

Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts,

(Under Ministry of Culture, Govt. of India)

Eastern Regional Centre, Varanasi,

Proceedings

The Special Lecture Series (15.3 – 25.3.2010)

on

“Perspective of the Pervasive Theories of Indian Aesthetics”

In order to explore the possibilities of the presence of a pervasive theory of Indian Aesthetics which may embrace literature, theatre, Architecture, Sculpture and all other Art forms, IGNCA, ERC, Varanasi organised a special lecture series from 15th March up to 25th March 2010 at Banaras Art Gallery hall, Bhadaini, Varanasi. In this series total seven lectures were delivered by Prof. V.N. Jha, Prof. R.N. Mishra, Prof. B. Bäumer, Prof. Radhavallabh Tripathi, Prof. V. Kutumba Shastri, Prof. G.C. Tripathi and Prof. C. Rajendran chaired by Prof. P.K. Mukhopadhyay, Prof. B. Bäumer, Prof. R.N. Mishra, Prof. Rajendra Mishra and Prof. Shivji Upadhyay respectively. Almost every day the hall remained crowded with Professors and erudite scholars of different Universities of Varanasi. Throughout these seven days followings were present:

1. Prof. Ashok Kumar Chatterjee
2. Prof. Shivji Upadhyay
3. Prof. Revaprasad Dwivedi
4. Prof. Bettina Bäumer
5. Prof. G. Anjaneya Shastri
6. Prof. Chandramauli Dwivedi
7. Prof. Krishnakant Sharma
8. Prof. Deenbandhu Pandeya
9. Prof. Gopabandhu Mishra
10. Prof. Phoolchand Jain
11. Prof. Srikrishna Tripathi
12. Prof. Rajib Ranjan Singh
13. Prof. Suresh Kumar Nair

14. Prof. Mark Dyczkowski
15. Prof. Rajaram Shukla
16. Prof. Rajendra Prasad Singh
17. Prof. S. Vijay Kumar
18. Dr. Smt Pushpalata Pratap
19. Dr. Smt. Manju Sundram
20. Dr. Smt. Svaravandana Sharma
21. Prof. M.N.P. Tiwari
22. Prof. A.D. Singh
23. Prof. Kamalesh Jha
24. Prof. Kaushalendra Pandeya
25. Prof. Manudev Bhattacharya
26. Prof. Adya Prasad Pandey
27. Prof. Bhanu Agrawal
28. Prof. Bhagavat Sharan Shukla
29. Prof. Gayatri Prasad Pandeya
30. Prof. Upendra Pandeya
31. Prof. Kamalesh Datta Tripathi
32. Dr. N.P. Joshi
33. Dr. Sashikant Dwivedi
34. Dr. Sadashiv Dwivedi
35. Dr. Sukumar Chattopadhyay
36. Dr. Sacchidananda Sharma
37. Dr. Archana Agrawal
38. Dr. Kunwarji Agrawal
39. Dr. Atul Bhatnagar
40. Dr. Yogesh Bhatt
41. Dr. Jashindar Kaur
42. Dr. S.S. Sinha
43. Dr. Iravati
44. Dr. Hema Atmanathan

45. Dr. Usha Rani Tiwari
46. Dr. C.S. Panchakshari
47. Dr. Sumit Bharadwaj
48. Dr. Subhra Nag
49. Dr. Uma Bandyopadhyay
50. Dr. Renu Shaki
51. Dr. Urmila Sharma
52. Dr. Kamala Pandeya
53. Dr. S.P. Pandeya
54. Dr. Bhaktiputra Rohitam
55. Dr. Mannu Yadav
56. Dr. Sukdeva Bajpeyee
57. Dr. Sanjay Kumar Singh
58. Dr. Rajkishor
59. Dr. Archana Kumar
60. Dr. Dhananjai Kumar Pathak
61. Dr. Axa Tussi
62. Dr. Francois Pebarthe
63. Dr. Evan Layton
64. Dr. P. Shano Christia
65. Dr. Katherine Myres
66. Dr. Suneel Jilloson
67. Dr. Bartorela David
68. Dr. Narendra Dutta Tiwari
69. Dr. Parvati Banerjee
70. Dr. Rama Dubey
71. Dr. Trilochan Pradhan
72. Dr. Rajanikant Tripathi
73. Miss Renu Shaki
74. Miss Tabassum
75. Miss Kushboo

76. Miss Aparna Tripathi
77. Sri Rakesh Singh
78. Sri Ashutosh Kumar
79. Sri Vishal Mishra
80. Sri Janardan Mishra
81. Sri Govind Mishra
82. Sri Ajeet Kumar
83. Sri Mukesh Kumar Tripathi
84. Sri Ambuj Trivedi
85. Dr. S.P. Pandey
86. Dr. P. Ghosal

This Seven day long special lecture series started at 3 p.m. on 15th March 2010 at the Banaras Art Gallery Hall. The function opened with a sweet prayer to Universal Goddess rendered by Dr. Smt. Svaravandana Sharma. In the holy atmosphere sanctified by the resonance of benediction, Prof. K.D. Tripathi delivered welcome address to the guests and introduced the theme of the lecture series before the audience.

Prof. Tripathi introduced **Prof. V.N. Jha** the speaker of the day also, who delivered his lecture on *Aesthetic Theory of Annumitī with Special Reference to Mahimabhaṭṭa*. This lecture was chaired over by Prof. P.K. Mukhopadhyay. Prof. Jha in his erudite speech at first raised a set of eleven basic questions regarding aesthetics.

1. What is the world view of an artist? Is he/She an idealist or realist?
2. What is the ontological status his/her world of experience?
3. What is the model of understanding his/her world of experience?
4. What is the status of understanding (*jñāna, samvit*)?
5. What is the status of language?
6. Who is an artist (*kavi*)?
7. Who is a connoisseur (*sahṛdaya*)
8. What is beauty (*saundarya/sobhā*)?

9. What is an aesthetic experience (*rasānubhūti*)?
10. How is a world of Art created (*utpatti prakriyā*)? and
11. What is the epistemology (*jñāpati-prakriyā*) of an aesthetic experience?

Then he concentrated on the theory of linguistic communication, where on the end (1) there remains the communicator (*jñatā*) and before him lies (2) the world which he wants to communicate, (3) when the world is known by name and form (*nāma-rūpa*) and when he wants to share, he/she communicates his knowledge through language (4) On the other end there is reader/listener who receives communicator's language, (5) decodes and (6) discovers the knowledge which is encoded by the communicator.

According to Prof. Jha this is broad structure of the theory of linguistic communication. He opined that similarly there is an aesthetic theory of communication also. He explained the same on the basis Mahimabhaṭṭa's discourses.

In course of his lecture he told that our world of experience consists of two things (1) given and (2) created. With the help of examples he showed the distinction between these two.

He explained this given world according to the way shown by Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Philosophers which includes six positive entities (*bhāva-padārtha*) and one negative i.e. (*abhāva*) which is also considered as entity. Six positive entities again include a set of nine substances (*dravya*), twenty-four qualities (*guṇa*), five actions (*karma*), one universal/genre (*sāmānya*), endless particulars (*viśeṣa*) and inherence (*samavāya*) i.e. a single permanent relation.

Prof. Jha in course of his lecture explained the process of knowing this given world i.e. epistemology. We may know this world either directly through perception (*pratyakṣa*) or through inference (*anumāna*), or analogy (*uṣamāna*) or through language (*śabda*). Later on Prof. Jha concentrated on the process of understanding or decoding the language (*sābda bodha prakriyā*) through five

stages (i) *padajñāna*, (ii) *padārtha smaraṇa*, (iii) *tātparya jñāna*, (iv) *padārthānvaya* and (v) *sābdabodha*. Prof. Jha explained the thing elaborately with the help of graphs and charts.

On the opposite side of this given world there is a created one which includes all art forms viz. music, dance, sculpture etc. As because *kāvya* is also a literary art form and *kavi* is an artist or creator (*apāre kāvya saṁsāre kavir ekaḥ prajāpatiḥ*); therefore development of an aesthetic theory of communication is required. Prof. Jha explained the process of knowing this created world through several stages by two parallel sets, e.g. (1) *kavi*, (2) *kāvyaśaṁsāra*, (3) *kāvyaśaṁsārānubhava*, (4) *kāvyaśāśā* and (5) *sahṛdaya*. Similarly (1) *vaktṛ*, (2) *viśva*, (3) *viśvānubhava*, (4) *śāśā* and (5) *śrotṛ*.

In the second part of his lecture Prof. Jha discussed epistemology of an aesthetic experience. In this phase he discussed dialectics between *dhvani* theorists and its critics especially Mahimabhaṭṭa, who rejected the *dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana. In his opinion, to explain the generation of understanding from a literary art form, there is no need of postulating *vyañjanā* because inference (*anumāna*) alone can accomplish this task. Mahimabhaṭṭa accepted only one relationship i.e. *abhidhā* or primary relationship to explain primary meaning (*vācyārtha*) and all other meanings are understood on the basis of this primary meaning by employing method of inference. In his opinion there are two capabilities (*śakti*) one is *śabda* called *abhidhā* and other is its meaning (*artha*) called *liṅgata* or *anumāpakṛtā*. Hence, there are two *pramāṇa*-s only *pratyakṣa* (perception) and *anumāna*.

Prof. Jha upheld Mahimabhaṭṭa's logic with ample quotations. At the end of his lecture he summed up all the vital points and his conclusion was even if *dhvani* theory be replaced by *anumāna* theory comprehensiveness of Indian theory of aesthetics would not be lost. The only thing is we have to address both our enquiry towards both (i) *utpatti* or *kṛti* and (ii) *jñapti* or *vyakti* aspects of an art form.

The lecture is presided over by Prof. P.K. Mukhopadhyay who in his brief speech stated that Indian Aesthetics has been developed on the basis of analytic exposition of different forms of literary composition. We have a rich and uninterrupted tradition of poetry. He emphasised on the necessity of varieties of languages e.g. *kāvyaabhāṣā*, *ālankārika bhāṣā* etc. which should differ from the existing *loka bhāṣā*.

Prof. Rajaram Shukla, Prof. Revaprasad Dwivedi and Prof. Chandramauli Dwivedi gave illuminating comments over the lecture. The programme ended with vote of thanks by Prof. Bettina Bäumer.

The second session of this Special Lecture Series was held on 16th March, 2010 which comprised two speeches delivered by Prof. Bettina Bäumer chaired by Dr. R.N. Mishra and Dr. R.N. Mishra chaired by Prof. Bettina Bäumer.

Prof. Bettina Bäumer

Second day the session started with *maṅgalācharaṇa* rendered by Dr. Smt. Manju Sundaram. Prof. Bettina Bäumer gave a detailed speech on the "*Pervasive Theory of Indian Aesthetics with Special Reference to the Architectural Texts*". She started with two ways of approaching the subject (1) from the manifestations of Art or (2) from the Śāstras. In her opinion both are valid.

According to Prof. Bäumer (1) aesthetics is a European term and one has to be conscious of its historical implications and (2) in its narrow sense aesthetics seems to be more akin to the definition of Beauty. In course of her lecture she raised a basic question of the nature of matter in the philosophies underlying architectural aesthetics. With this context she quoted a verse attributed to **Yogavāsīṣṭha** and oft-quoted by Jayaratha, Kṣemarāja, etc. She analysed three vital terms used in the poem viz. (1) *vāṇas* the body (2) *ākāra* an embodied form and (3) third is *rūpa*.

In course of her lecture Prof. Bäumer discussed the interrelation between text and temple, or between theoretical and practical knowledge. She focussed on the holistic concept of the temple from **Agni Purāna Śilparatnakōśa** and especially **Vāstusūtra Upaniṣad**.

She explained that in the Architectural texts temple is considered as a living organism and different parts of it are compared to the limbs of human body. On the basis of a verse from **Śilparatnakōśa** and with the aid of a series of illustrations she explained temple architecture as *sarvadarśana lakṣaṇam* and *sākāratattvam*. In other texts also like **Agni Purāna** the holistic understanding of temple is contained in its identification with Vedic Puruṣa. The symbolic implications are multiple, just as the Puruṣa has manifold implications in the Indian tradition. Another holistic concept is the connection of temple with the cosmic elements and the complete scheme of the 36 *tattvas*. The temple in its super structure rising as *vimāna* or *śikhara* above the sanctum ascends through the different levels "from earth to Śiva". With a set of illustration she discussed five components of base compared to five elements (*pañcakarma*). As the world is conceived of five elements similarly temple is conceived out of *pañcakarma*.

In course of her lecture she told that beauty and auspiciousness are closely related to each other. With reference to Orissan temples she discussed two types of *śikhara* (peak); *meru* and *kailāsa*. She focussed on the temple construction which corresponds to the entire area of measurement and proportion (*tāla tālamāna, pramāṇa* etc.). This concerns both the technical as well as the aesthetic aspect. It is a harmonious, balanced proportion of the elements and components of the temple which lends it both the stability as well as beauty. The proportions in temple structure correspond to rhythmic structures (*tāla*) in music and dance, and to metre (*chandas*) in poetry. The term *chandas* is also found in the *śāstras* the metrical and rhythmic harmony related to proportions. She showed the example of Brahadiśvara temple in Tanjore to illustrate her points. Next she concentrated on *nyāsa* which in the context of architecture and image making is not simply a technical device but it is connected with the divinity to be represented in the building and in *mūrti*. In

this context she quoted form **Vāstusūtra Upaniṣad** - "*nyāsadhāraṇā śreṣṭhā*" and established that cosmic creation linked with the artistic creation. Here *nyāsa* means *rekḥānyāsa* the placement of lines on the panel. Next she highlighted the connection i.e. joineries of different parts of temple viz. *satyabindu*, *madhyabindu*, *khilapañjara* etc. She also dealt with the tools required in the building of different parts of temple.

Next she discussed varieties of *yantra* and *maṇḍala*-s viz. *yoginīyantra*, its importance in the *garbhagṛha*, *kāmakalāyantra* to be placed for the protection of wall. In this way she discussed *yantra*-s and the purpose of placing these *yantra*-s in different parts of temples. She also focussed on *rasa* underlying this structure and the embodiments of this *rasa* through various images.

In course of her lecture Madam Bäumer with the help of illustration discussed ground plan of Rājārāmī temple of Orissa and its correspondence with *śrīyantra*. She told that *śrīyantra* esoteric to *śrīvidyā* is an embodiment of Supreme Goddess (be it) Bhuvanesvarī, Tripurasundarī, Rājārājesvarī or Lalitā.

She also discussed varieties of temple viz. male and female and their distinction (on the basis of Śilparatnakośa). In her words whole temple construction is the elevation of *Śivaśakti*, *Śikhara* could be considered as *śrīcakra* the body of Śiva and western niche of the temple is described as unified form of *śiva-śakti*.

She concluded that no aesthetics in Indian Art can ignore the connection between elemental forms artistic creation, cosmic and sacrificial implications (Vedic or Tantric) and the mood of devotion and meditation produced, leading to divinization and liberation.

Prof. M.N.P. Tiwari and Prof. D.B. Pandey offered illuminating comments over the lecture. Chairperson Prof. R.N. Mishra gave some presidential remarks and delivered his own lecture.

Prof. R.N. Mishra

Next speaker of this session was Prof. R.N. Mishra who delivered a lecture on *Śilpa and Aesthetics with Special reference to Citrasūtra*. Prof. Mishra at the outset of his lecture tried to define aesthetics by showing derivation of the

term. The word aesthetics is derived from *aestheticos* or *aesthanomisi* the root *aesth* signifies perceiving. Etymologically therefore; aesthetics is explained as belonging to appreciation of beautiful and appreciation in accordance with the principles of good taste. After that he discussed a brief history of aesthetic movement in Europe. In course of his lecture Prof. Mishra opined that Indian experience in over all historical perspective, seems something different from ideological premises. What goes in the West under the name of aesthetics generally proposed in terms of Saundarya Śāstra, in Indian studies on Poetics and Dramaturgy.

Prof. Mishra continued that the canon of beauty and its essence and appreciation is embedded in Dramaturgy with a continued theorization of its principles across the board from Pre-Bharata times (probably 6th Cent. B.C.). The Nāṭya Śāstra integrates music, dance, drama, *abhinaya*, *puruṣārtha*, *alaṅkāra* gestures, movements, action (which are) relevant to the dramatic mode. It theorizes on representations where among other things *bhāva*, mental states of being with its myriad auxiliaries, their interrelation and their ultimate fruition into *rasa* through *anukīrtana*.

Prof. Mishra next focussed on the concept of *śilpa* and its implication Vedic Literature. He divided his lecture into three phases. In first two phases he discussed the process and scope of *śilpa* which together define its aesthetic bearings in representations; in the third part Prof. Mishra briefly dealt with the processes involved in image-making and the compositional structure of a work of *śilpa*. According to him these three parallel streams run concurrently in respect of representation and its appreciation in traditional Indian arts. These streams were composed respectively of *śilpa*, Poetics and Dramaturgy and spiritually. Of these *śilpa* strives to approximate the truth of reality and its experience by *lakṣya-lakṣaṇa* or *vyāṅgya-vyañjaka* relation; poetry and drama brings delight by *rasotpatti*, in *dhvani*, *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa*, style and by *anukarṇa bhāvānukīrtana*, *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* etc. among other ways; while spirituality consummates *dhyāna* meditation into realization of spiritual delight through *bhakti*.

In order to discuss the theoretical foundations of *śilpa* and aesthetic bearings Prof. Mishra gradually concentrated on the concepts of *anukaraṇa*, *lakṣaṇa*, *sādrśya*, *chāyā* and their interrelation on the basis of **Samarāṅgaṇa Sūtradhāra** and **Citrasūtra** of **Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa** and **Vāstusūtra Upaniṣad**.

Prof. Mishra concluded with the remark that poetic imagery and *śilpa* tradition here coalesce together in materializing a vision and in that they seem adhering to the interdependence of arts so often underscored in Śāstric views on it.

Prof. M.N.P. Tiwari and Prof. K.D. Tripathi offered some observations on this lecture. With this context Prof. Tripathi discussed on the purpose of art, relationship between sacred art and *sādhana*. In course of his short speech Prof. Tripathi discussed how *anukaraṇa* goes deeper in the concepts of *chāyā*, *ādarśa*, *pratirūpa*, *pratibimba* etc.; and finally becomes *bhāvānukīrtana*. Prof. B. Bäumer gave presidential remarks.

The session ended with vote of thanks rendered by Prof. K.D. Tripathi.

The Third session of the lecture series was held on 19th March where main speaker was Prof. Radhavallabh Tripathi and chairperson was Prof. Rajendra Mishra. The session started with a prayer to Gopālacūḍāmaṇi rendered by Dr. Urmila Sharma.

Prof. Radhavallabh Tripathi

Prof. Radhavallabh Tripathi delivered his speech on the "*Pervasive theory of Indian Aesthetics: The Theory of Alaṅkāra*". He divided his lecture into six parts viz. (1) *Alaṅkāra* - its fundamental philosophy (2) *Alaṅkāra* – as viewed in the tradition of *Alaṅkāra śāstra* (3) The classification of *Alaṅkāra*-s (4) *Alaṅkāra* as a paradigm for modern writings, (5) *Alaṅkāra* and Discourse Analysis and (6) *Alaṅkāra* – as a canon for plastic and fine arts.

In the first phase of his lecture Prof. Tripathi discussed the derivation of the term *alaṅkāra* and its synonyms and like *bhūṣaṇa*, *vāraṇa*, *paryāpti* and *śakti*. Actually these are different meanings of the word *alam* in which it occurs in various disciplines. Prof. Tripathi in course of his lecture discussed the

manifestation of *alaṃbhāva* or *alaṅkāra bhāva* in literature or a piece of art which encompasses three levels of human existence viz. *ādhibhautic* (physical/empirical), *ādhidāivika* (psychic) and *ādhyātmika* (individual/spiritual). He examined closely the root *kṛ* with *oram/alam* and its usages in Vedic *Samhitā*.

According to Prof. Tripathi theory of *alaṅkāra* alongside the concepts relating to its various categories developed right from the Vedic age. With this context he quoted Yāska's **Nirukta** and referred to Gargācārya who had not only defined Upamā but had also spelled out its five variations. Gārgya's definition has directly or indirectly influenced the whole tradition of *alaṅkāra śāstra*.

In the second part Prof. Tripathi discussed *alaṅkāra* as viewed in the tradition of Rhetorics. In this portion he gradually examined the views of exponents like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Udbhaṭa, Vāmana, Bhoja, Kuntaka, ʼnandavardhana etc.

In the third phase he classified the *alaṅkāras* and through a vivid chart presented before the audience. In this portion he remarked that *laya* (rhythm), *yati* (pause) and *gati* (movement) are *alaṅkāras* in literature. *Laya* percolated the deep structure of a literary piece. He discussed that novels of Rabindranath Tagore, Tolstoy and Boris Pasternak has a typical *laya* of its own. Bhoja in his **Śṛṅgāraprakāśa** discussed on six varieties of *gati alaṅkāra*.

In the fourth part with the example from Indian and Foreign literatures he discussed how *alaṅkāra* becomes a paradigm for modern writings also. According to him with the aid of *alaṅkāra śāstra* interpretation of world literature and world arts is possible.

In the fifth phase with example from the master pieces of classical Sanskrit Literature (like Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Śūdraka, Bāṇa and Bhavabhūti) he proved that more than any other paradigm *alaṅkāra* provides potent criterion for evaluating epic (*mahākāvya*), drama (*nāṭaka*) and novels (*gadyakāvya*) also. The above mentioned writers applied concept of *alaṅkāra* with a wide perspective structuring the world of their fancy at the three levels (*ādhibhautika*, *ādhidāivika* and *ādhyātmika*) and attain *alaṃbhāva*. This triple

process tends to make an artistic creation extraordinary and this extraordinary nature of art is *alaṅkāra*.

At last he discussed *alaṅkāra* as a canon for plastic art and fine arts like dance, music and *abhinaya* as well.

Prof. Revaprasad Dwivedi and Prof. Chandramauli Dwivedi gave illuminating comments over this lecture. This session was chaired over by Prof. Rajendra Mishra. The Programme ended with vote of thanks by Dr. Pranati Ghosal.

The fourth session of this Special Lecture Series was held on 22nd March, 2010 where main speaker was Prof. V. Kutumba Shastri and chairperson was Prof. P.K. Mukhopadhyay.

The session started with traditional chanting of Vedas rendered by the students of Paṭṭābhirāma Shastri Veda-Mīmāṃsā Anusandhāna Kendra, Hanumanghat, Varanasi.

Prof. V. Kutumba Shastri

Before main lecture Prof. K.D. Tripathi introduced the speaker and his topic. In doing so he explained the term as "Hermeneutics" as the study of methodological principles of interpretation of classical texts. After this short introduction Prof. V. Kutumba Shastri gave a detailed lecture on the "*Evolution of Indian Hermeneutics and Emergence of Tātparya Vṛtti*".

Prof. Shastri in his speech examined the theory of Indian hermeneutics and in course of his speech he explained how did *tātparya* vṛtti emerge for the verbal comprehension.

He started with Abhinavagupta who dealt with *tātparya* in a cursory manner only. Not only Abhinava but majority of the *ācāryas* only touched the importance of *tātparya*. Most probably they did it intentionally, because their purpose was to establish the theory of Suggestion (*vyañjanā*). Only *Dhvanīkāra*

and Bhoja dealt with the problem in a different way. They examined importance of *tātparya* for the verbal comprehension.

He continued that Abhinavagupta was accustomed to show the role of *tātparya vṛtti* by way of exploring *abhihitānvayavāda* and *anvitābhīdhānavāda*. Our rhetoricians tried to establish theory of Sentential meaning and *tātparya vṛtti* as a Mīmāṃsā theory.

Prof. Shastri in course of his lecture discussed four levels of extensional meaning viz. denotation (*abhidhā*), implication (*lakṣaṇā*), suggestion (*vyañjanā*) and intention (*tātparya*). For the verbal comprehension each of these meanings should be interrelated.

Prof. Shastri through his speech tried to establish *tātparya vṛtti* in a proper manner and in its appropriate place. He told that there are two meanings (1) sentential meaning (*vākyārtha*) and (2) intended meaning (*vivakṣitārtha*). With several examples he showed where intended meaning is some thing different from the intended meaning.

With the example of **Śrīmadbhagavad Gītā** he discussed that scholars of different school are confronting to interpret actual purport of Gītā whether it is *śaraṇāgati*, or *bhakti* or *karma* or *jñāna*.

With a quotation from **Tātparyacandrikā** he raised the question where is the purport of Veda? Whether it is in the rituals or in the understanding of the main text?

Later on he explained nature of *tātparya vṛtti* and its role to suggest sentential meaning. Some people explain *tātparya* as a potency or *śakti*. While others say it is *vṛtti* or function of meaning. He said Mīmāṃsakās define *tātparya* as *arthapratītiyanana योग्यत्वम् tātparya vṛttitvam*. He quoted opinion of modern scholars like Motilal who explained *tātparya* as a speech episode.

Prof. Shastri explained importance of *tātparya* in seven/eight layers. He continued to say that scholars raise question regarding nature of *tātparya*

whether it is a potency or function of *ṛtti* only? With this context he clarified the difference between *śakti* and *ṛtti*. He then explained actual measure of a *yajus*. From **Śābarabhāṣya** he explained "*yavatā padasamūhena ijjate tāvad ekaṃ yajuh / kiyatā ca ijjate? yāvatā kriyāyāḥ upakāra bhāvaḥ prakāśyate tāvad vaktavyatvāt vākyatvam*. He then discussed different opinions of scholars regarding definition of *tātparya*.

Parthasārathi Misra says: *tatparatvāt śabdānām śābdatvam, vākyaṛthe hi śabdānām tātparyam*. According to Naiyāyikas: *vaktur icchā hi tātparyam* where as Mīmāṃsakās define it as: *tādarthyā bodhajanana योग्यत्वम् tātparyamiti*. He explained logic/reasons of accepting *tātparya*. He concluded that for the verbal comprehension *tātparya* alone is sufficient, *vyāñjanā* is not required at all.

Prof. S. Vijay Kumar and Prof. Rajaram Shukla gave some comments over this lecture.

While delivering presidential address Prof. Mukhopadhyay raised several questions- e.g. (1) actual placement of *lakṣaṇa* whether it should be accepted in *pada* or in *vākya*, (2) why Mīmāṃsakās did not allow *lakṣaṇā* for verbal comprehension? (3) Even after *lakṣaṇā* being allowed, what discrepancy is there and *tātparya* becomes invariable?

At the end he clarified Naiyāyika standpoint that in daily usages there is no place for suggestion, hence Naiyāyikas did not accept it.

Prof. G.C. Tripathi

23rd March, 2010 was the fifth day of Special Lecture Series on Indian Aesthetics. The session started with *maṅgalācaraṇa* rendered by Dr. Smt. Svaravandana Sharma. Speaker of the day was Prof. G.C. Tripathi, and this lecture was chaired over by Prof. A.K. Kalia. After formal introduction Prof. G.C. Tripathi delivered his speech on "**Iconography and Iconology in Pāñcarātra ´ gamas with Special Reference to Hayaśīrṣa Pāñcarātra ´ gama**". In his lecture Prof. Tripathi discussed secret of Hayaśīrṣa image. He started with

general discussion on Hayaśīrṣa icon, prevalent in the Pāñcarātra school. After that he concentrated on the contents of **Hayaśīrṣa Pāñcarātra** consisted of four parts among which first part named Pratiṣṭhā kāṇḍa consisting forty two chapters deals with concepts of various images and their installation; second part the Saṃkaṣṣaṇa consists of thirty seven chapters; third one is Liṅga kāṇḍa having twenty chapters and fourth one is Saura-kāṇḍa including forty-five chapters.

Prof. Tripathi in course his lecture dealt with the date of Hayaśīrṣa Pāñcarātra which is roughly ascribed between 6th-8th century A.D and later than Barāhamihira's **Br̥hat Samhitā** and **Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa**, Prof. Tripathi told that Pāñcarātra was a vaiṣṇavite school, prevalent in Southern India and belonged to Viśiṣṭādvaita school but its texts were originated in Kashmir.

Next he discussed the logic of the name Pāñcarātra. Although on this issue many opinions are available but the most popular one is, it is related with a sacrifice for Supreme Puruṣa Nārāyaṇa to be completed within five nights. Prof. Tripathi also discusses five fold manifestations of Supreme Consciousness viz. (1) *para*, (2) *vyūha*, (3) *arcā* etc. Prof. Tripathi in course of his lecture has thrown some light on the Vaikhānasa system which is an older system than Pāñcarātra school. With reference to this context, he discussed the difference between Vaikhānasa and Pāñcarātra school; some of which are (1) Vaikhānasa school was comparatively orthodox and prevalent among Brahmins only, where as Pāñcarātra system was a liberal one and it allowed to initiate women and non-brahmin people also, (2) Vaikhānasa followers used Vedic *mantra*-s only in their rituals while Pāñcarātra followers used both the Vedic and *Laukika mantras*. Later on he discussed on iconographic features of Vāsudeva and other different images of this school. While delivering his lecture Prof. Tripathi also dealt with the size and measurement i.e., *tāla-mānavyavasthā* of the images of Pāñcarātra school.

Next to it he concentrated on the iconographic features and material of the deities (rather images) of discussed in Hayasīrṣa Pāñcarātra śramaṇa. These images could be fashioned out of earth (*mṛṇmayī*), metal (*dhātujā*), wood (*dārumayī*) stone (*aśmanmayī*) flowers (*kausumī*) and scented materials. He also pointed out various results of worshipping these images.

Prof. Tripathi then switched over to the various types of classification of Pāñcarātra images, which could be of two types (1) *rekḥāmayī* and (2) *mānasa pratimā*. Again, *arcā*-s may be of two types (1) movable (*cala-pratimā*) and (2) immovable (*acala-pratimā*).

The movable (*cala*) icons are comparatively small and they are displayed out side the temple and carried in the processions on different occasions. The immovable (*acala*) ones are big and situated in the sanctum of (*garbhagrha*) temple; they are worshipped daily. These *acala mūrti*-s are normally *śilāmayī* or wooden (*dārumayī*) also called *mūla bera*, *dhruva bera* etc.; where as *cala-mūrti*-s are named as *kautuka bera*, *tīrtha-bera*, *snāpana-bera* etc.

Next he focussed on the quality of *śilā* (stone) used in fashioning image; this *śilā* could be of various types (1) masculine (*pumśilā*), (2) feminine (*strīśilā*) and (3) neutral (*napuṃsaka*). The pedestal of a male god should be made of *strīśilā* and that of a female deity may be made of *pumśilā*. But *napuṃsaka śilā* should not be used in fashioning images to be worshipped. Equally use of *sargabhā śilā* (pregnant ones) is prohibited.

Then he concentrated on varieties of rituals which form part of fashioning image and also parts of worship of the deity. Among these rituals, one important item is *netronmīlana* (the process of opening eye). In course of fashioning images left eye of the deity should be opened with the silver needle and right eye should be opened with the gold needle.

Prof. Tripathi in course of his lecture also discussed the purpose of *mūrti pūjā*. The devotees of advanced intellect can meditate on Supreme God even without any *liṅga* or *mūrti*; but the general mass or *madhyama varga upāsaka*-s

are unable to concentrate without any locus, for their benefit *mūrtipūjā* becomes essential.

Dr. N.P. Joshi and Prof. M.N.P. Tiwari gave their observations over this lecture. Prof. A.K. Kalia in his presidential address discussed history of Hayagrīva maṭha and Pāñcarātra schools prevalent in Mysore. He also focussed on the feature of Hayagrīva image, worship of which is prevalent in South India. He focussed on the justification of relating *garuḍa* or *śyena* with Viṣṇu since Vedic period. The programme ended with vote of thanks rendered by Prof. K.D. Tripathi.

Prof. C. Raenran

The final session of this Special Lecture Series was held on 25th March, 2010. The programme started with *maṅgalācaraṇa* rendered by Dr. Smt. Manju Sundaram. After formal introduction Prof. C. Raenran, chief speaker of the day delivered his speech on *Pervasive Theory of Indian Aesthetics: Theory of Dhvani* which was chaired over by Prof. Shivji Upadhyay. Prof. C. Rajendran started his speech with the remark that theory of *dhvani* is a landmark in the history of Indian aesthetics and he hailed 'nandavardhana as the path maker of Alaṅkāra Śāstra.

In the beginning he raised a set of question as a prima-facie view, e.g. (1) Can *dhvani* theory be picked up as the really pervasive theory of Indian aesthetics? (2) What are the claims of it to be regarded as superior to other approaches like *Alaṅkāra*, *Guṇa* or *Rīti* systems? (3) Can it serve also as a key to the understanding of other art forms like music and painting?

Before answering these questions at first he determined what should be the definition of a key theory? In his view, a theory which can make sense of a vast literary discourse cutting a cross socio-cultural and linguistic barriers and which can serve as a key to unravel the value of literature has strong claims to be regarded as great. In case of literary theory, it must fulfill some norms of methodology for arriving at the conclusion and attestibility through its

engagement with actual literature. Now remains the question why *dhvani* theory should be considered as nucleus of Indian literary theory even in contemporary times. It's remarkable that Ānandavardhana himself was aware about such a question regarding universal relevance of his theory.

Prof. Rajendran in course of his lecture grouped the negationists of *dhvani* theory into three groups. While answering to these problems he told that *dhvani* (suggestion) is the essence, not only of Indian literary theory but it is applicable for explaining other art forms also. Then he mentioned Ānandavardhana's opinion that even in case of Epics like **Rāmāyaṇa** or **Mahābhārata**, the source of charm is the suggested sense comprising essence of *dhvani*. Next he dealt with some pivotal aspects *dhvani* theory.

In a nutshell, this *dhvani* theory can be described as springing from the firm conviction (1) that suggestion is superior to direct expression. The more a poem is evocative the more is its charm. (2) Again the suggested element in poetry is all pervasive and not confined to any particular part. It is likened to the charm of women which transcends all individual limbs, (3) The suggested sense is the hall-mark of poetic genius; the presence of the poetic genius is experienced by the reader encountering poetry with suggestive beauty. (4) The suggested sense itself is not homogenous; it can be an idea, a poetic figure or an aesthetic emotion.

On the basis of these points and with the help of some quotations he remarked that suggestive art makes poetry more charming than direct expression. Even the French poet and symbolists like Mallarmé, Valéry, etc. accepted importance of suggestion. They told that it is the suggestion which is basic principle of symbolism.

Prof. Rajendran also told, the suggestive art amazingly compresses and reveals several shades of meaning in a unique way at an instance the sheer richness of which is mind boggling.

In course of his lecture Prof. Rajendran pointed out three types of poetic textures called *Samghaṭanā*(1) *asamāsāḥ*, (2) *madhyasamāsāḥ* and (3) *dīrghasamāsāḥ* and illustrated these segments elaborately.

Next, he told that it is *rasadhvani*, which is decisive factor in determining the nature of poetic texture. Then on the basis of 'nandabardhana's theory Prof. Rajendran gave some criteria regarding suggestive potential of the composition as a whole; viz.

1. Selection of a plot whether well-known or created afresh, which is elegant due to the propriety of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāribhāvas*.
2. Rejection of the things which may be detrimental to *rasa* and fashioning new twists and turns to the original story, which is conducive to *rasa*.
3. Construction of *sandhi* and *sandhyaṅga*-s as per the requirement of *rasa*.
4. Intensification and mellowing the *rasa* throughout the work in accordance with the occasion.
5. Following the path of principal *rasa* throughout the work and
6. The selection of appropriate figures of speech.

Throughout his speech Prof. Rajendran propounded it is the *dhvani* theory which enthrones the principle of *rasa* as the very criterion for the comprehension and evaluation of literary work.

Now remains the last point how far this *dhvani* theory is applicable for the evaluation of other art forms like music, painting and performing arts.

It is unfortunate that the matter has not received appropriate attention. In spite of that it is true that, in the aspect of music, 'nandavardhana when demarcating suggestivity (*vyañjakatva*) from denotation (*vācakatva*) mentions that even musical notes denoting nothing in particular have the capacity to suggest *rasa*. "*avācakasyāpi gītaśabdādeḥ rasādi lakṣaṇārthāvagama darśanāt*".

According to Jagannātha Paṇḍita, *rāga* has the capacity to suggest *rasa* is recognised by all poeticians like *Dhvanikāra*, *rāgasyāpi rasavyaṅjakatayā dhvanikārādi sakalālaṅkārikasammatatvena*.

Even some of the texts mention innate relation ship between *rāga* and *rasa* and in dance form like Kathākali, there are accepted conventions relating *rāga*-s with *rasa*. Same is the case with painting and sculpture. Prof. Rejendran illustrated the point with examples given by G. Sivarāmamūrti in *Indian Paintings*.

Prof. Rajendran concluded that *dhvani* theory by assuming a fix text with fixed expressed meaning allows freedom for interpretation and thus gives both the poet and the reader their due in the scheme of things in the institution of letters.

Prof. Candramauli Dwivedi, Prof. P.M. Mukhopadhyay and Dr. Sanjay Singh offered illuminating comments over the lecture. Prof. Shivji Upadhyay while delivering presidential address remarked that the element which leads and heightens the texture beyond the limit of *vācakatva*, is the soul or essence of poetic composition - and in that sense *dhvani* and *rasa*, both being *anirvacanīya* deserve to be called essence of not only poetry but of other art forms also.

The programme ended with vote of thanks rendered by Pranati Ghosal.

Pranati Ghosal