

From Word Meanings to Sentence Meaning: Different Perspectives in Indian Philosophy of Language

The reflection on language and its structures was a major component of the Sanskritic intellectual horizon, intimately connected with the broader epistemological and soteriological concerns of different schools. This led to the emergence of various conflicting philosophical views on the nature of the cognition obtained from language (*sābdabodha*). In this respect, a pivotal issue is how *padārthas* (the meaning/referents of words) relate to *vākyārtha* (the meaning/referent of the sentence). During this one-day colloquium, the focus will especially be on the views set forth by the Pūrva-Mīmāmsā philosophers (Bhātta and Prābhākara), the Buddhists, the Grammarians, and the theoreticians of Alamkāraśāstra, and on the reconstruction of the debate as it developed in the course of the first millennium CE.

Date: November 11, 2016 Time: 9:30 am – 6:00 pm Venue: Room 213, Faculty of Asian & Middle Eastern Studies, University of Cambridge Convenors: Vincenzo Vergiani and Shishir Saxena

Maria Piera Candotti, Université de Lausanne / Università di Cagliari (Visiting Scholar) Bhartrhari and the basic meaning unit: innovation or restauration

Daniele Cuneo, Universiteit Leiden When words do not suffice: the polymorphic concept of *bādha*

Hugo David, École française d'Extrême-Orient '*vākyārtha eva padārthaḥ*': On the reappropriation of an old Mīmāmsā principle in a Vedāntic framework

Elisa Freschi, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften From authorless words to Vedic prescriptions: The Mīmāmsaka journey from the subjectindependent nature of language to the prescriptive nature of language

Kei Kataoka, Kyushu University How to paraphrase a sentence? Bādari vs Jaimini

Tiziana Pontillo, Università di Cagliari The general *samartha*-constraint of word-formation rules in the Pāṇinian tradition

Akane Saito, Kyushu University Phonemes as the Conveyors of Sentence Meaning for Kumārila, Śālikanātha, Vācaspati, and Jayanta

Shishir Saxena, University of Cambridge Kumārila on why *śabda* cannot be classified as *anumāna* on the basis of *āptavādāvisaņvāda*,

Kumarila on why sabda cannot be classified as anumana on the basis of aptavadavisamvada, as argued in the Sabdapariccheda & Vākyādhikarana of the Ślokavārttika

Vincenzo Vergiani, University of Cambridge Of the unitary nature of complex sentences: Bhartrhari's remarks in the second kāṇḍa of the Vākyapadīya