

BEING AND LANGUAGE

Meeting ground for Bhartṛhari and Heidegger

Sebastian Alackapally*

INTRODUCTION

Man speaks. It is his speech, language that makes him a distinct being. The fascination for language has lead man, both in the East and West to the philosophical speculation of his capacity to speak. In India speculations on the notion of *Śabda*, speech or language originated in the Vedic times. The Indian seers were interested in the problems of language just as they were pre-occupied with their search for the meaning of the various realities of the universe. Their discussions included many subtle problems related to the origin of a word, different forms of speech, relation of a word to its meaning, speech and its nature, etc. The Vedic *Samhitās*, *Brāhmaṇas*, and the *Upaniṣads* as well as *Niruktas* (etymology), the *Prātiśākhya*s (phonology) and the extensive grammatical literature all offer us valuable information about all these problems. This fact, no doubt, points to the keen interest and assiduity of Indian teachers concerning their interest for the study of the phenomena of *Śabda* or *vāk*.

We have great works like Yaska's *Nirukata*, Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsā* and its commentaries of Śabara, Prabhākara, Kumāriḷa, Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* and such other masterpieces, about the investigation into the meaning of language. Though, the Indian speculations on *Śabda* were mixed up with religious and spiritual conceptions, they were in no way less rigorous in their scientific and metaphysical discourse on the problem of meaning of the word. The Indian philosophical systems also made many important observations on linguistic problems. Each of the schools of thought had to consider *Śabda* at some stage or other, and they had to ponder over some fundamental questions concerning the relation of the word to reality and the validity of verbal knowledge. Except the Cārvākas, the Vaiśeṣikas and the Buddhists, all other systems of Indian philosophy accept *Śabda* as a distinct source of knowledge.

*Teaches philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy of Dharmaram Vidya Kshetram, Bangalore and the Darsana Institute, Wardha.

Philosophers from the very ancient to the modern and contemporary West are equally concerned with the great capacity of human language. Their speculations on language, theories of meaning and the scientific development of language studies into various branches like syntax, semantics and semiotics - all bear witness to the genuine interest in language studies. Systematic and even mathematically rigorous accounts of language by Gottlob Frege, Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein and the logical positivists shed much light into the logic and meaning of language phenomenon. The contemporary language philosophers and the ordinary language philosophers like G.E. Moore, J.L. Austin set out to answer the philosophical questions that surround the ordinary language. Further language studies take into account the philosophical problems about the connection between mind, language and the world opening up new vistas for representation, communicative meaning and truth.

We have two representatives from East and West in the persons of Bhartṛhari (c. 450-500)¹ and Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) with their thinking on language which culminates in their thinking of Being. For both, the question of Being is essentially interwoven into the experience of the question of language. Hence the thinking of Being is simultaneously a thinking of language; to experience the truth of the one is necessarily to experience the truth of the other. The analysis of Bhartṛhari's understanding of Being along with his thinking on language as well as Heidegger's question of Being in relation to his understanding of language assume the inter-relatedness of the question of Being and language in the philosophies of Bhartṛhari and Heidegger. What is looked for is the independent congruence of the thought content which lay open the hidden truth of the paths taken by thinking from a comparative perspective.

In Bhartṛhari's vision the language we speak is the medium of the self-expression of the ultimate Reality communicated through all meaning-

¹Bhartṛhari belongs to the tradition of the great grammarians like P ānini and Patañjali. Bhartṛhari for the first time undertook a thorough study of the Word-Absolute (*Śabdātattva*) and demonstrated its logical implications. And we get the absolutistic trends of the philosophy of language from his masterpiece the *Vākyapadīya*, which ranks as the principal authoritative work among all Sanskrit works on a philosophy of grammar.

bearing words. It leads us across the external appearance to the core of Reality, which is the source and the underlying unity beneath everything. The Real breaks-forth (*sphuṭ*) through the medium of speech (*Śabda*)². This *Śabda* is not merely a means to a truth or reality but it is the Truth and Reality. In Heidegger's thinking about language the focus moves from the human activity to a source beyond man in Being.³ Language is the original utterance (*Sage*) which Being speaks to man. Does this mean that Being itself comes to speech in human language? Obviously there is much in Heidegger that hinges on this deep connection that language is alleged to provide between Being and being. It is language that brings Being into expression for both Bhartṛhari and Heidegger.

THE REAL IS ŚABDATATTVA

Bhartṛhari conceives Reality as One, which is of the nature of word. The whole phenomenon of material existence is only an appearance (*vivarta*) of this Word-Principle (*Śabdatattva*), which is identical with the ultimate Reality, Brahman. The *Śabdatattva* of Bhartṛhari differs from the Upaniṣadic conception of *Śabdabrahman*. According to the Upaniṣadic vision, there are two Brahmans to be known: Word Brahman and the Supreme, it is this Supreme Brahman that man reaches when he is proficient in the word Brahman.⁴ Whereas for Bhartṛhari *Śabdatattva* is the Absolute and there is no distinction between the *Śabdabrahman* and the Supreme. The speech essence (*Śabdatattva*) is the ultimate Reality

²The term *Śabda* is a very meaningful word. It has a variety of meaning. *Śabda* is generally rendered by terms like word, speech, sound, noise, etc. It also connotes a phoneme, vowel, resonance, language and meaning. *Śabda* in its literal sense stands for a word (*pada*); and etymologically it signifies sound (*dhvani*). Epistemologically *Śabda* refers to the source of knowledge, namely, verbal testimony (*Śabda-pramāṇa*).

³The word 'Being,' a basic concept in Heidegger's philosophy, will be written with a capital 'B' in order to distinguish it from the word 'being' which expresses a particular being or 'being' which is the participle of the verb 'to be.' 'Being' will correspond to the German *Sein* and 'being' to the German *Seiendes*.

⁴S. RADHAKRISHNAN, *The Principal Upanisads* (London: George Allen & Unwin 1953), 833. All the references from the *Upanisads* are taken from this edition.

which has neither beginning nor end and is unchanging. Bhartṛhari expounds this view in the very first verse of *Vākyapadīya* thus:

*anādi nidhanam brāhma śabdatattvam yad akṣaram /
vivartate arthabhāvena prakriyā jagato yatah* ⁵

Śabdatattva is of the nature of word and from it are manifested all objects and the whole cosmos. So, this very first *kārikā* of *Vākyapadīya* would mean that the whole phenomenon of material existence is only an appearance (*vivarta*) of the speech principle which is identical with the ultimate Reality, Brahman. The ultimate Reality which Bhartṛhari understands as substance (*dravya*) is the universal in particular things which is nothing other than Brahman as existence. The Real is also called *tattva* (thatness) which is further referred to as *para* (the highest one)⁶. As *tattva*, it neither is nor is not; it is neither one nor differentiated; neither combined nor separated; neither changing nor unchanging.⁷ The Absolute transcends all spatial and temporal determinations. Hence diversity and multiplicity could not really be part of the essence of the Absolute. The Real, beyond the reach of the senses cannot be an object of consciousness accompanied with the idea of either existence or non-existence and is therefore beyond being or non-being. From the transcendental point of view, Brahman cannot be a real or unreal cause, for it is ineffable. This means that the entire world of things whose individuality consists only in names and forms (*nāma* and *rūpa*) to use the advaitic terms, has its source in this speech-essence. It does not mean that the *Śabdatattva*, the eternal timeless, is limited by Time. Instead, Time is an inherent power of the Absolute which exerts its influence in bringing about the powers of *Śabdatattva*.

⁵That beginningless and endless One, the imperishable Brahman of which the essential nature is the Word, which manifests itself into objects and from which is the creation of the Universe. BHARTṚHARI, *Vākyapadīya* Chapter I, tr., K.A.S. IYER (Poona: Deccan College 1965), I. 1. Hereafter VP. I.

⁶BHARTṚHARI, *Vākyapadīya*, Chapter III, Pt. I, tr., K.A.S. IYER (Poona: Deccan college 1971), III.1.20. Hereafter VP. III.

⁷VP. III.2.12.

The eternal timeless appears as changing under the operation of its powers such as Time.⁸ Real and unreal are not different entities but real, when not comprehended properly, is believed to be unreal.⁹ Hence Bhartṛhari asserts that there exists an ultimate unity, deep-seated within all subjects and objects. The entire manifold universe ultimately and essentially expresses this unity. Both unity and diversity are terms relative to each other and have no individual independent existence of their own. Thus the Reality is non-dual having the nature of word as *Śabdatattva*.

ŚABDATATVA AS SPHOṬA

In Bhartṛhari's view the Absolute Existence itself manifests in the form of words and their meaning. There is no difference between them; Brahman himself is the word. Our speech imperfectly imitates this absolute word. Words that we speak, says Bhartṛhari, come out as an embodiment of thought, which then, is called language. Hence Language, according to Bhartṛhari, not only reveals reality, but it is Reality.

One primary problem faced by Bhartṛhari was how the passing sounds constituting a word could have a single meaning for the listener. He postulated a meaning-bearing symbol called *sphoṭa*, behind the several letters forming a word, or many words making up a sentence. This *sphoṭa* theory, in brief, says that the word essence is the very soul of a meaningful word. It is something that the word reveals or communicates to mind through its meaning. So what is eternal and self-subsistent is not the sound or the word, but the word-essence. The word-essence which is the Absolute for Bhartṛhari appears on the one hand, as the plurality of words and, on the other hand, as the plurality of objects. Hence, the Word-Absolute is ultimately one and undivided. Yet in our empirical experience it appears as divided into sentences, words and phonemes.

Although Bhartṛhari follows the tradition of Grammar School, he develops the *sphoṭa* doctrine probably against the background of the Mīmāṃsaka interpretation of *Śabda* and *artha*. According to Mīmāṃsakas, since *Vedas* are eternal, the words of which they are composed also have

⁸VP.1.3.

⁹VP. III.2.7.

to be eternal. In opposition to this theory of eternalness of the words Bhartṛhari holds that it is the meaning rather than the word that is eternal. All words in his view ultimately mean the Supreme Brahman, which he calls *Śabdatattva*. In order to evince this truth he established the concept of *sphoṭa*. In Bhartṛhari's view *sphoṭa* is an indivisible entity which is the real meaning bearing whole. *Sphoṭa* as a meaning principle works identically everywhere and in everybody's speech.

Bhartṛhari begins with the treatment of *sphoṭa* which is the conveyor of real meaning from *Vākyapadīya* I.44. He says: "In the words which are expressive the learned discern two elements: one (*sphoṭa*) is the cause of the real word which, the other (*dhvani*), is used to convey the meaning." Thus Bhartṛhari advocates that a word (*Śabda*) has two aspects, namely, the word sound (*dhvani*) and word meaning (*artha*). Although they may appear to be essentially different, they are really identical. What Bhartṛhari emphasizes is the meaning bearing or revelatory function of this two sided unity, the *sphoṭa*, which he maintains is eternal and given in nature. The apparent difference is seen to result from the various external manifestations of the single internal *sphoṭa*.

The real expressive word, the indivisible *sphoṭa* is over and above the sounds which are many in number and are uttered by the speaker in a temporal sequence. This means that the separate letters of a word or words of the sentence merely manifest the *sphoṭa* or meaning-whole. As a rule, the sounds, which are uttered by the speaker, manifest the expressive word, which already exists in the hearer. In other words, when one utters a word, which is in his mind, he produces a sequence of different sounds in order to make a sense out of many words. So it is not the manifesting sounds, which convey the meaning, but the indivisible sequenceless word that is hidden behind the visible words. That is why the listener though first hears a series of sounds he ultimately perceives the utterance as a unity.

The second *kāṇḍa* of *Vākyapadīya* occupies a central question whether it is the sentence (*vākya*) or the word (*pada*) that constitute the primary unit of language. *Kārika* II.57 calls the upholders of the sentence *vākyavādins*, i.e., the grammarians and the upholders of the word as *padadarśins*, i.e., the Mīmāṃsakas. In contrast to the Mīmāṃsakas who

conceive the sentence meaning or the complete thought as resulting from the summation of the individual meanings, Bhartṛhari understands *sphoṭa* primarily as an indivisible sentence which is expressive of sense. Technically it is also called *akaa vākyasphoṭa*.

The sentence is the fundamental linguistic fact and letters and words are unreal abstractions from it. The basic logic behind his thinking is that the whole is prior to the parts. Bhartṛhari makes his stand clear by observing that man does not speak in individual words. For it is the whole idea or complete thought which is the expressive aspect of *Śabda* (*sphoṭa*). He gives an example for it. Even when a word is used merely in the form of a substantive noun (e.g. 'tree'), the verb 'to be' is always understood so that what is indicated is really a complete thought (e.g. 'It is a tree').¹⁰ Completeness of meaning is then the test of a sentence. It is a plain truth that without the unifying function of the meaning of a sentence words cannot stand; they will scatter and wither away. This means the meaning has to stand as a principle at the root of words and sentences.

Bhartṛhari's linguistic analysis is not a language game, but as it is basically linked with the spiritual discipline called *vāgyoga* which involves a theory of human life and a vision of life's end. *Vṛtti* on *Vākyapadīya* I.130 declares the *vāgyoga* as a process that involves the breaking of one's ego-sense, the sense of the 'I' and 'mine' and thereby realizing the non-differentiated Word which is the Absolute. *vāgyoga* - the *Yoga* of speech thus lends man to the complete comprehension of truth. Bhartṛhari proposes *vāgyoga*, to reach the complete absence of all sorts of differentiation and sequence. *Vāgyoga*, therefore, is a kind of meditation which aims at raising the level of the consciousness of words to the highest stage of the Word-Principle. The *vāgyoga* demands a kind of *śōbdasamskāra*,¹¹ i.e., the purification of words which culminate in the attainment of the ultimate Reality.¹² It is only the proper grammar and

¹⁰Bhartṛhari, *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the Vṛtti*, tr., K.A.S Iyer (Pune: Deccan College 1995) I.24-26. Hereafter VPV.

¹¹VP. I.132.

¹²As Bhartṛhari says in his *Nītisataka*, right speech (*vāk*) alone adds to the handsomeness of one's personality more than anything else. While other things

proper use of language that will lead us beyond the mire of confusion and wrong associations. One who has attained such a state of existence is a perfect man, who distinguishes truth, speaks truth and as a result acts truthfully. Perfection in thinking, speaking and acting makes one's life more and more integrated. Thus, *Śabdātattva* of Bhartṛhari's conception, in its final analysis acts like a principle of integration, which culminates in the ultimate liberation.

BEING - THE ABYSS

Now Heidegger, as the philosopher of Being explains his own philosophy as a rethinking of the traditional metaphysics of being. He proposes meditative thinking as a new way for his *Seinsdenken*. Dasein¹³, man as a privileged being, always has a relation to its Being. Dasein is privileged because Da-sein is gifted with awareness of its own Being. Again man as a questioning being is the way to the questioning of Being, leading, finally to Being as the questioned. Therefore, Being for Heidegger is always Being as it enters into Dasein's understanding of Being. Being the *Da* (there) of *Sein* (Being) man is the Da-sein.¹⁴ Being can only be revealed in Dasein. Therefore, as long as there is a Dasein, Being can be revealed. On the other hand, man is man because being breaks into openness which is the essence of man.

Man's ek-sistence is ek-static open-ness to Being. This ek-static standing of Dasein is also a standing out in the truth of Being.¹⁵ The *Da* in

perish the gracefulness of speech lasts forever. *Subhāshita Trisati of Bhartṛhari*, ed., W.L.S.PANSIKAR (Bombay: Pandurang Jawji 1925), 12.

¹³The word Dasein is very important in Heidegger's philosophy and is a special German expression with many indications and connotations. Literally it would mean There-being (*Da-Sein*) which would signify the relatedness of human reality to Being as well as the sense of presence, the mode of "to be" that distinguishes it from all other beings.

¹⁴M. HEIDEGGER, *Being and Time*, tr., J. MACQUARRIE & E. ROBINSON (New York: Harper & Row 1962), 171. Hereafter BT.

¹⁵M. HEIDEGGER, *Letter on Humanism in Basic Writings*, ed., D.F. KRELL (New York: Harper Collins 1993), 229. Hereafter LH. Heidegger makes use of the term ek-sistence in contrast to existence, in order to point out the nature of man's existence. Man's very existence is an ek-sistence, namely, a going out of himself.

Dasein is Being itself revealed or brought out of concealment into disclosure. Since disclosure in Heideggerian thinking is truth, Dasein is the truth of Being. Dasein being the "There" (presence) of Being; human existence is, in the final analysis, the openness to Being, "the standing in the lighting-process of Being."¹⁶ By means of this openness, which belongs to his very essence man is admitted into a new region, the region in which "reasons" are neither demanded nor supplied, in which things stand forth and emerge out of their own grounds, free from the categories of metaphysical thought. The relationship between Being and man cannot be thought of in terms of the subject-object relation. Since Being is in no way a being, but is rather not-a-being, it is Nothing. This Nothingness of Being makes Dasein conscious of its inauthentic state of existence and invites it to authentic existence.

Being presents itself in Time. The Real and Time belong together. How can this be? As to the relation between Time and Being, Heidegger fixes on the notion of Presence. In the decades following the publication of BT, Heidegger's *Seinsfrage* shifted its focus. The epoch of *Being and Time* and of what is often referred to as the earlier Heidegger is followed by the epoch of later Heidegger. The problem of the ontological difference and the emphasis on the primacy of Being become more and more pronounced with the unfolding of Heidegger's way of thinking, especially in the later works. This change of emphasis from "There" to Being could be regarded as the consequence of the meditative experiencing of the coming about of the ontological difference and of the deepening of the question of Being on Heidegger's way. Heidegger referred to this change as a 'turn' and a 'completion' of the questioning that had begun with *Being and Time*. If *Being and Time* had analyzed 'man in relation to Being,' Heidegger characterized the 'turn' with an inversion in terms, as an approach to 'Being and its truth in relation to man.'¹⁷ Heidegger suggests that in the

This going out signifies the fundamental character of man's ek-sistence as openness to Being.

¹⁶LH. 229.

¹⁷Heidegger's acceptance and interpretation of the distinction between the earlier phase and the later development of his thought can be found in his "Vorwort" (Letter to Richardson, 1962), in W.J. RICHARDSON, *Phenomenology to Thought*, xx-xxii.

process of unveiling, there is a kind of granting at work which grants Being-present, while it lets-be-present that which is present, namely, beings. In this process we come again upon a granting, and thus upon an "It" which grants. Heidegger names the 'It' that grants as *Ereignis* (Event)¹⁸. In the event man comes to himself, discovers his identity and relationship with the Being. *Ereignis* is therefore the name given by way of anticipation to a possible 'identification' between man and Being, beyond metaphysics - to the groundless ground. But why is Being groundless? Because every form of grounding, even self, grounding would reduce Being to some kind of being.¹⁹ Inasmuch as Being is a ground without ground, Heidegger calls it the 'abyss' that which lacks a basis and ground. Being then is both ground and abyss. The authentic experiencing of this Being which is beyond differentiations includes a movement from the philosophical God in Heidegger's interpretation to the truly divine.

BEING IS THE SAYING

Heidegger's understanding of language has been intimately associated with his thinking of Being over the entire course of his works. Man's special relationship to Being indicates that he is active with regard to the revealing and concealing of Being in beings. Man, as engaging in this particular activity, must have a particular capability - the 'word.' This intimation of the role of the 'word' as proposed by Heidegger indicates that speech is directly involved in the disclosure of the Being of beings. Man shows himself as the entity, which talks.²⁰ Language emerges as being co-constitutive of the disclosedness of Dasein, the Being-in-the-world as the articulation of its intelligibility.²¹ However the analysis of *Being and*

¹⁸The German verb *ereignen* usually means simply 'to happen.' while the noun *Ereignis* is simply 'event.' *Ereignis* includes the root *eigen* corresponding to the English word 'own.' The *Ereignis* then is not just any event, but the event of appropriation, when something is made someone's own. This appropriation would seem to be the other side of the act of giving. So we read: 'The gift of presence is the property of appropriating.' M. HEIDEGGER, *On Time and Being*, tr. J. STAMBAUGH (New York: Harper and Row 1972), 22 .

¹⁹M. HEIDEGGER, *Der Satz vom Grund* (Pfullingen: Neske 1957), 185

²⁰BT. 208.

²¹BT. 203-204.

Time never directly confronts the problem of the nature of language as such. The later Heidegger moves to resolve this difficulty, as he asserts in *Letter on Humanism* that the essence of language is "that it is the house of the truth of Being."²²

As man dwells in the clearing of Being he attends thoughtfully to the call of Being. The call of Being which precedes all verbal utterance calls upon man to respond to Being in the equally wordless mode of listening. By responding thoughtfully in silence to the call of Being man becomes manifest as that being who thinks. The call of Being indicates that man's thoughtful nature resides within the essence of language, which is the primal Saying of Being. The role of language is taken up within Being itself. Language is the clearing-and-concealing advent of Being itself. Language becomes the concrete presence of Being rather than mere articulation. In as much as language grants to man this capacity of speech Heidegger claims that language is "the foundation of human being."²³ It is the 'house of Being' - an abode given by Being to man, within which abode man is to dwell thoughtfully.²⁴ The essential being of language is the *Sage* (Saying) as that which shows.²⁵ The showing of Saying takes place when language breaks in to speech. Thus language becomes the primordial poetry through which a people speaks Being.

The primal Saying of language which is prior to all human speech is a monologue.²⁶ This monologue is characterized as "stillness (*Stillen*)."²⁷

²²LH. 223

²³LH. 230.

²⁴LH. 217.

²⁵M. HEIDEGGER, *On the Way to Language*, tr., P.D. HERTZ (New York: Harper and Row 1971), 123. Hereafter WL. Because Heidegger finds an affinity between *Sagen* and *Zeigen* (to show-forth, to let-appear-in-the-open) Richardson, translates *Sagen* as "utter" and the word "utter" derives from the comparative form of the Anglo-Saxon *ut*, meaning "out," hence may be taken to mean "to give or bring out," sc. in the Open. (W.J. RICHARDSON, "Heidegger and the Origin of Language," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 2 (1962) 41.

²⁶WL. 134.

²⁷M. HEIDEGGER, *Poetry, Language and Thought*, tr., A. HOFSTADTER (New York: Harper and Row 1971), 207. Hereafter PLT.

Man belonging to Saying (*der Sage gehörend*) listens to it and its word and brings what it hears "correspondingly" into human-sounding words. Mortal speech is thus characterized as a co-responsence (*ent-sprechen*) or a response (*Nachsagen*).²⁸ Language "grants presence - that is Being - wherein something appears as existent."²⁹ Phenomena in the world occur simultaneously with the occurrence of language and the world exists only where words exist.

Language is not representative, but manifestative. Language manifests, or shows itself in that it makes things light up. Ultimately Being shows itself in language. The showing of the primal Saying of Being is prior to all human speech and is determinative of all human speech. Since primal Saying is prior to and transcends all human speech, primal Saying is wordless and is not subject to expressive utterance. Nevertheless, primal Saying motivates human speech by giving a call to man to come into Being as that thoughtful being which he is. According to Heidegger human speech is always and essentially a response to the primal call of Being, man's response is most authentically to listen to the call of Being. But as a man listens thoughtfully to the call of Being, he is led to express his understanding of this call to his fellows according to the utterance of human speech. Thus, speech is understood to be derivative of the primal Saying of the call of Being. Hence, language for Heidegger, is not merely an instrument of communication, but is basically the coming of Being into Saying.

BHARTṚHARI AND HEIDEGGER: MEETING GROUNDS

Bhartṛhari is primarily concerned about leading man from inauthentic to authentic existence, from absorption in the object to self-realization. Heidegger also, it seems, expresses his dissatisfaction over the 'thrown fallenness' of every day life. Heidegger in rediscovering for the West, man's belongingness to *Ereignis* comes closer to Bhartṛhari's man who dissociates himself from untruth through *vāgyoga* and achieves union with the Real, *Śabdatattva*. Man, says Heidegger, is the 'Neighbour of

²⁸WL. 134.

²⁹WL. 146.

Being.' Similarly for Bhartṛhari an analysis and reflection on the nature of the self is a means of knowing Brahman, the *Śabdatattva*.

From an ontological perspective, Brahman stands for true Reality (Being). A reflection on the Reality of Brahman in philosophical terms, brings us closer to Heidegger's concept of Being. Because Being is no-being (no-thing), it cannot be described as such or such. Heidegger considers Being as the groundless ground and Abyss of all human understanding. In the eventing of Being, it seems, Heidegger is not distant from Bhartṛhari moving from finite to the unspoken realms of Being. Because the Truth of Being is forever hidden from us, Being in the last analysis remains a mystery.

Time, *kāla* for Bhartṛhari, is the power of *Śabdatattva*. They belong to each other. Being and Time according to Heidegger belong together. Heidegger often speaks of the Light of Being, or clearing which brings Light. According to Bhartṛhari Being shines forth in the breaking forth of the word. In Bhartṛhari's view Truth (*satya*) and Being (*sat*) are intimately inter-connected. *Sat* is *satya*. *Satya* as the claim of Being is the *sphoṭa* emerging from *Sat*. When *sphoṭa* is listened to in silence, it is *Śabda* - the *ādiśabda* (primordial utterance) which is at the same time *anāhataśabda* (unmanifest utterance). According to Heidegger, in the eventing of Being happens Truth and Dasein becomes the place of the truth of Being. Being reveals, comes-to-pass in being and being dwells in the light of Being. *Sein* in its innermost nature is *Sage*. Being is *Logos*. The Real, *Śabdatattva* expresses itself through the breaking forth of words. It shines forth as the *satya*, truth in everything.

For Heidegger the primal Saying prior to all human speech is a monologue which might correspond to Bhartṛhari's *sphoṭa* in the unuttered stage of speech as the indivisible whole. Now the primal Saying is brought to expression through human speaking in the same manner *sphoṭa* breaks in to words through human speech. In Heidegger's view phenomena in the world occur simultaneously with the occurrence of language. This seems to be what Bhartṛhari meant when he says 'all things that comprise reality are of the nature of word.'

CONCLUSION

The question of Being is a bridge that links the traditional philosophy to the philosophy up to our times. All things are and can be Being and a form of Being. To the extent, therefore, that things are, they are unified by that which is common to all of them, that they are Being. It serves as a unifying aspect of everything. In this sense, Being constitutes the unity of everything that is. The question of Being is at the same time a quest for a way of thought that can redeem our humanity by overcoming the 'forgetfulness of Being' and so enable us to live in the world as truly our home, in the "neighbourhood" of Being. Ek-sisting to Being - *Śabdatattva*, being receives the light of Being, unveiling the truth of Being. Then the being speaks the primordial *Sage* - *sphoṭa* which breaks forth as Being. In this deeper unity of the Being - *Śabdatattva*, being finds its authenticity. Heidegger's path of thinking the Being and Bhartṛhari's meditative way of knowing the *Śabdatattva* lead one to the belonging togetherness of Being and being in a deeper unity which is a continued process beyond all conceptualizing.