* is the root of all other *Śabdās*. More clearly to say whatever we come across in the world ultimately comes from *Aum*. *Aum* or *Śabdabrahman* is the seed of the whole world. The whole world can be brought under three categories- the knower, the known and the knowledge. All of them come from *Śabdabrahman*. *Śabdabrahman* remains in our mind in the form of idea or thought or knowledge or consciousness and in the external world it, the same reality remains in verbal or written form or in the form of external objects. More importantly the knower or the speaker and the hearer are also nothing but the different form of the *Śabdabrahman* itself. But it is worthy to note that the term *Śabda* in the philosophy of Bhartṛhari has been used in a technical sense. In ordinary sense, *Śabda* means what we can perceive through ear. But Bhartṛhari used the term *Śabda* in a different sense. For him, the term *Śabda* is a combination of two, one is inner meaning revealing language and another is verbal utterance. Actually, we know that Bhartṛhari is a linguistic philosopher and he wanted to describe the world in terms of *Śabda* (language). Bhartṛhari claimed that language, thought and cognition, all of the three are identical. But this language is not like verbal language through which we can communicate with each other. Verbal language is the instrument through which thought or inner meaning revealing language can be manifested and the hearer grasp the intention of the speaker. The language understood by Bhartṛhari consists of two units- inner and outer. The

inner unit stands for consciousness, thought or idea and the outer unit stands for verbal language which is uttered and heard and is used as a tool for communication.

Now, if we accept Bhartrhari's standpoint that language, thought and cognition all of the three are identical then there must be a linguistic form within us and we think about something in a linguistic form. In the case of a speaker and a hearer, when a speaker wants to utter a sentence to express his thought then before uttering the sentence the thought of the speaker remains in the inner linguistic form and this linguistic form is inner language. In the same way after hearing the utterances of the speaker, the hearer understands the intention of the speaker and he understands the intention of the speaker with the aid of linguistic form. After seeing the beauty of a picture when we utter the sentence, oh! How beautiful it is, then before uttering the sentence the emotion remains in the inner linguistic form and because of this inner linguistic form we can utter the sentence oh! How beautiful it is. It is worthy to note that all of us have one and the same linguistic form but we are not aware of that linguistic form. Knowledge and inner linguistic form, these two, are identical. Both of them are intertwined. One cannot be separated from another. Knowledge is possible within a linguistic form. So, it can be said that there is an inner linguistic form within us and because of this inner linguistic form we can use verbal language. So, we think, the combination of language, thought and cognition is an inner linguistic form and it is one and common for all of us.

Next, we have focused on the levels of language advocated by Bhartrhari which are known as *paśyantī*, *madhyamā*, and *vaikharī*<sup>2</sup>. Among these three levels *paśyantī* is the pure one and it is free from ignorance. This *paśyantī* level of language is the inner linguistic form and it is one and common for all of us. We live in a society so we want to communicate with each other, we want to express our thought, we want to share our feelings and for these purposes *madhyamā* and *vaikharī* levels come. But these two levels are not free from ignorance. But these two levels are not possible without *paśyantī* level which is pure inner linguistic form.

According to Bhartṛhari this *paśyantī* level actually is known as *Śabdabrahman* and it is pure consciousness. But we think pure consciousness has an ultimate linguistic form which is *Aum* and it cannot be manifested through *madhyamā* and *vaikharī* level of language. It is actually, inner language which is known as *Śabdabrahman*. Here, we have used the term linguistic form to indicate the ultimate inner language i.e *Aum*. Because of our ignorance we the common people cannot realise the ultimate inner language *Aum*. Only a few *Ṛsis* can realise *Aum*. When our ignorance goes away only then we can realise that ultimate inner language *Aum* which is indescribable. Actually this ultimate inner language *Aum* is pure consciousness. Pure consciousness is actually pure understanding which is justified by itself in a linguistic form. There is no ignorance in pure understanding.

In my work I have also tried to analyse why Bhartṛhari claimed that *Śabdabrahman* is the ultimate reality out of which knowing souls, known objects and experiences come into being. I think Bhartṛhari's philosophical view cannot be ignored because as *Śabdabrahman* means pure consciousness so if pure consciousness is not there within us then no experiences comes into us and we cannot identify an object as black, blue, small, big etc. But it is important to note that pure consciousness is one and common to all of us and because of our ignorance we can see the differences in this world. Say for example, after seeing different objects like, chair, table, books etc. we can use different sentences like sit on the chair, read the book, it is a table etc. to communicate with others and to express our feelings but among these differences there is an unique one i.e. objectness which resides in pure consciousness. Actually, we can see and indicate different objects in this world because of our pure consciousness which is known as *Śabdabrahman*. So, it can be said that experiences depends on pure consciousness or *Śabdabrahman*. In the next chapter of my work an attempt has been made to show how the world of experiences depends on *Śabdabrahman*. Obviously, it is an idealistic view of describing the world but we think this view is more authentic to achieve the

ultimate reality which is *Śabdabrahman*. Bhartṛhari wanted to describe the world in terms of language. In Bhartṛhari's philosophy, language means inner language which is *Aum* and *Aum* is identical with pure consciousness which is one and common to all of us. *Aum* is a pure inner linguistic form which is also known as pure consciousness and all knowledges are resided in a pure inner linguistic form. If we think deeply then we can see that if we are not purely conscious about the world and worldly objects or if we don't have the pure inner linguistic form about the world then we cannot describe the world and worldly objects by outer language or by verbal language. So, all of us have an inner pure linguistic form which is metaphorically termed as *Aum*. This *Aum* is actually pure consciousness. According to Bhartṛhari *Śabdabrahman* actually is pure consciousness which is known as *paśyantī*.

Now the question comes if there is only one ultimate reality i.e. *Śabdabrahman* then how we can explain the differences in this world? Following Bhartṛhari it can be said that the differences in this world are actually modifications of one and the same *Śabdabrahman* and one and the same *Śabdabrahman* reveals as many in the form of different objects due to our ignorance. As we are not aware of the real nature of pure consciousness i.e. *Aum*, we believe in the differences in the world. When our ignorance goes away then we can realise the ultimate reality i.e. *Śabdabrahman* and the false knowledge of plurality of objects goes. Here we find the echos of the well known philosophy of Śaṅkarāchārya who said '*Brahma satya jagat mitthyā*'. According to Śaṅkarāchārya *Brahman* is the only reality and the jagat (the world) which appears as plural as false. Likewise, Bhartṛhari also believed that the only true reality is *Śabdabrahman* which is absolutely one and all sorts of plurality of the world either in the form of language or in the form of objects is false. Here another problem is yet to solve. So far as our discussion is concerned the problem of the plurality of the world is resolved. But what is about the plurality of the knowers, the souls? We see in our day to day experience that I am different from you. And again both you and me are different from them,

the others. Thus it is seen that the plurality of the souls is a fact. We think the same problem can easily be solved following the well known reply given by Śaṅkarāchārya- '*jīva brahmaiva na paraḥ*'. In fact *jīva*, the soul is identical with *Brahman* but due to ignorance we consider ourselves as different from *Bharman*. When our ignorance goes the knowledge of *Tattvamasi* comes and we realise that we are one with *Brahman*. The observation of Bhartṛhari is very close to that of Śaṅkara. But one should not underestimate the originality of the thinking of Bhartṛhari because as he is predecessors of Śaṅkara the question of copying the philosophy of Śaṅkara does not arise. The *vedic* concept of *Tattvamasi* means You and I am one and same. Here 'You' means *Brahman* and 'I' means conscious being within me. But it is important to note that *Brahman* also exists within us. *Brahman* actually is pure consciousness within conscious being. So, it is better to say that *Brahman* is combined with conscious being. But owing to ignorance conscious being cannot realise *Brahman* or pure consciousness. Following Bhartṛhari it can be said that pure consciousness must has a linguistic form which is indivisible. This inner indivisible linguistic form is *Aum*.

In my work I have tried to focus on a difference between Bhartṛhari and Buddhist philosophers regarding the status of knowledge. According to Bhartṛhari knowledge must be *svavikalpaka* but on the other hand, according to Buddhist knowledge must be *nirvikalpaka*. So, a sharp distinction is seen between Bhartṛhari and Buddhist philosophers as per as the status of knowledge is concerned. As Bhartṛhari claimed that language, thought and cognition, all of the three, are identical, it can be said that knowledge and language are inseparable. So, according to Bhartṛhari knowledge necessarily is *svikalpaka*. But according to Buddhist philosophers there is no any inner language which is identical with knowledge. According to them knowledge must be *nirvikalpaka*. I think, the distinction between them is made because of the concept of momentary principle accepted by Buddhist philosophers. This momentary principle says that everything exists just for a moment and in the next

moment there is a new thing and this new thing also exists just for a moment and in the next moment again there is a new thing and it is an ongoing process. That is why Buddhist philosophers claim that when we say that this is an object then this object is not same with the knowledge of that object. Say for example, when we see a table then our knowledge is actually knowledge of table1 and when after seeing the table1 we say that it is a table then the table actually becomes table2. For using language we need atleast two moments. In the first moment we perceive an object but in the subsequent moment we pass a statement. Momentary principle says that Table1 exists just for a moment and when we say that this is a table then Table 1 is no more, it already turned into Table 2 but Table 2 is yet to be known. So, the languages we use to describe the object known always miss the object. So, it can be said that through language we cannot explain our knowledge properly. So, our knowledge must be *nirvikalpaka*. Everything exists just for a moment so language cannot explain anything as it is.

One problem may crop up regarding the levels of *Śabdabrahman* given by Bhartṛhari. As far as the explanation particularly of the *paśyantī* and *madhyamā* level of *Śabdabrahman* is concerned it can be said that these two states of *Śabdabrahman* are actually non-verbal consciousness. Now the question comes, is that non-verbal consciousness identical with consciousness of our soul or it is different from it? In either of the cases problem comes. If that consciousness is the consciousness of our soul then no doubt it would be dependent upon our soul. In that case *Śabdabrahman* cannot be considered to be the ultimate Reality. If it is otherwise, that is if that *Śabdabrahman* is different from the consciousness of our soul then why it would be there within us? And again why it would be produced from the very centre of our navel part of our body? We think these questions may arise regarding the *paśyantī* and *madhyamā* level of *Śabdabrahman*. Actually, according to Bhartṛhari *paśyantī* level is known as *Śabdabrahman* and it is inner meaning revealing language out of which knowing souls,

known objects and experiences come into beings. If knowing souls come from *paśyantī* i.e the *Śabdabrahman* then it implies that *Śabdabrahman* is the cause and souls are the objects. Effects are dependent upon the cause but the cause is not dependent upon the effect. So, *Śabdabrahman* or *paśyantī* and *madhyamā* cannot be dependent upon our soul but our soul itself is dependent upon the *Śabdabrahman* or *paśyantī* and *madhyamā*. So, it is accepted as ultimate Reality.

So, in reply to the above mentioned questions following Bhartṛhari it can be said that Bhartṛhari's philosophical inquiry is actually a cognitive analytic inquiry into the nature of cognition and communication<sup>3</sup>. For him, the real is the intelligible being or idea which revealed non-differently in the mind by language. He accepts language as a unit of distinct and self-determinate cognition or as a revealing force of awareness<sup>4</sup>. According to Bhartṛhari the existence of Beings that is things-in-themselves is actually an ontological substratum of the cognition and of the objects of cognition revealed in the mind by language. I think Bhartṛhari did not speculate into the problem of Reality on the basis of mystical experience. He interpreted the problems from the point of view of cognition as revealed in the mind by language. For him, the outside reality is inferred on the basis of the cognition revealed by language. We think Bhartṛhari was not interested in the ontic nature of things. He discusses about the transcendental Beings as the ontological substratum of beings expressed by language in mind that is cognitive beings and this cognitive being is actually the unit of awareness in nature. For him, language is actually the revealing force of awareness. So, it can be said that the *paśyantī* level of language which is known as *Śabdabrahman* is the revealing force of awareness and because of this awareness the outside reality is inferred<sup>5</sup>. So, finally it can be said that the source of the entire world of individual things which consists only of *nāma* and *rūpa* is the *Śabdabrahman* which is the ultimate Reality mentioned by Bhartṛhari. So, on the basis of the above discussion it is clear that the philosophical approach of

Bhartṛhari is a cognitive one. He investigated beings from the point of view of cognition and not from the point of view of finding a Reality as its substratum.

According to Bhartṛhari Philosophy is a cognitive activity and as cognition is always infused by language Philosophy concerned with language primarily as a cognitive activity. We think Bhartṛhari wanted to show that as only ideas can be revealed in the mind by language, ideas are the objects of cognition and these objects of cognition are infused by language. The primacy of language in cognitive activities is most important. So, following Bhartṛhari it can be said that no knowledge can be possible without language and all knowledge is revealed by language<sup>6</sup>. That is why Bhartṛhari claimed that language, thought and cognition all of the three are identical. Actually Bhartṛhari's view on ultimate Reality i.e. *Śabdabrahman* is a cognitive one. We think Bhartṛhari accepted language as the object of philosophical reflection because cognition can be revealed by language. According to him without language thought is not possible<sup>7</sup>. But it is important to note that he technically used the term language. If we follow Bhartṛhari's Philosophical view then, we think, the idea of private language does not arise. Because the inner meaning revealing language i.e. *sphoṭa* is ubiquitously given in the mind of all individuals. It is articulated variously through verbal utterances. The essential feature of language is to participate in a linguistic society and it can be possible only because of ubiquity of language that reveals cognition<sup>8</sup>. But it is important to note that though Bhartṛhari accepted inner meaning revealing language i.e. *sphoṭa* as the foundational being of the world of communication, he also gave importance to verbal utterances as the instrument through which *sphoṭa* can be manifested. So, verbal utterances and inner meaning revealing language are inseparably involved in the purpose of communication. I think the idea of private language does not arise in Bhartṛhari's philosophy because according to him language is ubiquitously given in the mind of all individuals and he believes in the ubiquity of language to explain communication.

According to Bhartṛhari language itself and the meanings revealed by it non-differently are the objects of cognition. So, both being and non-being are revealed in the mind by language. As language itself and its meaning reveal non-differently, unitary and indivisible cognition is accomplished by language. So, cognition independent of language ceases to be cognition. If we accept Bhartṛhari's viewpoint then it can be said that in every cognition language reveals itself first and then it reveals its meaning non-differently<sup>9</sup>. So, for him, no meaning is possible without language. Language forms itself an object of cognition through language. In cognition language is expressed by language and that is why it is an expressed entity also. It means language reveals itself as the object of cognition by language. Actually before revealing meaning language reveals itself first. So, it is both expressed and expresser. If the language that is the expresser is not revealed then no cognition can be possible as all cognition is expressed by language.

In Bhartṛhari's philosophy meaning is not independent of language because it is revealed non-differently in the mind by the language. These two are related with each other as expresser and expressed. For Bhartṛhari, when *Śabda* is manifested by verbal noises, it reveals its own nature i.e. *sphoṭa*. A sharp distinction is seen between perception process and the process of cognition by language. In the case of perceptual or inferential process there is a distance between the senses and the indications. Actually, after expressing knowledge the senses and the indications are separated from the external known object but language is not separated from the cognition in the case of verbal cognition. Following Bhartṛhari it can be said that *Śabda* is an inner meaning revealing unit which is ubiquitously given in all individuals and it is manifested by verbal noises. We cannot perform an action without cognition and no cognition is possible without language. So, the inner language i.e. *sphoṭa* is accepted by Bhartṛhari as potency to perform an action and without this potency we cannot perform an action. Even in the case of a dumb and deaf person who can't speak or hear, when

he intends to communicate, his bodily behaviour manifests the inner *sphoṭa* and after seeing his bodily behaviour the audience can understand his language. But it is true that through this process in all the cases determinate cognition cannot be possible to achieve. We think according to Bhartṛhari not only determinate cognition is infused with language but also indeterminate cognition is infused with language. So, both the determinate and indeterminate cognition is infused with language. In determinate cognition the expresser i.e *sphoṭa* and the expressed both are cognized distinctly but in the case of indeterminate cognition the expresser i.e *sphoṭa* is not revealed fully and that is why the expressed i.e meaning is not distinctly cognized. So, no cognition either determinate or indeterminate can be expressed without language i.e *sphoṭa*. Even *svapna* can be known distinctly because *svapna* is also intertwined with language. If language is not there then the illuminating nature of *svapna* can not be possible.

So, in the philosophy of Bhartṛhari the inner meaning revealing language i.e *sphoṭa* is not a mental construction. Actually, *sphoṭa* is the awareness that reveals itself and the meaning unitedly and it is common to all<sup>10</sup>. Expresser and the expressed are actually intelligible beings which are awareness in character. So it can be said that for Bhartṛhari language is not a metaphysical reality but is a cognitive being. Actually, he accepts metaphysical reality as the metaphysical substratum of the cognition revealed by language. Even the mind or soul is accepted by him as metaphysical substratum of the cognition which is revealed by language. Bhartṛhari did not accept metaphysical entities as directly cognized by language but for him these are logically inferred for seeking a metaphysical principle of the beings and these are revealed in the mind by the language as the metaphysical substratum of the cognition<sup>11</sup>.

Though Bhartṛhari's philosophy has a similarity with that of *Advaita vedāntins* and he is also a monist, there is a distinction between Bhartṛhari and *Advaita vedāntins* as far as the concept of ultimate reality is concerned. We think, on the basis of the holistic conception of *Brahman*

*Advaita vedāntins* deduce the solution of the philosophical problems but Bhartṛhari accepts *Śabdabrahman* as the ultimate reality and he accepts ultimate reality as the ontological substratum of the cognition. Actually, Bhartṛhari wanted to describe the world of communication by taking it as a cognitive problem and he claimed that the ontological substratum of cognition i.e. *Śabdabrahman* can be revealed by language in communication. Clearly it can be said that Reality i.e. *Śabdabrahman* is an all pervading consciousness and it is common to all. Actually, *madhyamā* level is an intelligible language and we can perceive *vaikharī* level when intelligible language is cognized as a unit of awareness and after that meaning can be revealed in the mind. The *paśyantī* level i.e. *Śabdabrahman* is the subtlest among the three levels. *Paśyantī* level is the ontic substratum of intelligible language. I think, this ontic substratum of intelligible language is identical with pure consciousness and this pure consciousness is known as *Śabdabrahman*. But it is important to note that *Śabdabrahman* accepted by Bhartṛhari is one and same but due to our ignorance the ultimate reality i.e. *Śabdabrahman* is revealed as many.

Now, one question may arise, why did Bhartṛhari accept *Śabda* as *Brahman*? In reply, it can be said that according to Bhartṛhari *Śabda* is not used only as a means of communication but for him, the term *Śabda* has also cognitive and spiritual significance. Actually for him, *Śabdabrahman* means pure consciousness which is common to all. Among the three levels of speech principle accepted by Bhartṛhari *paśyantī* level is known as *Śabdabrahman* i.e. pure consciousness. Bhartṛhari accepted that there are different layers of language and these are *paśyantī*, *madhyamā* and *vaikharī*. So, being the place of origin of different layers of language as well as being the same reality from subtle to gross it is called *Brahman*. I think, from cognitive viewpoint *Śabda* is the indivisible awareness and from metaphysical viewpoint *Śabda* is consciousness itself. This consciousness is not produced. It is manifested by human efforts in the form of verbal utterances. For Bhartṛhari, *Śabda* is eternal and it has

neither a beginning nor an end and hence, not subject to birth and death<sup>12</sup>. So, as *Brahman* also has neither a beginning nor an end and hence, not subject to birth and death, Bhartṛhari designated *Śabda* as *Brahman*. Besides this this is not the case that the concept of *Śabdabrahman* is purely a new concept. This concept is traced in *Upaniṣads* in the form of *Aum*.

So, on the basis of the above discussion it can be said that *Śabda* i.e eternal and indivisible reality is the cause of all elements but it is itself uncaused. Actually, Bhartṛhari accepted *Śabda* as the nature of all existing or non-existing things. *Śabdabrahman* i.e pure consciousness is comparable to the foundational metaphysical reality of the *Vedānta* i.e *Brahman*. Bhartṛhari accepted *Śabda* as *Brahman* because of its all-pervading and illuminating nature. So, if the question comes how *Śabda* can be taken as the nature of all existing and non-existing things, it can be said that everything can be pervaded by *Śabda*. All existing and non-existing things are of the nature of *Śabda* and everything is expressed by *Sabda*. It is important to note that Bhartṛhari accepted grammar as a means to realize the ultimate reality i.e *Śabdabrahman*. According to Bhartṛhari the indivisible language i.e *Śabdabrahman* is eternal and it has neither a beginning nor an end. We can not create or destroy it. It is eternally given within us and whenever our ignorance goes away then we can realize it. Verbal utterances are destroyed in the sequence of uttering but *Śabdabrahman* i.e pure consciousness is not destroyed with the destruction of those utterances. It is ubiquitously given in the mind as illuminating principle. Actually, Bhartṛhari accepted *Śabda* as awareness and the cognition of existent or non-existent being can be possible by it. If we accepted thought as imagination then that imagination cannot be possible without language because language infuse them. If we do not accept language prior to its articulations then the expectancy to speak or to articulate will not arise. Everything in this world can be communicated through language (*Śabda*) i.e awareness. If we are not aware of existent or of

non-existent beings then we cannot communicate those beings. These are expressed by language (*Śabda*). So, language is taken as a pre-requisite of the beginningless world of communication<sup>13</sup>.

From the cognitive viewpoint, Bhartṛhari accepted *sphoṭa* as the real *Śabda*, the expresser, indivisible and as an intelligible language. This *real Śabda* can be manifested by utterances and we can accept it as universal because like universal it is also eternal and it is not destroyed but it is prevented after and before its articulations. Actually, this real *Śabda* acts as a cause of the incentive to speak when revealed by language in the mind. Bhartṛhari has taken this *real Śabda* as an absolute one i.e. *Śabdabrahman* and it is not subject to birth and death. He accepted the *real Śabda* as eternal in the sense of beginningless of communication. So, it can be said that he accepts *Śabda* as eternal in the two different senses. The first one is, he accepts *Śabda* as eternal in the absolute sense which is not subject to birth and death. The second one is, he recognized *Śabda* as eternal in the sense of the beginningless of communication. So, in both of the senses Bhartṛhari accepted *Śabda* i.e. real word as eternal. In Bhartṛhari's philosophy it is claimed that this real word i.e. *Śabdabrahman* can be inferred as the ontological substratum of indivisible cognition revealed in communication. Being indivisible this cognition is not a construction out of parts. *Śabdabrahman* is not a construction out of a collection of external things or their qualities. Language is a unit of awareness in nature that is manifested by utterances. All cognitions can be cognized through this language.

Bhartṛhari was influenced by *Upaniṣads*. In *Upaniṣads* *Brahman* is accepted as almighty and omniscience. *Upanisadic Brahman* is taken as the material and efficient cause of this universe because of its *māyā śakti*. In the same way Bhartṛhari also has elucidated language i.e. real language as power. Influenced by the *Upaniṣadic* philosophy Bhartṛhari accepted language as a power because he wanted to elucidate that everything in this empirical world or

in the transcendental world are dependent on *Śabda* i.e real language for their illumination. Actually, he accepted *Śabda* as an expressive power of creation and cognition. It is true that if we accept language only as an association of letters then we cannot explain it as a cognitive unit. The language in the state of an idea i.e. meaning revealing language is explained as a cognitive unit. Actually, among the three levels of *Śabdabrahman* accepted by Bhartṛhari, the *paśyantī* level is ubiquitously given to all living beings as their own consciousness. This *paśyantī* level can be manifested by verbal utterances which is known as *vaikharī*. It revealed itself as an idea in the mind and this level is known as *madhyamā* level of *Śabdabrahman*. Through this process one can realized the all comprehensive consciousness i.e *Śabdabrahman*. Following Bhartṛhari we can say that the physical entities are actually the external substratum of the meaning of language. From the point of view of ontological substratum of cognition language is called as *paśyantī* i.e consciousness itself or *Śabdabrahman* and from the subtle viewpoint language is known as inner meaning revealing language i.e language as awareness or idea. This inner meaning revealing language, thought and cognition all of the three are identical. It is worthy to note that though language and meaning are non-different we accept language and meaning as different due to our ignorance, we cannot realize its meaning revealing or awareness character. When our ignorance goes away then we can realize that there is only one reality i.e *Śabdabrahman* and language and meaning revealed non-differently in the mind. It is important to note that the differences in this world are possible because of the power of one and the same reality i.e *Śabdabrahman*. Actually; the power of *Śabdabrahman* is the potential or unmanifested form of *Śabdabrahman* because of which it manifests in specific forms of diversity. On the basis of the above discussion it can be said that Bhartṛhari is a *satkāryavādi*. Because, *satkāryavāda* claimed that the effect necessarily exists in the cause before its production and the cause reveals as effect. In the same way Bhartṛhari also claimed that there is only one reality i.e

*Śabdabrahman* and the one *Śabdabrahman* revealed as many. This implies that plurality of the world was there in the *Śabdabrahman* before its production. The differences in this world are actually manifestation of one and the Same *Śabdabrahman*. Because of our ignorance we accepted the differences in this world as real.

## References:

1. *anādinidhanam brahma śabdatattvam yat akṣaram/  
vivartate 'rthabhavena prakriyā jagato yataḥ//. Vākyapadīya 1/1.*
2. *vaikharyāmadhyamāyaśca paśyantyāscaitadadbhutam. Anekātīrtha bhedāyāstrayyā  
vācaḥ paramampadam. Vākyapadīya 1/142.*
3. Tiwari D.N: *The Central Problems of Bhartṛhari's philosophy*, I.C.P.R publication,  
New Delhi, 2008, pp.2-3.
4. Ibid, p.3.
5. Tiwari D.N: *Language, Being and Cognition*, Astha publication, Assam, 2014, p.30.
6. Rathore Usha: *Sphoṭasiddhi of Maṇḍana Misra*, Vidyanidhi prakashan, Delhi, 2000,  
p.50.
7. Pillai K.Raghavan: *Vākyapadīya, (VP.henceforth), Eng*, Motilal Banarsidass  
publication, Delhi, 1971. *Vākyapadīya 1/123.*
8. Tiwari D.N: *The Central Problems of Bhartṛhari's Philosophy*, ICPR publication,  
New Delhi, 2008, p.12.
9. *artharūpam tathāśabde svarūpam ca prakāśate. Vākyapadīya 1/50.*
10. *buddhirhi bhinneva svaśaktyākramapratyavamarśinī bhaviṣyati. Vākyapadīya 2/25*
11. Tiwari D.N: *The Central Problems of Bhartṛhari's Philosophy*. ICPR publication,  
New Delhi, 2008, p.43.
12. Tiwari D.N: *Language, Being and Cognition*, Astha publication, Assam, 2014, p.32.
13. Ibid, pp.33-34.