

DISCUSSION II

ARE DRAVID'S MAHAVAKYAS FREGEAN MAHAVAKYAS?

Apropos to Professor Dravid's rejoinder to my comments in this Journal, I offer the following proof, which will clear much of the confusion, taking the cue from Dravid's own final re-statement of the problem. Dravid's main thrust here is to explain how Fregean Mahāvākyas and Mahāvākyas *per se* (Dravid's Mahāvākyas) are diametrically opposed. Does he succeed to show that they are? Once he is proved that he is not, then he should agree that his Mahavakyas are no different from Fregean Mahāvākyas. Consider,

- 1. Pure Consciousness = Pure Consciousness  
Is an identity vākya, for the precise reason that they have pure referents. The onus is on Dravid to explain the 'pure' referents. That is, Dravid can agree that:
- 2. Pure referend = Pure referend  
But he will classify this as Fregean Mahāvākyas. For Dravid, this is diametrically opposed to,
- 3. Tvam = Tat  
which is Dravid's Mahāvākyas.  
Now, Dravid states the precise reason why Fregean Mahāvākyas are to be treated as opposed to his variety. That is because,
- 4. Empirical consciousness = Universal consciousness  
which is *ex hypothesi* non-identical. This is what that needs explanation especially after the 'shed'-ing of the clause. Now,
- 5. Tvam = Tat

is not paraphrasable into,

6. Empirical Consciousness is the same as Universal Consciousness.  
This is just like,
7. Morning star = Evening Star  
and the latter corresponds to,
8. 'Morning Star' is the same as 'Evening star'.

The above sentences are not equivalent because they do not pass Church's test, for the specific reason that the former is use and the latter is mention of the sentence.

This is quite agreeable from Church's point of view (Kenneth Taylor 1998). Is this also equally agreeable to Dravid? But for Dravid, unfortunately this should be enough to show that Fregean identity vākyaṣ are tautologies. They are not identical from Dravid's own point of view, especially when they are mentioned. So, it transpires that identityvākya for Dravid is only a tautology of the form  $A=A$ . When  $A=B$ , they are not tautologies, but they are neither identities according to Dravid. This is exactly what is not acceptable to Kenneth Taylor and to me as well as to Professor Bokil (Kanthamani)

Now, the exact move Frege employs is to add sense so as to see that,

9. Meaning (reference plus sense 1) = Meaning (reference plus sense 2)  
which is just equivalent to the (7) above.

But for Dravid, (6) should be understood only with reference to suggestive mode of meaning (SM), which comes to,

10. SM (reference *minus* sense1) = SM (reference *minus* sense 2)

The question is whether this Dravidvākya is an identityvākya or not.

When the 'shed'-ing 'sense' clause that Dravid recommends, the common denominator should be explained as (11):

11. Sm (pure referent) = SM (pure referent)  
this is according to him is just equivalent to 12):
12. SM (pure referend) = SM (pure referend) = Pure Consciousness

But this is exactly what Frege says in,

13. Morning Star = Evening Star = Venus

Venus as the pure referend is Venus irrespective of plus or minus. This is only a difference between Tweedledom and Tweedledee. In what other way Dravid wants to distinguish, he should tell us. May be that he will say that,

14. Empirical Consciousness = Pure Consciousness

is not an identityvākya in which case, it will be impossible to get the plus or minus but he will get not the denial of identity, but only a case for indeterminacy. that is, we will get only that (14) is not translatable into (15):

(15) Empirical Consciousness is not identical with Pure consciousness.

But this is not what is recommended in his *plus-minus* strategy. That is, to say Dravid may get only (16):

16. 'Tvam=Tat' is not translatable into that 'Tvam is the same as Tat'.

To do so amounts only to distinguish between use and mention. This is different from the Dravid' strategy of *plus* and *minus* discussed in the above. *Voila*, Dravidvakyas are that much different from Fregean ones!

A. KANTHAMANI

### REFERENCES

- N.S. Dravid (2000) Mahavakyas Again in *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* Vol. XXVII, No. 3 pp. 334-337.
- Kenneth Taylor (1998) *Truth and Meaning: An Introduction to Philosophy of Language* (Blackwell).
- S.V. Bokil (2000) Reflections on Dravid's 'Mahāvākyas Again' in *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* Vol. XXVII, No. 3pp.339-343.
- A. Kanthamani (2001) What is it to be a Witness-Consciousness (Saksin)? *Indian Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1 pp. 1-13

100

## INDIAN PHILOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY PUBLICATIONS

- Daya Krishna and A. M. Ghose (eds) **Contemporary Philosophical Problems : Some Classical Indian Perspectives**, Rs. 10/-
- S. V. Bokil (Tran) **Elements of Metaphysics Within the Reach of Everyone**. Rs. 25/-
- A. P. Rao, **Three Lectures on John Rawls**, Rs. 10/-
- Ramchandra Gandhi (cd) **Language, Tradition and Modern Civilization**, Rs. 50/-
- S. S. Barlingay, **Beliefs, Reasons and Reflection**, Rs. 70/-
- Daya Krishna, A. M. Ghose and P. K. Srivastav (eds) **The Philosophy of Kalidas Bhattacharyya**, Rs. 60/-
- M. P. Marathe, Meena A. Kelkar and P. P. Gokhale (eds) **Studies in Jainism**, Rs. 50/-
- R. Sundara Rajan, **Innovative Competence and Social Change**, Rs. 25/-
- S. S. Barlingay (ed), **A Critical Survey of Completed Research Work in Philosophy in Indian University (upto 1980), Part I**, Rs. 50/-
- R. K. Gupta. **Exercises in Conceptual Understanding**, Rs. 25/-
- Vidyut Aklujkar, **Primacy of Linguistic Units**. Rs. 30/-
- Rajendra Prasad. **Regularity, Normativity & Rules of Language**  
Rs. 100/-

*Contact :* The Editor,  
**Indian Philosophical quarterly,**  
Department of Philosophy,  
University of Poona,  
Pune 411 007.