

G-761

THE SAMSKRITA RANGA ANNUAL

V

1964-5, 1966-7

COMPLIMENTARY COPY

SANGEET NATAK AKADEMI NEW DELHI	
Acc. No.	G-761
Date	11/9/2004
Lang.	English / Tamil
Call No.	

5/—

THE SAMSKRITA RANGA

MADRAS

1967



संगीतनाटक
अकादेमी



संगीत नाटक अकादेमी ग्रंथालय

**Sangeet Natak Akademi
Library**

	Pages
Bhāsa's <i>Dulavakya</i> in Tamil— Dr. V. Raghavan and Dr. S. S. Janaki	1— 14
Mahendra Vikrama's <i>Bhagavadajjukiya</i> in Tamil— Dr. V. Raghavan and Dr. S. S. Janaki	15— 30
Uparūpakas and Nṛtyaprabandhas— Dr. V. Raghavan	31— 54
Two more old Farces—Dr. V. Raghavan	55— 68
The Winter's Tale and the Śākuntala—a Comparative Study—Prof. A. C. Subramanian	69— 76
Kūḍiyāttam—Its form and significance as Sanskrit Drama—Dr. V. Raghavan	77— 87
Indian Classical Concept of Total Theatre— Dr. V. Raghavan	88— 92
Kālidāsa, Sanskrit Drama and Indian Theatre— Dr. V. Raghavan	93— 98
Bhāsa—Dr. V. Raghavan	99—103
Book-Reviews —V. R.	104—109
New Sanskrit Plays—Ancient and Modern—V. R. ...	110—113
News and Notes	114—116
Appreciation of the Samskr̥ta Ranga's work	117—119
Annual Report and Audited Statement of Accounts of the Ranga, 1964-65	120—124

REPORT 1953-1958



SANGEET NATAK AKADEMI

4-A, Mathura Road, Jangpura
New Delhi-14

Sanskrit Drama—Nāṭya Śāstra : Noteworthy Articles in c Journals—*S. S. Janaki.* πῶ

New Sanskrit Plays : Notice—*V. R.*

Sanskrit Drama—Indian Theatre : New Publications : Notice
V. R.

Book-Review : Some Old Lost Rama-Plays— *T. L. Venkatarama Iyer.*

News and Notes.

Appreciations of the Ranga Productions.

IV : 1962-3, 1963-4

Rs. 3/-

Annual Reports and Audited Statements of Accounts of the Ranga, 1962-63, 1963-64.

The Vikramorvaśīya of Kalidāsa, a study of the poet's sources—
Dr. S. S. Janaki.

Harijīvanamiśra and his short Sanskrit plays—
Dr. George T. Artola, Honolulu.

The Sahridayānanda of Harijīvanamiśra—
Dr. V. Raghavan.

The Earliest Plays about India—
Dr. George T. Artola, Honolulu.

Researches on the Indian Theatre since 1890—
Prof. Louis Renou (English version)

Book-Reviews

News and Notes

Off-prints separately available :

Lakṣmī Svayamvara	...	50 np.
Āśadhya prathama-divase	...	50 np.
Mahāśvetā	...	50 np.
Punarunmeṣaḥ	...	50 np.
Rāsālilā	...	50 np.
Kāmaśuddhi	...	50 np.
A Bibliography of English Translations of Sanskrit Dramas	...	1 Re.
A Bibliography of Modern Sanskrit Plays	...	1 Re.
Research on Indian Theatre since 1890 — <i>Louis Renou</i>		2 Rs.
Dūtavākya and Bhagavadajjukīya in Tamil, each	...	1 Re.

THE SAMSKRITA RANGA,

17, Srikrishnapuram Street, Royapettah, Madras-14.

Bharati Vijayam Press, Triplicane, Madras-5.



CONTENTS OF
THE SAMSKRITA RANGA ANNUALS
I: 1958-59.

Annual Report of the Ranga's work, 1958-9

Lakṣmī Svayamvara (One-Act Prekṣaṇaka in Sanskrit)—

Dr. V. Raghavan.

Drama, Dance and Music in the works of Bāṇa and Harṣa—

C. S. Sundaram.

Kālidāsiyarupakesu apradhāna-striṭatrāṇi (Minor women-characters in Kālidāsa's dramas)—*S. S. Janaki.*

Production of Kālidāsa's plays in Ancient India—*Dr. V. Raghavan.*

The Hasya-cūḍāmaṇi of Vatsarāja—*V. S. Venkataraghavachari.*

Sanskrit Drama in Russia—*Dr. V. Raghavan.*

The First Annual Day Celebrations of the Samskrita Ranga
Sanskrit Drama in Italian: Review—*K. V. Sarma.*

II: 1959-60.

Rs. 3/-

Annual Report of the Ranga's work, 1959-60.

List of Members.

Kūḍiyāttam: The staging of Sanskrit Plays in the traditional
Kerala theatre—*Dr. K. Kunjunni Raja.*

Kālidāsa as a Dramatist—*Dr. V. Raghavan.*

Āśadhasya prathama-divase—*Dr. V. Raghavan.*

Mabāśveta—*Dr. V. Raghavan.*

Punarunmeṣaḥ—*Dr. V. Raghavan.*

A Bibliography of English Translations of Sanskrit Dramas—
Dr. V. Raghavan.

Sanskrit dramatic features on the A. I. R.—*C. S. Sundaram.*

Productions of the Samskrita Ranga, Madras.

Sanskrit Drama—News and Notes.

Sanskrit Drama and Dramaturgy—Notice of some new Publications.

III: 1960-62.

Rs. 3/-

IIIrd Annual Report 1960-61.

IVth Annual Report 1961-62.

A Bibliography of Modern Sanskrit Plays—*Dr. V. Raghavan* and
C. S. Sundaram.

A New Play of the 10th century—Āgamaḍambara of Jayanta
Bhaṭṭa—*Dr. V. Raghavan.*

Rāsālīlā, a musical playlet—*Dr. V. Raghavan.*

Kāmaśuddhi—an one-act play in Sanskrit—*Dr. V. Raghavan.*

காவலன்—மன்னவ, வெற்றி! தேவரீர் ஆணைப்படி அரசர் குழாம் முழுதும் கூடியிருக்கிறது.

தூய்யோ—நன்று. நீ போகலாம்.

காவலன்—உத்தரவு.

(காவலன் அவ்வாறே போகிருன்)

தூய்யோ—மதிப்பிற்குரிய வைகர்ணரே, வர்ஷதேவரே, பதினொரு அக்ஷௌஹிணி கொண்ட என் பெரும்படைக்கு யாரைத் தலைவராக நியமிக்கலாம் என்று நீங்கள் இருவரும் சொல்லுங்கள். என்ன, என்ன சொல்கிறீர்கள்?—“இது கடினமான பிரச்சனை. ஆலோசனை செய்துதான் தீர்மானிக்க வேண்டும்” என்று கூறுகிறீர்களா? அதுவும் சரிதான். வாருங்கள். ஆலோசனை மண்டபத்துக்குப் போகலாம். (நுழைகிறார்கள்). ஆசார்ய த்ரோணரே, வணக்கம், உள்ளே போங்கள்; பிதாமஹர் பீஷ்மரே, வணக்கம், உள்ளே போங்கள்; வைகர்ணரே, வர்ஷதேவரே, நுழையுங்கள். சூத்திரியர்களே! மண்டபத்துக்குள்ளே வாருங்கள். நண்ப, கர்ண, நாமும் உள்ளே போகலாம்.

(நுழைந்து)

த்ரோணரே, இதோ கூர்மாஸனம், அமருங்கள். பீஷ்மரே, இதோ சிம்ஹாசனம், அமருங்கள். சகுனிமாமா, இதோ தோலாசனம், உட்காருங்கள். வைகர்ண-வர்ஷதேவர்களே, உட்காருங்கள். அரசர்களே, எல்லோரும் அமருங்கள். என்ன என்ன? “உங்கள் அரசனான நான் ஏன் அமரவில்லை” என்று கேட்கிறீர்கள்? ஆகா, என்ன உங்களுடைய ராஜ-ஸேவையின் நெறி! இதோ நானும் உங்கள் விருப்பப்படி உட்காருகிறேன். கர்ண, நீயும் உட்கார்.

(ஆசனத்தில் அமர்ந்துகொண்டு)

வைகர்ணரே, வர்ஷதேவரே, பதினொரு அக்ஷௌஹிணி கொண்ட என் பெரும்படைக்கு யாரை சேனாதிபதியாக நியமிக்கலாம், சொல்லுங்கள். என்ன சொல்கிறீர்கள்—“இதோ, காந்தார அரசன் சகுனி கூறட்டும்” என்று? அப்படியே. மாமா, நீங்கள் தான் கூறுங்களேன். “பெருமை தாங்கிய கங்கா புத்ரனான பீஷ்மர் இருக்கும் பொழுது ஸேனாதிபதிப் பதவிக்கு யார் தகுதியாவார்” என்று? ஆம், ஆம். நிரம்ப சரி. பிதாமஹரே சேனாதிபதியாய் இருக்கட்டும். நாமும் இதைத்தான் விரும்புகிறோம்.

சண்ட மாருதத்தால் ஏற்பட்ட பெரும் மோதல்கள் நிரம்பின கடலின் ஒலியை யொத்த படைகளின் கோஷங்கள், தம்பட்டங்கள், சங்கங்கள் இவைகளுடைய முழக்கங்களுடன்

பாஸ மஹாகவியின்

தூதவாக்யம்

(நாந்திக்குப் பிறகு சூத்ரதாரன் பிரவேசிக்கிறான்)

சூத்ரதாரன்—உலகனைத்திற்கும் மகிழ்ச்சியைத் தரும் உபேந்திரனின் அடி, தன் சிறிய சிவந்த நகத்தினால் வானில் நழுசியென்ற அரக்கனை கிழித்து ஒழித்த அடி—உங்கள் எல்லோரையும் காக்கட்டும்.

இவ்வாறு பெரியோர் முன்னிலையில் அறிவிக்க விரும்புகிறேன். —ஆ! இது என்ன? நான் அறிவிக்க முற்படும்போது ஏதோ சப்தம் கேட்கிறதே! சரி, என்னவென்று பார்க்கிறேன்.

(திரைக்குப்பின்)

வாயிற்காவலாளர்களே! மஹாராஜா துர்யோதனன் கட்டளை-யிடுகிறார் :

சூத்ரதாரன்—ஓகோ, புரிந்துவிட்டது. கௌரவர்களுக்கும் பாண்டவர்-களுக்கும் பகை நேரிடவே துர்யோதனன் கட்டளைப்படி வேலையாள் மந்திராலோசனைச் சபை கூடுவதற்கு ஏற்பாடு-கள் செய்கிறான்.

(போகிறான்)

(அந்தப்புரக் காவலன் பிரவேசிக்கிறான்)

அந்தப்புர வேலையாள்—“வாயிற்காவலர்களே! இன்று எல்லா அரசர்-களுடன் கூடி மந்திராலோசனை செய்யப் போகிறேன். ஆகையால் எல்லா அரசர்களையும் வரவழைக்கவும்” என்று துர்யோதன மகாராஜா கட்டளையிட்டிருக்கிறார். (சுற்றிலும் பார்த்துவிட்டு) ஆ, அதோ—கரும் உடலில் வெண்ணுடை போர்த்தி சந்தனக்குழம்பு பூசி அணிமணிகளால் ஜ்வலிக்-கின்ற அங்கங்களுடன் உயர்ந்த குடை, சாமரங்களுடன் நட்சத்திரங்களின் நடுவில் பிரகாசிக்கின்ற பூர்ண சந்திரனைப் போல—அதோ, துர்யோதன மகாராஜா இவ்விடமே வருகிறாரே!

(மேலே கூறினபடி துர்யோதனன் பிரவேசிக்கிறான்)

துர்யோதனன்—பாண்டவர்களுடன் வந்திருக்கும் இப்போரை நினைத்-தவுடனேயே கோபத்தை விட்டு சந்தோஷம் என்னுள் பொங்குகிறது. பாண்டவர் படை யானைகளின் உலக்கை போன்ற தந்தங்களை பிடுங்கி, மூளியாய் செய்ய ஆசைப்-படுகிறேன்.

காங்கேயன் தலையில் அபிஷேக ஜலங்கள் விழுவதோடு, பகை அரசர்களின் இதயங்களும் சேர்ந்து விழட்டும்!

(உள்ளே வந்து)

காவலன்—அரசே! ஜயம் உண்டாகட்டும். பாண்டவர் கூடாரத்திலிருந்து புருஷோத்தமரான நாராயணன் தூதராக வந்திருக்கிறார்!

தூர்யோ—பாதராயண! கம்சனின் வேலைக்காரனான, கயிற்றால் கட்டுண்ட தாமோதரனான உனக்கு புருஷோத்தமன்? அந்த இடையான உனக்கு புருஷோத்தமன்? ஜயத்தானால் நாடு, கீர்த்தி, போகம் முதலியவற்றை இழந்தவனான புருஷோத்தமன்! ஆகா, அரசனை அண்டின உன் நடத்தை தான் என்ன! உன் பேச்சின் துடுக்குதான் என்ன! போ, ஒழிந்து போ!

காவலன்—மன்னிக்க வேண்டும், அரசே! குழப்பத்தினால் மரியாதையை மறந்துவிட்டேன். (தண்டமிடுகிறான்).

தூர்யோ—ஆ, குழப்பமா! ஆம், மனிதர்களுக்கு குழப்பம் ஏற்படத்தான் செய்கிறது. எழுந்திரு, எழுந்திரு.

காவலன்—தங்கள் சித்தம்.

தூர்யோ—இப்போது தெளிந்தது என் உள்ளம். வந்திருக்கும் இந்த தூதன், யார்?

காவலன்—கேசவன்.

தூர்யோ—கேசவன்—ஆம், அப்படிச் சொல்வது தான் முறை. அரசர்களே! தூதனாக வருகின்ற கேசவனுக்கு என்ன செய்வது தகும்? என்ன நீங்கள் சொல்கிறீர்கள்? 'தக்க மரியாதையுடன் உபசரிக்கவேண்டும்' என்று? எனக்கு அது பிடிக்கவில்லை. அவனைப் பிடித்துக் கட்டி விடுவது நல்லது என்று நினைக்கிறேன்.

வாசுதேவன் பிடிபட்டுவிட்டால் பாண்டவர்கள் கண்ணிழந்தவர்களைப் போல் ஆவார்கள். கதியும் மதியும் அற்றவர்களாக அவர்கள் தவிக்கும்பொழுது இவ்வுலகமனைத்தும் எனக்கு பகைவனில்லாமல் ஆகும்.

மேலும், இங்கு யாராகிலும் கேசவனுக்கு உபசாரம் செய்ய எண்ணி எழுந்தீர்களானால் அவர்கள் 'பன்னிரண்டு தங்க பாரங்களை அபராதமாக செலுத்தவேண்டும்' என்ற தண்டனைக்கு ஆளாவார்கள்; ஆகையால் ஜாக்கிரதையாக இருங்கள்! (தனக்குள்) நான் எனிடத்தைவிட்டு எழுந்திருக்காமல் இருப்பதற்கு என்ன வழி? ஆ, இதோ தெரிந்தது உபாயம்! (வெளிப்படையாய்) பாதராயண, திரௌபதியின்

கூந்தலையும், ஆடையையும் பற்றி இழுக்கும் காட்சி வரையப்பட்டிருக்கும் சித்திரத்தை எடுத்து வா. (தனக்குள்) அந்தப் படத்தைப் பார்த்துக் கொண்டு வீற்றிருப்பவனும் கேசவன் வரும்பொழுது எழுந்திருக்காமல் இருப்பேன்.

காவலன்—உத்திரவு, அரசே. (போய் திரும்பியும் வந்து) அரசே, ஜயம் உண்டாகுக. இதோ அந்த சித்திரப்படம்.

தூர்யோ—என் முன்னே அதை விரித்துக்காட்டு.

காவலன்—உத்திரவு, அரசே (அவ்வாறு காண்பிக்கிறான்)

(பிறகு போகிறான்)

தூர்யோ—ஆகா, எத்தனை அழகு இந்த சித்திரம் ! இதோ துச்சாசனன் திரௌபதியின் கூந்தலைப் பற்றுகிறான். துச்சாஸனனால் தொடப்பட்டு கலவரத்தால் விரிந்த கண்களையுடைய பாஞ்சாலி ராகுவாயில் விழுந்த சந்திரனைப்போல் காணப்படுகிறான்.

பல அரசர்களின் முன்னிலையில் திரௌபதிக்கு ஏற்பட்ட அவமானத்தைத் தாளாத பொல்லாத பீமன் சினம் பொங்க, சபையின் தூணை அசைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறான். இதோ யுதிஷ்டிரன், சத்தியம், தர்மம், தயை இவற்றிற்கு இருப்பிடமானவன், சூதாட்டத்தில் மதியிழந்தவன், தன் கணஜாடையால் பீமனின் சினத்தைத் தணிக்கிறான்.

இதோ, அர்ச்சுனன், சினத்தால் கண்கள் கலங்க, உதடு துடிக்க, பகைவரை அற்பமாக நினைத்து, எல்லா அரசர்களையும் உடனே கொல்ல எண்ணியவன் போல காண்டிவத்தை மெள்ள இழுக்கிறான். யுதிஷ்டிரர் அர்ச்சுனனை தடுக்கிறார்.

இதோ நகுல்-சகதேவர்கள் ! கோபத்தால் கடுமையான முகத்துடன் பற்களை நறநற வென்று கடித்து, இழுத்துக்கட்டிக்கொண்டு, வானையும் கேடயத்தையும் ஏந்தி சாவிற்கும் அஞ்சாதவர்களாக சிங்கத்தை எதிர்க்கும் வலிவுள்ள மான் குட்டிகளைப்போல என் சகோதரன் துச்சாசனனை எதிர்த்துச் செல்கிறார்கள்.

இவர்களிருவரையும் நெருங்கி தர்மபுத்ரன், “சோதரர்களே, நான் தான் அதமன், மதி தவறியவன் ; நீதி-அநீதி தெரிந்த நீங்கள் கோபத்தை விடவேண்டும். சூதினால் ஏற்பட்ட அவமானத்தைப் பொறுக்காமல் காட்டும் வீரத்தை மனவுறுதி படைத்த மேலோர் குறை சொல்லுவார்”, என்று கூறி தடுக்கிறான்.

இந்தப் பக்கம் காந்தார அரசன் சகுனி—கைதேர்ந்த சூதாடி, தந்திரி, பகடையை எறிந்து விட்டு, கர்வத்துடன் சிரிக்கிறான்.

தன் கீர்த்தியால் பகைவரின் இன்பத்தை ஒழித்து, கடைக்-
கண்ணால் கண்ணீர்விடும் த்ருபத ராஜகுமாரியைப் பார்த்துக்-
கொண்டும், தரையில் கால் விரலால் கோட்டை வரைந்து
கொண்டும், அலக்ஷியமாய் அமர்ந்திருக்கிறான்.

இதோ! ஆசார்ய துரோணரும் பிதாமஹர் பீஷ்மரும்
த்ரௌபதியைப் பார்த்து வெட்கத்தால் தங்கள் முகங்களை
ஆடையினால் மூடிக் கொள்கிறார்கள்! ஆகா! சித்ரத்தில்
என்ன உணர்ச்சிப் பொலிவு! என்ன பொருத்தமாய் வரை-
யப்பட்டிருக்கிறது! வெகு தெளிவாய் வரையப்பட்ட ஓவியம்!
மகிழ்ச்சியடைகிறேன். யாரங்கே?

காவலன்—அரசே, வெற்றி உண்டாகட்டும்.

துர்யோ—பறவையை வாகனமாகக் கொண்டு பெருமிதம் கொள்ளும்
அந்த தூதனை அழைத்துவா.

காவலன்—தங்கள் கட்டளைப்படி (வெளியே செல்கிறான்).

துர்யோ—நண்ப! கர்ண!

கருப்பு உள்ளம்கொண்ட கருப்பன், கிருஷ்ணன், பாண்டவர்-
களின் சொல்லின் மேல் ஒரு வேலையாள் போல வந்திருக்-
கிறான். பெண்ணுடையது போல மென்மையான தர்ம-
புத்ரனின் சொற்களைக் கேட்க, கர்ண! உன் கர்ணங்-
களைத் தயார் செய்துகொள்!

(கிருஷ்ணரும் காவலனும் பிரவேசிக்கிறார்கள்)

கிரு—தர்மபுத்ரனின் வார்த்தைக்காகவும் அர்ச்சுனனுடைய நிஜமான
நட்புக்காகவும் போர் இறுமாப்பு கொண்டு சொன்னதைக்-
கேட்காத துரியோதனனிடம் தூதனாக வரும் ஒவ்வாத
பொறுப்பை இன்று நான் ஏற்றுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறேன்.
மேலும்.

பகைவரின் யானைகளின் மத்தகங்களை தகர்த்தெறியும்
கொடும் கதையையுடைய பீமனுக்கு, திரௌபதிக்கு ஏற்பட்ட
அவமானத்தால் உண்டான கோபத்தீயினலும் அர்ச்சுன-
னின் அம்புகளான புயற்காற்றிலும் குருவம்சமான காடு,
சண்டையில் திண்ணமாய் அழியப் போகிறது.

இதோ, துர்யோதனின் கூடாரம். அரசர்களுக்காக இஷ்டப்-
படி கட்டப்பட்ட இருப்பிடங்கள் தேவலோகத்து மாளிகை-
களுக்கு ஒப்பாகவே இருக்கின்றன. பலவிதமான ஆயுதங்-
கள் நிரம்பியிருக்கும் ஆயுதசாலைகள். கணக்கற்ற குதிரைகள்
லாயங்களில் களைக்கின்றன. யானைகள் பிளிறுகின்றன.
அந்தோ! இச்செழுமைக்கெல்லாம் ஒரு நொடியில் சுற்றத்-
திறருக்குச் செய்த அவமானத்தால் அழிவு கிட்டி நிற்கிறது.
தப்பாய் பேசுவன், நற்குணங்களுக்கு விரோதி, போக்கிரி,

உறவினர்களிடம் தயையற்றவன், இந்த துர்யோதனன் என்னைக் கண்டதும் என்ன நியாயமாகச் செய்ய வேண்டுமோ, அதைச் செய்யமாட்டான். இது திண்ணம். பாதராயண! உள்ளே போகலாமா?

காவலன்—ஆம், ஆம், பத்மநாபர் பிரவேசிக்கலாம்.

கிரு—(உள்ளே நுழைந்து) என்ன! என்னைக் கண்டவுடன் இவ்வரசர்கள் எல்லாம் பரபரப்பு அடைகிறார்களே! குழப்பம் வேண்டாம். சுகமாக ஆசனத்தில் அமருங்கள்.

துர்யோ—என்ன, என்ன! கேசவனைக் கண்டவுடன் அரசர்கள் ஏன் பரபரப்பு அடைகிறார்கள்? போதும், போதும், உங்கள் குழப்பம். முன்பே நான் அறிவித்த தண்டனை ஞாபகமிருக்கட்டும், ஜாக்கிரதை! இங்கு ஆணையிடுபவன் நான் இருக்கிறேன்!

கிரு—(அருகில் வந்து) துர்யோதன, என்ன உட்கார்ந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறாய்?

துர்யோ—(ஆசனத்திலிருந்து கீழே விழுகிறான். தனக்குள் சொல்கிறான்) ஆம், நிச்சயம் கேசவன் வந்திருக்கிறான்! முயற்சித்து ‘எழுந்திருக்கவேண்டாம்’ என்று தீர்மானித்து, உறுதியாய் ஆசனத்தில் அமர்ந்திருந்தும், நான் கேசவனின் சக்தியால் கீழே விழுந்துவிட்டேன். பல மாயைகள் கொண்டவன் இந்த தூதன்! (வெளிப்படையாக) தூத, இது உன் ஆசனம். இதில் உட்கார்.

கிரு—ஆசார்ய துரோணரே, பீஷ்மர் முதலிய அரசர்களே! நீங்கள் யாவரும் அவரவர் ஆசனத்தில் சுகமாய் அமருங்கள். நாமும் உட்காருகிறோம். (உட்கார்ந்து கொண்டு) ஆகா, என்ன அழகான சித்ரம்! (உற்றுப் பார்த்துவிட்டு) வேண்டாம், வேண்டாம். திரௌபதியின் கூந்தலையும் ஆடையையும் இழுப்பதல்லவா இப்படத்தில் வரைந்திருக்கிறது! என்ன விந்தை! துர்யோதனன் தன் மடமையினால் உற்றரின் அவமானத்தை பராக்ரமச்செயல் என்று கருதுகிறானே! எவன் தன் தவறைப் பொது மன்றங்களில் வெட்கம் இல்லாமல் வெளிப்படுத்துவான்? ஹும், இப்படத்தை அப்புறப் படுத்துங்கள்!

துர்யோ—பாதராயண, படத்தை எடுத்துப்போ!

காவலன்—அரசர் உத்திரவு. (எடுத்துச்செல்கிறான்).

துர்யோ—தூத, யமதர்மராஜனின் புத்ரன் யுதிஷ்டிரன், வாயுபுத்ரன் பீமன், இந்த்ரபுத்ரன் அர்ச்சுனன், நன்னடத்தையுள்ள அசுவினி குமாரர்களான இரட்டையர் நகுல-சகதேவர்

இந்த என் சகோதரர், மற்றும் அவர்களை அண்டினவர்கள், எல்லோரும் செளக்யம் தானே ?

கிரு—காந்தாரி புத்ராணை நீ இப்படிக்கேட்டது மிகவும் பொருந்தியதே. எல்லோரும் செளக்கியம். அவ்வாறே பாண்டவர்களும் உன்னுடையதும் உன் நாட்டில், அகத்திலும் புறத்திலும் உள்ள நலத்தையெல்லாம் விசாரித்துவிட்டு தெரிவிக்கிறார்கள் :

“ எல்லையற்ற துன்பத்தை அனுபவித்தோம். குறிப்பிட்ட தவணையும் முடிந்தது. ஆகையால் எங்களுக்கு உரியதான பங்கு எங்களுக்கு பாகம்செய்து அளிக்கப்படவேண்டும் ” என்று.

தூர்யோ—என்ன, என்ன ! உரிமைப்பங்கா ! ஒகோ ! காட்டில் வேட்டையாடும்பொழுது ஏற்பட்ட தவறினால் முனி சாபத்தைப் பெற்றார் என் சிறிய தந்தை. அன்றிலிருந்து இல்லற வாழ்க்கையை அறவே ஒழித்தார். பிறருடைய புத்திரர்களான பாண்டவர்களுக்கு அவர் எவ்வாறு தகப்பனார் ஆக முடியும் ?

கிரு—உன் குலத்தின் பழங்கதையை நன்குணர்ந்த உன்னை கேட்கிறேன்—சிற்றின்ப பிரியானு விசித்திரவீரன் கடியரோகத்துக்கு ஆளாகி சந்ததியில்லாமலிறந்தான். வியாசருக்கும் அம்பிகைக்கும் பிறந்த திருதராஷ்டிரானு உன் தந்தை ராஜ்யத்தை எவ்வாறு அடைந்தான் ? வேண்டாம், வேண்டாம். தூர்யோதன, இவ்வாறு ஒருவருக்கொருவர் பகையை வளர்ப்பதால் உன் குருவம்சம் பெயரளவில் இருப்பதாய் ஆகிவிடும். ஆகையால் ரோஷத்தை மறந்து, பாண்டவர்கள் நயமாகச் சொல்வதைச் செய்வாயாக.

தூர்யோ—தூத ! உனக்கு அரசியலே தெரியவில்லை. பகைவர்களை வென்று, உள்ளம் படைத்த அரசிளங்குமாரர்களால் ஆளப்படுகிறது நாடு. இவ்வுலகில் அந்நாடு யாசிக்கப்படுவதில்லை, எளியவனுக்கு தானமாக வழங்கப்படுவதுமில்லை. பாண்டவர்கள் அரசராக வேண்டுமானால் விரைவில் சாகசப் போர் புரியட்டும் ! இல்லை, சாந்தியை நாடினால் முனிவர் வசிக்கும் ஆசிரமத்துக்கு தாராளமாய் செல்லட்டும்.

கிரு—தூர்யோதன, உறவினரைக் குறித்து கடுமையாய் பேசுவது போதும் ! பூர்வ ஜன்ம புண்ணியத்தால் ராஜ்யலக்ஷ்மியைப் பெற்ற ஒருவன் உற்றாரையும் நண்பர்களையும் வஞ்சிப்பானுகில் அவன் வீண் ப்ரயாசப்பட்டவனுவான்.

தூர்யோ—தூதுவனே, உன் மாமன் கம்சனிடம் நீ அணுவளவும்தையை காட்டவில்லை. எப்பொழுதும் எங்களுக்கு கெடுதலையே விளைவித்து வந்த பாண்டவரிடம் நான் ஏன் கருணை காட்டவேண்டும் ?

கிரு—கம்சன் மடிந்தது என் குற்றமென்று எண்ணவேண்டாம். பல தடவைகள் குழந்தைகளைக் கொன்று என் தாய்க்கு பிள்ளைப்பிரிவை ஏற்படுத்தி, தன் வயது முதிர்ந்த தந்தையை சிறைபடுத்திய கம்சன் தானாகவே ம்ருத்யுவால் கொல்லப் பட்டான்.

துர்யோ—நீ என்ன கூறினாலும் கம்சன் உன்னை வஞ்சிக்கப்பட்டவனே. உன் தற்பெருமை போதும். இது உன் வீரச்செயல் அன்று. இதோ பார்—தன் மருமகன் கம்சன் இறந்தது! கேட்டு கோபத்தால் துடித்த மகத நாட்டரசனான ஜராசந்தனைப் பார்த்தவுடன் பயத்தால் நடுங்கி ஓடியே—ஆகா, உன் வீரம் அப்போது எங்கே போயிற்று?

கிரு—சுயோதன! நீதியின் நெளிவு தெரிந்தவருக்கு வீரம் காட்டுவதென்பது தேசத்தையும் காலத்தையும் ஒட்டி இருக்கும். போதும், என்னைப் பற்றின இகழ்ச்சி. உன் காரியத்தை சரிவர செய். உன் சகோதரர்களிடம் அன்பு காட்டு. அவர்களின் குற்றங்களை மற. உற்றரின் சேர்க்கை இம்மைக்கும், மறுமைக்கும் நன்மை பயக்கும்.

துர்யோ—தேவப் புதல்வர்களான பாண்டவர்களுக்கும் மானிடனான எனக்கும் எந்தமுறையில் உறவு ஏற்படக்கூடும்? சொன்னதையே சொல்லிக் கொண்டு இருப்பது போதும்! நிறுத்து இத்துடன் இக்கதையை.

கிரு—(தனக்குள்) தணிந்து பேசினால் இவன் தன் இயற்கையை விடமாட்டான். ஆம், கடுஞ்சொற்களை விடுத்து இவனைக் கலக்குகிறேன். (வெளிப்படையாக) துர்யோதன, அர்ச்சுனனின் வலிமை, ஆற்றல் உனக்குத் தெரியாதா, என்ன?

துர்யோ—தெரியாதே.

கிரு—அப்படியா? கேள். வேடன் உருவத்தில் வந்த பசுபதியை போர் செய்து த்ருப்தி செய்வித்தவன்; காண்டவ வனத்தை விழங்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கும் அக்னி பகவானுக்காக பெருமழையைத் தன் அம்புகளால் தடுத்தவன்; இந்திரனைத் துன்புறுத்திக் கொண்டிருந்த நிவாதகவசர் எனும் அரக்கர்களை விளையாட்டாக ஒழித்தவன்; விராட நகரத்தில் பீஷ்மர் முதலிய பெரியோர்களைத் தான் ஒருவனாயிருந்து வென்றவன். துர்யோதன! உன்கண் முன்னால் நடந்த ஒரு சம்பவத்தையும் சொல்கிறேன். கோஷ்யாத்திரையில் சித்திரசேனனால் கட்டி இழுத்து மேல் உலகத்துக்கு கொண்டு போகப்பட்ட நீ உதவிக்காகக் கதறின பொழுது அந்த அர்ச்சுனனால் தானே விடுவிக்கப்பட்டாய்? ஏன் வார்த்தையை வளர்த்தல் வேண்டும்? என் சொல்படி நீ இந்நாட்டின் பாதியை பாண்டவர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கவேண்டும். இல்லையெல் கடல் குழந்த



A scene from Svasru-vijaya



Participants in Svasru-vijaya production of the Samskrita Ranga
with chief guest Sri V. Nagayya

இப்பரந்த பூமியை பாண்டவர் பலாத்காரமாக எடுத்துக் கொள்வார்கள்.

தூர்யோ—என்ன, என்ன, பலாத்காரமாக பாண்டவர் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளுவார்களா? பீமன் உருவத்தில் போரில் வாயு பகவானே அடிக்கட்டும். அர்ச்சுனன் உருவத்தில் சாட்சாத் இந்திரனே போர் புரியட்டும். கொடுஞ்சொல் மன்னவ! நீ கூறினதற்காக என் தகப்பனார் ஆண்டதும் என் வலிமையினால் காப்பாற்றப்பட்டதுமான என் நாட்டிலிருந்து புல்லைக் கூடக் கொடுக்கமாட்டேன்.

கிரு—கௌரவ குலத்திற்கு வந்த களங்கமே! அபகீர்த்தியை வேண்டித் தேடுபவனே! உனக்கிடையே புல்லைப் போட்டுப் பேச வேண்டியவன் நீ!

தூர்யோ—இடையா, கோபால! நீ தான் புல்லைப் போட்டு பேச வேண்டியவன்!

கொல்லத் தகாதவளான பெண், குதிரை, எருது, மல்லர்கள் முதலானவர்களைக் கொன்று விட்டு வெட்கமில்லாத நீ நல்லோருடன் பேசவும் ஆசைப்படுகிறாய்!

கிரு—தூர்யோதன, என்னை இகழ்கிறாயல்லவா!

தூர்யோ—நான் கூறுவது எல்லாம் உண்மை தானே.

கிரு—சரி, நான் போகிறேன்.

தூர்யோ—போ, போ. பசுக்களின் குளம்பு தூசி ஏறின உடம்புடன் மாட்டுத் தொழுவத்துக்கே போ! என் பொழுது வீணாகி விட்டது உன்னால்.

கிரு—அப்படியே இருக்கட்டும். நாம் சொல்ல வந்த செய்தியைத் தெரிவிக்காமல் திரும்பிப்போக எமக்கு விருப்பமில்லை. ஆகையால் தர்மபுத்திரனின் செய்தியைக் கேள்.

தூர்யோ—நீ என்னுடன் பேசத் தகுதியற்றவன்! வெண்குடை பிடிக்கப்பட்டவன் நான்! சிறந்த அந்தணர்களால் புண்ணிய ஜலத்தால் முடியபிஷேகம் செய்யப்பட்டவன் நான்! என் முன் வணங்கி, பின்வரும் அரசர்களுடன் கூடப்பேசவேன்; உன்னைப் போன்றவருடன் பேசமாட்டேன்.

கிரு—ஓகோ, இந்த தூர்யோதனன் என்னுடன் பேசமாட்டானாம்! துஷ்ட! உற்றவரிடம் பற்றற்றவனே! சபல! பார்வை கெட்டவனே! குரங்கே! உன்னால் குருவம்சமே சீக்கிரம் அழியப்போகிறது. அரசர்களே! நாம் போகிறோம்.

தூர்யோ—என்ன, கேசவன் போகிறானே? துச்சாசன, துர்மர்ஷண, துர்முக, துர்புத்தி, துஷ்டேசவர! கேசவன் தூதன் இருக்க-

வேண்டிய நிலையினின்றும் தவறிவிட்டான். அவனை பிடியுங்கள், கட்டுங்கள்! என்ன, உங்களால் முடியவில்லையா? துச்சாசன, உனக்கும் முடியவில்லையா? யானை, குதிரை, கம்சன் முதலானவர்களைக் கொன்ற இக்கேசவன் இடையர்களுக்கிடையே வாழ்ந்ததால் ஒரு பணியாற்றுவவனின் தொழிலைத் தெரிந்துகொள்ளவில்லை. தோள்வலியை இழக்கச் செய்து, இவன் அரசர்கள் முன்னிலையில் அலட்சியமாய்ப் பேசிய குற்றத்திற்காக சீக்கிரமே கட்டப்பட்டும். என்ன, துச்சாசனுக்கு முடியவில்லை! சகுனிமாமா! நீதான் கேசவனைப் பிடி! ஆ, அது என்ன! சகுனி எதிர் நிற்கமுடியாமல் கீழே விழுகிறானே! இருக்கட்டும்! நானே கயிற்றால் கட்டுகிறேன். (கயிறை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு நெருங்குகிறான்).

கிரு—ஆ! என்னைக் கட்டவா துர்யோதனன் விரும்புகிறான்? பார்க்கலாம் அவன் சாமர்த்தியத்தை! (என்று விசுவரூபம் எடுக்கிறார்).

துர்யோ—தூத! நாற்புறமும் உன் தேவ மாயைகளை விடுத்தாலும் சரி, எதிர்க்க முடியாத தெய்விக ஆயுதங்களால் அடித்தாலும் சரி. யானை, குதிரை, எருது முதலியவற்றையே கொன்று கர்வம் கொண்ட உன்னை, இளவரசர்களின் முன்னிலையில் கட்டுகிறேன். ஆ! நில்லங்கே! என்ன, கேசவனைக் காணவில்லையே? இதோ கேசவன்! எத்தனை சிறியவனாக இருக்கிறான்? அப்படியே நில்! ஐயோ, மறுபடியும் காணவில்லையே! அதோ, அதோ கேசவன்! ஆ, எத்தனை பெரிய உருவம்! இது என்ன, மறுபடியும் மறைந்து விட்டானே! ஓ, இதோ இருக்கிறானே! என்ன, ஆலோசனை மண்டபத்தில் எங்கும் கேசவர்களாய் இருக்கிறார்களே! என்ன செய்வேன்? (யோசித்து) ஆம், இதுதான் வழி. அரசர்களே, நீங்கள் ஒவ்வொருவரும் ஒவ்வொரு கேசவனைக் கட்டுங்கள். ஹா! இது என்ன, அரசர்களே கட்டப்பட்டு கீழே விழுகிறார்களே! மாயக்கள்ளனே! நல்லது! நல்லது! பாண்டவர்கள் பெருமூச்செறிந்து கண்ணீர் மறைத்த கண்களால் என் வில்லினின்றும் வெளிவந்த சரமாரியால் ஏற்பட்ட ரத்த காயங்களால் சிவந்த உடலோடு தம் கூடாரத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்ட உன்னைப் பார்க்கட்டும்! (வெளியே போகிறான்).

கிரு—அப்படியா? பாண்டவர்கள் செய்ய இருப்பதை நானே செய்கிறேன். சுதர்சனமே! இங்கே வா!

(சுதர்சன சக்ரம் தேவ உருவமெடுத்து வருகிறது)

சுதர்சனம்—இதோ! நான் பகவானின் வார்த்தையைக் கேட்டவுடன் அவர் அருளால் மேகக்கூட்டத்தை இருபுறமும் பிளந்து தள்ளிக்கொண்டு ஓடோடியும் வருகிறேன். கமலக்கண்ணனுக்கு

யார்மேல் கோபம்? யார் தலையின்மேல் நான் பாய-
வேண்டும்? எங்கே பகவான் நாராயணன்?

அனாதியானவன், எண்ணவொண்ணாதவன், இவ்வுலகத்தை-
யெல்லாம் காத்து வருவதில் ஈடுபட்டவன், பல உருவங்களில்
இருக்கும் ஒருவன், எல்லா ஐசுவர்யங்களும் படைத்தவன்,
பகைவரின் வலிமையை அழிப்பவன், எங்கே?

(சுற்றிலும் பார்த்துவிட்டு) ஆ, அதோ ஹஸ்தினாபுரவாயிலில்
தூதத்தொழில் பூண்டு நிற்கிறான்! எங்கே ஆசமனத்திற்கு
தண்ணீர்? தேவி, ஆகாச கங்கையே! அருள் புரிவாயாக!
ஆ, இதோ தண்ணீர் விழுகிறது. (ஆசமனம் செய்துவிட்டு
கிட்ட நெருங்கி) பகவான் நாராயண, வெற்றி!

(பகவானை வணங்குகிறான்)

கிரு—சுதர்சன! எதிர்க்க முடியாத ஆற்றல் பெற்று விளங்குவாயாக!
சு—தங்கள் அருள்.

கிரு—நல்ல வேளையாய் காரியம் ஆகவேண்டிய தருணத்தில் வந்து
சேர்ந்தாய்.

சு—காரியமாகவேண்டிய தருணமா! தாங்கள் கட்டளையிடுங்கள்,
சுவாமி! மேரு, மந்திர மலைகளை புரட்டிவிட்டுமா? கடல்
முழுவதையும் கலக்கட்டுமா? நக்சத்ர மண்டலத்தை கீழே
தள்ளவேண்டுமா? தங்கள் அருளால் என்னால் முடியாதது
ஒன்றுமே இல்லை!

கிரு—சுதர்சன! இங்கே வா!

ஹே துர்யோதன! சபலமதியோனே! நீ கடல் நீரிலோ,
மலைக்குகைகளிலோ, கிரஹங்கள் சுழலும் வான வழியிலோ
போனாலும், என் கையின் வீரயத்தினால் வேகமாகச் சுழலும்
இச்சக்ரம் உனது காலசக்ரமாக ஆகட்டும்!

சு—துஷ்டனே, துர்யோதன, நில் நில்! (மறுபடியும் யோசித்து)
பகவன், நாராயண, கருணை காட்டுங்கள். உலகின் பாரத்-
தைக் குறைப்பதற்கல்லவோ தேவரீர் இங்கு அவதரித்தது.
துர்யோதனனுக்கு இப்போதே இக்கதி நேரிட்டால் நாரா-
யண! நின் அவதாரத்தின் பயன் வீணாகி விடுமே!

கிரு—சுதர்சன! கோபத்தால், நடக்கவேண்டிய முறையை நான்
கவனிக்கவில்லை. நீ உன் இருப்பிடத்திற்கே செல்.

சு—தங்கள் கட்டளைப்படியே. (சபையில் அரசர்களை நோக்கி) என்ன
என்ன, இடையன் என்ற குறிப்பிட்டார்கள்! மூன்று அடி-
களால் மூவுலகையும் அளந்த ஆண்டவன் நாராயணன்
அல்லவா அவர்! அவரை சரணம் அடையுங்கள்,

நான் போகிறேன். ஆ! இது யார்! பகவானின் சிறந்த ஆயுதமான வில் சார்ங்கம் அல்லவா வருகிறது? ஹரியின் கையால் இடையே பிடிக்கப்பட்டு பகைக் கூட்டத்தினரின் காலனாகி, பெண்மகளே போன்று மெல்லியதாய், மென்மையுடையதாய், அழகியதாய், மேலே தங்கப்பூட்டுபோடப்பட்ட இச்சார்ங்கம் க்ருஷ்ணன் அருகில் புதிய மேகக்கூட்டங்களுக்கருகில் இருக்கும் மின்னல் கொடிபோல அல்லவா அழகுற விளங்குகிறது. ஹே சார்ங்கமே! நாராயணனின் கோபம் தணிந்து விட்டது. நீ உன்னிருப்பிடத்திற்குச் செல்வலாம். அதோ, போய் விட்டதே! சரி நானும் செல்கிறேன்.

இது என்ன, கதை கௌமோதகியல்லவா வருகிறது? ரத்னம், தங்கம் முதலியவற்றால் விசித்ரமாய் ஒளி விடுவதும், பலவர்ணங்கள் உள்ள மாலைகளால் மூடியதும், அரக்கர்களை அழிப்பதில் ஆசை உள்ளதும், பாறையைப் போன்றதும், எதிர்க்க முடியாத கடும் வீரியம் பொருந்தியதுமான கௌமோதகி மேகக் கூட்டங்களால் தொடரப்பட்டு ஆகாயத்தில் வேகமாக செல்லுகிறது. ஹே கௌமோதகி! பகவானின் சினம் அடங்கி விட்டது. அதோ, கௌமோதகி சென்று விட்டது. நானும் போகிறேன்.

என்ன, அதோ சங்கு பாஞ்சஜன்யம் அல்லவா வருகிறது! பூர்ண சந்திரன், மல்லி, ஆம்பலின் உட்புறம், முத்து ஆரம் முதலியவற்றிற்கு ஒப்பாக வெண்மையானதும், நாராயணனின் தாமரை முகத்தின் அருளைப் பெற்றதுமான பாஞ்சஜன்யம்! இதன் கடலின் பேரொலிக்கு நிகரான ஒலியைக்கேட்ட மாத்திரத்தில் அசுரமகளிரின் கர்ப்பங்கள் நழுவி விடுகின்றன. பாஞ்சஜன்யமே! நாதனின் சினம் தணிந்து விட்டது. நீ உன் இருப்பிடத்திற்குச் செல்.

ஆஹா! வாள் நந்தகம் வருகிறதே! அதோ, பெண் உருவத்திலிருப்பினும் போரில் வீர்யம் பொருந்திய அரக்கர்களுக்கு அச்சத்தை உண்டாக்கும் நந்தகம், ஆகாயத்தில் எரி நட்சத்திரம் போலச் செல்லுகிறது. நந்தக! வாசுதேவனின் கோபம் தணிந்து விட்டது. நீ உன்னிடத்திற்குச் செல். நானும் செல்கிறேன்.

ஆ! இவை பகவானின் சிறப்புற்ற ஆயுதங்கள். அதோ கடும் கதிர்களையுடைய சூரிய பிம்பத்தைத் தன் ஒளிக்கதிர்களால் பழிக்கும் வாள் நந்தகம்! அங்கே அரக்கர்களின் உறுதியான மார்புகளைப் பொடிபண்ணும் கதை கௌமோதகி! அதோ ஊழிகால மேகத்தின் இடியோசைக் கொப்பர்ன நாணின் ஒலிகொண்ட வில் சார்ங்கம்! இதோ சந்திரனின் வெண்மையும், பேரொலியும் பெற்ற பாஞ்சஜன்யம் என்ற உத்தம சங்கு! ஹே சார்ங்கமே! கௌமோதகியே! பாஞ்ச-

ஜன்யமே, அசுரர்களின் யமனா நந்தகமே ! பகைவர்களை எரிக்கும் நெருப்புபோன்றவரே ! முராரியின் கோபம் அடங்கிவிட்டது. அவரவர் இடத்திற்குச் செல்லுங்கள். நானும் போகிறேன்.

ஆ ! ஆ ! இதென்ன ! வாயு கடும் புயலாய் வீசுகிறது. கதிரவன் வெகு கொடுமையாக காய்கிறான். மலைகள் அசைக்கின்றன. கடல் கொந்தளிக்கின்றது. மரங்கள் விழுகின்றன. மேகங்கள் சிதறுகின்றன. வாசகி முதலிய நாகங்கள் ஓடி ஒளிகின்றன. இதென்ன ? ஆ ! ஆ ! அதோ பகவானின் சிறந்ததான வாகனம் கருடனல்லவா வருகிறது ! தேவாசுரர்களாலேயே மிகவருந்தி எடுக்கப்பட்ட அமிர்தத்தை சத்துருவிடமிருந்து தாயை விடுவிப்பதற்காக எடுத்து வந்த கருடனல்லவா ! முராரிக்கே வாகனமாக இருப்பதாக வரம் அளித்தவனல்லவா !

காச்யபரின் அன்புக்குரிய புதல்வ ! கருட ! தேவதேவர்களின் அதிபதி சாந்தமடைந்து விட்டார். உன் நிலையத்துக்குச் செல். ஓ ! சென்று விட்டானே ! நானும் போகிறேன்.

அதோ, மாதவன் சினம் கொண்டதும் ஒளியிழந்து கலவரத்தால் முடி நடுவிய கின்னரர், யக்ஷர், சித்தர், தேவர் முதலியோர் நாதனின் கோபம் தணிந்தது கேட்டுத் தாபம் நீங்கி தங்கள் இருப்பிடத்துக்குச் செல்கிறார்கள்.

நானும் என் அழகிய மேரு குகைக்குச் செல்கிறேன். (போகிறான்).

கிரு—நானும் பாண்டவர் கூடாரத்துக்குச் செல்கிறேன்.

(திரைக்குப் பின்)

வேண்டாம், செல்லவேண்டாம் !

கிரு—(கேட்டுவிட்டு) இதென்ன, வயோதிக அரசன் திருதராஷ்டிரன் குரல் போலிருக்கிறதே ! அரசே ! இதோ இருக்கிறேன்.

(திருதராஷ்டிரன் வருகிறான்)

திருத—எங்கே பகவான் நாராயணன் ? எங்கே பாண்டவர்களுக்கு நன்மையைச் செய்யும் கடவுள் ? அந்தணர் பால் அன்பு கொண்ட ஆண்டவன் எங்கே ? எங்கே தேவகீ நந்தனன் ? தேவதேவ ! சார்ங்கபாணே ! என் புதல்வனின் தவறுக்காக நான் இதோ உங்கள் காலடியில் விழுகிறேன்.

(விழுகிறான்)

கிரு—அந்தோ! என் காலடியில் விழுந்து விட்டானே! எழுந்திரு,
எழுந்திரு.

திருந—தங்கள் கருணை, தேவ! இதோ அர்க்யம், பாத்யம். உப-
சாரங்களை ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளும்படி வேண்டுகிறேன்.

கிரு—அனைத்தையும் ஏற்கிறேன். இன்னும் என்ன நீ வேண்டுவதை
தரட்டும்?

திருந—பகவான் என்பால் அருள் கொண்டால் வேறு நான் வேண்டு-
வது என்ன இருக்கிறது?

பகவதஜ்ஜு^௨கீயம்

(துறவி நுழைகிறார்)

துறவி—சாண்டில்ய! சாண்டில்ய! (பின்புறம் பார்த்து) என்ன, காணவில்லையே! அஞ்ஞான இருளால் மூடப்பட்டவனின் தகுந்த செய்கைதான்! ஏனெனில்,

இவ்வுடல் நோய்களின் இருப்பிடம், மூப்பிற்காளாகக் கூடியது, மறைந்துள்ள யமனுக்கு உட்பட்டது, ஆற்றங்கரை மரம்போல எந்நாளும் இடையூறுகளால் தாக்கப்பட்டு தடைபட்ட இன்பத்தைக் கொண்டது. பன்மடங்கு நற்செய்கைகளால் இவ்வுடலைப் பெற்று உடலையே ஆத்மாவென்று அகங்காரம் கொண்ட மனிதன் தன் வலிமை, அழகு, இளமை முதலிய குணங்களால் தலைதெரியாமல்போய் அவற்றை குற்றங்களென்று நோக்குவதில்லை.

ஆகையால், பாவம்! இவன்மேல் பிசகில்லை! மறுபடியும் கூப்பிடுகிறேன். சாண்டில்ய!

(சாண்டில்யன் நுழைகிறான்)

சாண்டில்யன்—முதலாவதாக, நான் சாவில் பிண்டசேஷங்களை சாப்பிடுகிறவர்களும் அகபுரத்தைச் சொல்லியறியாத நாவை உடையவர்களும் கழுத்தில் பூணூலை மாத்திரம் போட்டுக் கொண்டிருப்பவர்களும் பிறந்த காரணத்தால் மட்டும் அந்தணர்களாக இருக்கும் குலத்தில் பிறந்தவன். இரண்டாவதாக, எங்கள்வீட்டில் சாப்பாடு இல்லாததால் பசியால்தூண்டப்பட்டு அதிகாலையில் கிடைக்கும் சாப்பாட்டின் ஆசையால் புத்தசன்னியாஸத்தில் நுழைந்தேன். பிறகு அங்கேயும் ஒரு வேளைச்சாப்பாடு என்ற ஏறபாட்டால் பசியெடுத்து அந்நிலையையும் விட்டு, துணியைக் கிழித்து, கப்பரையை உடைத்து, குடையை மாத்திரம் எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வெளிவந்தேன். மூன்றாவதாக, இந்தப்பொல்லாத சன்னியாஸியின் சுமைதாங்கும் கழுதையாக ஆனேன்! இதோ, அருகிலிருக்கும் என்ஆசானை அடைகிறேன். எங்கே போய்விட்டார் அவர்? ஆகா, புரிந்துவிட்டது! இப்போலித்துறவி காலைச்சாப்பாட்டின் ஆசையால் தன்னந்தனியாக பிட்டுச் எடுப்பதற்கு எனக்கு முன்பாகவே கிளம்பியிருப்பார் என்று நினைக்கிறேன்.

இதோ என் ஆசாரியர்! மன்னியுங்கள், மன்னியுங்கள்,
சுவாமி!

துறவி—சாண்டிலிய! அஞ்சவேண்டாம், அஞ்சவேண்டாம்!

சாண்—சுவாமி! இடைவிடாது இன்பம், களியாட்டம் என்றிருக்-
கும் இவ்வுலகில் எந்த வகையில் தாங்கள் பிட்சை எடுக்-
கிறீர்கள்?

துறவி—சொல்கிறேன், கேள்!

கௌரவத்திற்கு ஆசைப்படுவதில்லை. அவமானம் ஏற்பட்-
டால் பொருத்துப் போகவேண்டுமென்று இருப்பேன். எளி-
யவர்களிடமிருந்து பெற்ற பிட்சையால் உயிரைத் தாங்கி
வருகிறேன். கெடுதலும் கஷ்டமுமே அதிகமாயுள்ள இவ்-
வுலகில் பல முதலைகள் நிரம்பிய ஏரியில் எப்படியோ அப்படி
ஜாக்கிரதையாக நடந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறேன்.

சாண்—பகவன்,

என்னைச்சோந்தவன் ஒருவனும் இல்லை; உடன் பிறந்த-
வனும் இல்லை; எனக்கு அப்பா ஏது? தங்கள் கருணை
உண்டு; நான் ஒண்டி ஆள்; உணவுப் பஞ்சத்தால் அடிபட்டு
சன்னியாஸத்தை ஏற்றிருக்கிறேன், தர்மத்தின் ஆசையால்
அல்ல.

துறவி—சாண்டிலிய, என்ன இது?

சாண்—உண்மை, பொய் இவ்விரண்டுமே (மனிதனுக்குக்) கட்டு
என்று நீங்கள் கூறுகிறீர்களே!

துறவி—ஆம். உண்மை, பொய் இவற்றைப் பற்றுகொண்டு செய்தல்
கட்டிற்கு காரணமாகிறது. ஏனெனில்,

ஒருவன் எண்ணி விரும்பிய ஒரு காரியத்தை அதில் புல-
னைச்செலுத்தி செய்தால், அவனுடைய அந்தச்செய்கையின்
பயனை தேவர்கள் ஒப்படைக்க வேண்டிய பொருள்போல
காப்பாற்றி வருகிறார்கள்.

சாண்—அப்பயனை அவன் எப்பொழுது பெறுகிறான்?

துறவி—எப்பொழுது பற்றற்று இருக்கும் தன்மை நிரம்பி நிற-
கிறதோ அப்பொழுது.

சாண்—அந்நிலையை எவ்வாறு அடைகிறான்?

துறவி—பற்றில்லாமல் இருந்தால்.

சாண்—பற்றில்லாமல் இருப்பது என்பது என்ன?

துறவி—நிருப்பு, வெறுப்பு இவற்றின் நடுநிலை. ஏனெனில், இன்பத்திலும் துயரத்திலும் ஒரே நிலையையும், அச்சத்திலும் களிப்பிலும் குறையு ஏற்றங்களின்றி இருப்பதையும், நண்பரிடமும் பகைவரிடமும் சம உணர்ச்சியையும் சான்றோர் பற்றற்றிருப்பது என்று கூறுகிறார்கள்.

சாண்—இப்படி ஒன்று இருக்கிறதா என்ன?

துறவி—இல்லாததற்கு பெயர் கிடையாது.

சாண்—அவ்வாறு இருக்கமுடியும் என்று பகவான் கூறுகிறீர்களா?

துறவி—இதில் என்ன சந்தேகம்?

சாண்—இது பொய், இது பொய்.

துறவி—எப்படி?

சாண்—பகவான் எனமீது எக்காரணத்தால் கோபித்துக்கொள்கிறீர்கள்?

துறவி—நீ படிக்காததினால்.

சாண்—விடுபட்ட உமக்கு நான் படித்தாலென்ன, படிக்காவிட்டாலென்ன?

துறவி—அவ்வாறில்லை. குருவையண்டின சீடனை அடிக்கலாம் என்று அனுமதித்திருக்கிறது. ஆகையால் கோபிக்காமலேயே நான் உன் நலனுக்காக உன்னை அடிக்கிறேன்.

சாண்—ஆச்சரியம்! ஆச்சரியம்! கோபிக்காத இவர என்னை அடிக்கிறாராம்! விடுங்கள் இக்கதையை. பிச்சையொடுக்கும் வேளை தாண்டி விடுகிறது.

துறவி—மூடனே! இது காலை, நடுப்பொழுதல்லவே. வீடுகளில் அரிசி தீட்டும் உலக்கை ஓய்ந்தபின், தணல் அவிந்தபின், எல்லோரும் உணவு அருந்தின பின்னரும் தான் நமக்கு பிஷா காலம் என்று சொல்லப்படுகிறது. ஆதலால் இளைப்பாற இத்தாட்டத்திற்குச் செல்லுவோம்.

சாண்—சுவாமி, இதோ நந்தவனம்.

துறவி—நீ முதலில் உள்ளே செல். தனிமையான வீடு, காடு இவற்றை நாடுபவர்கள் நாங்கள்.

சாண்—பகவானே முதலில் நுழையுங்கள். நான் பின்னே வருகிறேன்.

துறவி—ஏன்?

சாண்—வயது முதிர்ந்த என் தாய், “அசோகத்தளிர்களிடையே ஒளிந்துகொண்டு புலி வசிக்கிறது,” என்று சொல்லக் கேள்விப்பட்டிருக்கிறேன். ஆகையால் பகவானே முதலில் செல்லுங்கள். நான் பின்னால் வருகிறேன்.

துறவி—நல்லது.

(நுழைகிறார்கள்)

சாண்—ஐயமேயோ! புலியால் பிடிக்கப்பட்டேன்! புலிவாயினின்றும் என்னை விடுவீயுங்கள்! ஆ! அதோ, இரத்தம் கழுத்திலிருந்து பெருகிறது!

துறவி—சாண்டில்ய! அஞ்சாதே, அஞ்சாதே! மயில் அல்லவோ அது?

சாண்—உண்மையாக மயிலா?

துறவி—ஆம், மயில்தான்.

சாண்—மயிலானால் கண்களைத் திறக்கிறேன்.

துறவி—உன் இஷ்டப்படி.

சாண்—ஹா! புலி என்னைக்கண்டு அஞ்சி மயில் உருவம்கொண்டு ஓடுகிறது! ஹி, ஹி! (தோட்டத்தைப் பார்த்து) ஆகா, என்ன அழகாக இருக்கிறது இத்தோட்டம்!

துறவி—மூடனே, நாளுக்கு நாள் புலன்கள் அழிவடையும்பொழுது என்ன அழகு உனக்கு வைத்திருக்கிறது?

சாண்—எப்பொருள் எக்காலத்தில் அழகாகக் காண்கிறதோ, அப்பொருள் அக்காலத்தில் அழகானது.

துறவி—மடமையினால் கூறுகிறாய். பார்—

வாராததை வேண்டிக்கொண்டும், கடந்ததை வருந்திக்கொண்டும், இருப்பவற்றால் திருப்தியடையாதவருமான மனிதருக்கு இனபம் கிடைக்கவே இடம்கூடாது.

சாண்—நீண்ட பாதை! இப்பொழுது எங்கே நாம் அமரலாம்?

துறவி—இங்கேயே உட்காரலாம்.

சாண்—அசுத்தம், அசுத்தம்!

துறவி—காடு புனிதமானது, பூமிக்கு மாசில்லை.

சாண்—களைப்புற்று உட்கார விரும்பினால் அசுத்தத்தை சுத்தமா-
கக் கூறுவீர்கள் !

துறவி—மறை அத்தாட்சி, நானல்ல. ஏனெனில், அதிக அகங்காரத்-
தால் வெறிகொண்டவர்களுக்கும், நலமற்றதை நலம் என்று
உறுதி கூறுபவர்களுக்கும், தங்கள் விருப்பப்படி பிரமாணம்
கூறுபவர்களுக்கும் நிலையான தத்துவம் கிடையவே கிடை-
யாது.

சாண்—பலவாறு பேசும் உங்களுடைய இவ்வார்த்தைகளுக்குப்
பிரமாணம் இல்லை.

துறவி—அவ்வாறு கூறுதே.

உலகில் சான்றோர் எதைப் பிரமாணம் என்று கூறுகிறா-
ர்களோ, அதைப் பிரமாணமாக ஏற்றுக்கொள். பிரமாணத்-
திலே நிலைகொண்ட பெரியோர் பிரமாணமின்றி ஒன்றைச்-
செய்யமாட்டார் என்பது திண்ணம்.

சாண்—உங்கள் பிரமாணம் எனக்குப் புரியவில்லை.

துறவி—வா, குழந்தாய்! படி.

சாண்—நான் படிக்கமாட்டேன்.

துறவி—ஏன் ?

சாண்—அத்யயனத்தின் பயனைக்கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

துறவி—அத்யயனம் செய்தவருக்கும் நாளடைவிலேதான் அதன்
பொருள் விளங்கும். ஆகையால் படி.

சாண்—அத்யயனம் செய்தால் என்ன ஏற்படும் ?

துறவி—கேள். ஞானத்திலிருந்து விஞ்ஞானம், விஞ்ஞானத்-
திலிருந்து புலனடக்கம், அதிலிருந்து தவம், தவத்தால்
யோகம், யோகத்தால் கடந்தது, வரப்போவது, இருப்பது
இவற்றைக் காணலாம். இவைகளிலிருந்து எட்டுவகை-
யான ஐசுவரியத்தை அடைகிறான்.

சாண்—சுவாமி, சன்யாஸிகள் யோகம் யோகம் என்று கூறுகிறா-
ர்களே, அந்த யோகம் என்பது என்ன ?

துறவி—கேள்.

ஞானத்தின் அடிப்படை, தவத்தின் சாரம், சத்துவ
குணத்திலிருத்தல், சுக - துக்கம் முதலிய இரட்டைகளின்

அழிவு, விருப்பு, வெறுப்பினின்றும் விடுதலை—இது தான் யோகம் என்று சொல்லப்படுகிறது.

சாண்—உணவு விஷயத்தில் அஜாக்கிரதை எல்லா விஷயத்திலும் அஜாக்கிரதையாகும் என்று சொன்ன புத்தருக்கு என்ன வணக்கம்.

துறவி—சாண்டிலிய, இது என்ன?

சாண்—தெரியாதா, சுவாமி, இங்கு வருவதற்கு முன் அதிகாலைச் சாப்பாட்டின் ஆசையால் புத்தமதத்தை நான் நாடியிருந்தேன் என்று?

துறவி—அங்கு ஏதாவது கொஞ்சம் கற்றுக்கொண்டாயா?

சாண்—ஆம், ஆம். அங்கு நிறைய கற்றுக்கொண்டேன்.

துறவி—அவை என்ன, சொல், கேட்கலாம்.

சாண்—கேளுங்கள் சுவாமி—“எட்டு பிரகிருதிகள், பதினாறு விகாரங்கள், ஆத்மா, ஐந்து வாயுக்கள், மூன்று குணங்கள், மனசு, ஆக்கல், அழித்தல்.” இவ்வாறு புத்தபகவான் பிடக புத்தகங்களில் கூறியிருக்கிறார்.

துறவி—சாண்டிலிய, இது சாங்கிய மதம், புத்தமதம் அன்று.

சாண்—பசியினால் ஏற்பட்ட சாப்பாட்டு யோசனையில் ஒன்றை நினைத்தேன், மற்றொன்றைக் கூறினேன். இப்பொழுது கேளுங்கள், சுவாமி!

ஜீவ இம்ஸையை விடுதல் சிக்ஷாபதம்.

கொடுக்கப்படாத பொருளை ஏற்பதை விடுதல் சிக்ஷாபதம்.

பிரேமசரியமற்றிருப்பதை விடுதல் சிக்ஷாபதம்.

மொய் பேசுவதை விடுதல் சிக்ஷாபதம்.

அகால உணவை விடுதல் சிக்ஷாபதம்.

எங்கு எங்கையு புத்தரை, தர்மத்தை, சங்கத்தை சரண அடைகிறேன்.

துறவி—சாண்டிலிய, தன் மதத்தை விட்டு பிறமதத்தைப் பேசுவது உனக்கு சரியல்ல.

தாமஸ் குணத்தை விடுத்து, ராஜஸகுணத்தை வென்று சத்துவ நிலையைப்பெற்று நனகு அமைதியடைந்து நியானம் செய். இது ஞானம் பெற உதவும்.

சாண்—பகவான் அமைதியாக யோகத்தைப்பற்றி நினைத்துக் கொண்டிருங்கள். நான் கவனமாய் உணவைப்பற்றி யோசிக்கிறேன்.

(கணிகை மாதும் வேலைக்காரியும் நுழைகிறார்கள்)

கணிகை—மதுகரிகா, மதுகரிகா! எங்கே, ராமிலகன் எங்கே?

மது—அஜ்ஜுகா! ‘நான் இதோ வருகிறேன்’ என்று கூறிவிட்டு பட்டணத்திற்குத்தான் அவர் போயிருக்கிறார்.

கணிகை—எதற்காக?

மது—வேறு எதற்கு? கோஷ்டியைத் துரிதப்படுத்துவதற்குத்தான்.

கணிகை—இன்னமுமா கூட்டம் கலையவில்லை?

மது—சரியாகக் கூறினீர்கள். குடிப்பதே கோஷ்டி, அதுதான் நாணத்தால் உறுதியாயிருக்கும் பெண்களைக்கூட மயக்குகிறது, சிரிக்கவைக்கிறது.

கணிகை—மதுகரிகா, மதுகரிகா! எங்கு உட்காரலாம்?

மது—அஜ்ஜுகா! இங்கே பூத்த மா, திலகம் முதலிய மரங்களால் அலங்கரிக்கப்பட்ட இக்கல்லாசனத்தில் உட்கார்ந்து நீங்கள் ஒரு பாட்டு பாடுங்களேன்!

கணிகை—அப்படியே.

(இருவரும் அமருகிறார்கள்)

கணிகை—(பாடுகிறாள்) குயில், வண்டு இவற்றின் நாதத்தை நாண ஒலியாகவும், மாம்பூவை அம்பாகவும் கொண்ட மன்மதன் இங்கே இருக்கிறான். திண்ணமாய் முனியின மனமும் மயக்கமுறும்.

சாண்—(கேட்டுவிட்டு) ஆகா! குயிலின் குரல் போலிருக்கிறதே! இல்லை, குயிலின் இசை இல்லை. பாயசத்திலே நெய் ஊற்றினதுபோல வெகு இனிமையான பாட்டல்லவா! சரி, பார்க்கலாம்! (பார்த்துவிட்டு) ஆகா, யார் இந்த இளம் பெண்? வெகு அழகாக, இயற்கை குணங்களான அணிகளை அணிந்து, இத்தோட்டத்திற்கே தான் ஒரு அணிபோல இங்கு அமர்ந்து இருக்கிறாள்?

மது—அஜ்ஜுகா!

சாண்—ஆ, கணிகையல்லவா இவள்? பணம் படைத்தவர்கள் அதிர்ஷ்டசாலிகள் தான்!

மது—இன்னொரு பாட்டைப் பாடுங்கள்.

கணி—அப்படியே (மறுபடியும் பாடுகிறாள்)

வசந்த மாதத்தால் கர்வம் ஏற்பட்ட காமன் காமினியின் கடைக்கண் பார்வையைத் துணையாகக்கொண்டு மலர்ந்த அசோக மலர்களை வைத்து, இதோ, யோகிகளின் மனதையும் அடிக்கிறேன்.

சாண்—வெகு இனிமையாக (இவள்) தொண்டையிலிருந்து பெருகுகிறது (நாதம்)! கேளுங்கள் சுவாமி!

துறவி—காது ஒலியைக்கேட்கிறது. இதில் பற்று ஒன்றும் எனக்கு இல்லை.

சாண்—கோபிக்காதீர்கள்! துறவிகள் கோபித்துக் கொள்ளக் கூடாது.

(யமபுருஷன் நுழைகிறான்)

யமபுருஷன்—செய்வினைகள் முடிந்த உயிர்களை இவ்வுலகில் எடுப்பவனும் உயிர்களின் நல்லதும் கெட்டதுமான செய்கைகளுக்கு சாட்சியானவனும் எல்லாவற்றிற்கும் முடிவைக் கொடுப்பவனுமான யமன் ஜீவன்களின் முடிவுகாலத்தில் உயிர்களை தேகத்தில் பங்கீடு செய்யும்படி என்னைக் கட்டினாயிட்டுருக்கிறான்.

எங்கேயவள்? ஆ! இதோ அவள்!

தளர்களாலும் காய்ச்சின தங்கத்தின் நிறமுள்ள அழகிய அசோக புஷ்பக்கொத்துகளாலும் மறைக்கப்பட்ட இவ்வழக மாலை மேகக்கூட்டங்களால் மறைபட்ட சந்திக்கலையைப் போல காண்கிறாள். சரி. அவள் வினையினமிகுதி (கொஞ்சம்) இருக்கிறது. ஒரு நிமிடம் இருந்துவிட்டு உயிரைப் பறிக்கிறேன்.

மது—அம்மா, இவ்வசோகத் தளிர் அழகாக இருக்கிறது. நான் பறிக்கிறேன்.

கணி—இல்லை, இல்லை. நாளை பறிக்கிறேன்.

யமபுரு—இதுவே இடமும் நேரமும். பாம்பாக அசோகமரத்தின் களையிலிருந்துகொண்டு இவளுடைய பிராணனை எடுக்கிறேன்.

(கணிகை பறிக்கிறாள்)

யமபுரு—இதே கடிக்கும் நேரம். (கடிக்கிறான்).

கணி—ஐயோ, ஏதோ என்னைக் கடித்துவிட்டது!

மது—ஐயய்யோ, அசோகமரப் பொந்தினுள்ளிருக்கும் பாம்பு !

கணி—ஹா ! பாம்பா !

சாண்—(அருகில் வந்து) அம்மா ! என்ன இது ?

மது—இக்கணிகையை பாம்பு கடித்துவிட்டது.

சாண்—ஹா ஸ்வாமி ! இக்கணிகை மகளைப்பாம்பு கடித்துவிட்டது !

துறவி—அவளுடைய வினை முடிந்திருக்க வேண்டும். ஏனெனில், தம் வினையை அனுபவிப்பதற்கு அல்லவோ ஐந்துக்கள் பிறக்கின்றன. வினை முடிந்தபின் ஆத்மாக்கள் வேறு இடத்திற்கு செல்லுகின்றன.

மது—அம்மா, வலிக்கிறதா, என்ன ?

கணி—உடல் சோர்வடைகிறது ! கண் சுழலுகிறது ! உள்ளம் கலங்குகிறது ! உயிர் போய்விடும்போலிருக்கிறது ! படுக்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

மது—சுகமாக படுத்துக்கொள்ளுங்கள், அம்மா !

கணி—அம்மாவிற்கு என் வணக்கத்தைத் தெரிவி.

மது—இல்லை, இல்லை. நீங்களை தாயை வணங்குவீர்கள்.

கணி—ராமிலகளை எனக்காகத் தழுவிக்கொள். (உயிர் நீக்குகிறாள்).

மது—ஐயோ ! இறந்துவிட்டாளே !

யமபுரு—ஆ, உயிரை எடுத்தாய்விட்டது. இதோ, பரந்த கிளைகள் கொண்ட ஆலமரம். இங்கு வீற்றிருக்கும் சிதரகுப்தனிடம் இவ்வுயிரைக் கொண்டுபோகிறேன்.

மது—ஆ ! அம்மா !

சாண்—சுவாமி, இவ்விளங்கணிகை தன் உயிரை விடுகிறாளே !

துறவி—மூடா ! ஜீவன்களுக்கு உயிர் மிகப் பிரியமானது. உயிரால் சரீரம் விடப்பட்டது என்று கூறவேண்டும்.

சாண்—ஹா, நீ தொலைந்துபோ ! இரக்கமற்றவனே ! அன்பற்றவனே ! கல்நெஞ்சனே ! தூபுத்தி ! நடத்தை கெட்டவனே ! சோத்து வண்டி ! விண் மொட்டை !

துறவி—என்ன தான் பண்ணவேண்டும் என்கிறாய் ?

சாண்—சுவாமி ! நான் வருந்துகிறேன்.

துறவி—எதற்காக ?

சாண்—எனக்கு வேண்டியவள் இவள் !

துறவி—எப்படி ?

சாண்—இவள் யோகிகளைப்போல ஒரு விஷயத்தில் கூட ஆசை வைப்பதில்லை. சுவாமி, என் துக்கத்தை அடக்க முடியவில்லை. நெருங்கிப்போய் அழுகிறேன்.

துறவி—கூடாது, கூடாது ! அங்கு செல்லக்கூடாது.

சாண்—கோபிக்காதீர்கள் ! யோகிகளுக்கு கோபம் ஒவ்வாது. (கணிகையின் அருகில் சென்று) அன்பு நிறைந்தவளே ! இனிமையாகப் பாடுபவளே !

மது—இது என்ன சுவாமி ?

சாண்—அன்பு.

மது—(தனக்குள்) இருக்கலாம். நல்லவர்கள் எல்லோரிடமும் இளகிய உள்ளங்கொண்டவர்கள். சரி, நான் இவ்வாறு செய்கிறேன். (வெளிப்படையாக) ஐயா, கணிகையைச் சிறிது நேரம் பார்த்துக்கொள்ளுங்கள். நான் அவள் தாயை அழைத்துவருகிறேன்.

சாண்—சீக்கிரம் போ. தாயற்றவர் எல்லோருக்கும் நான் தாய்.

மது—இரக்கமுள்ள இந்த பிராமணர் கணிகையை விட்டுப் போக மாட்டார். நான் போய் வருகிறேன். (செல்கிறாள்).

சாண்—போய்விட்டாள் ; வாய்விட்டு அழுகிறேன். ஆ ! இனிமையாகப் பாடுகிறவளே !

துறவி—சாண்டிலய் ! நீ இவ்வாறு செய்யக்கூடாது.

சாண்—ஆ, நீ ஒழி ! அன்பற்றவளே ! என்னையும் உன்னைப்போல எண்ணுகிறாயா ?

துறவி—வா, அத்யயனம் செய்.

சாண்—என்ன சுவாமி, பாவம் ! இந்த அநாதைப் பெண்ணின் நோமைத் திருங்கள்.

துறவி—என்ன, வைத்ய சாஸ்திரமா படிக்க வந்தாய் ?

சாண்—பாபம்தான் உன் யோகத்தின் பயன்.

துறவி—பாவம், இவன் என்ன செய்வது என்று தெரியாததால் சன்யாஸ ஆசிரமத்திற்கு ஏற்படும் இழுக்கை அறியவில்லை.

சேடனிடம் உள்ள கருணையால் ஒன்றைச் செய்து காட்டினால் அது யோகத்திற்குத் தடை ஆகாது என்று மகேசுவரர் முதலிய யோகாசாரியர்களிடமிருந்து கேள்விப்பட்டிருக்கிறேன். ஆதலால் யோகம் இப்படிப்பட்டது என்று இவனுக்கு யோகத்தில் நம்பிக்கை ஏற்படும்படி செய்கிறேன். இக்கணிகையின் உடலில் என் ஆத்மாவைச் செலுத்துகிறேன்.

(யோகத்தினால் நுழைகிறார்)

கணி—(எழுந்துகொண்டு) சாண்டில்ய, சாண்டில்ய!

சாண்—(களிப்புடன்) ஆகா, இவளுக்கு உயிர் திரும்பி வந்து விட்டதே! அம்மா, இதோ இருக்கிறேன்.

கணி—அலம்பாத கைகளால் தொடாதே!

சாண்—ஐயோ, வெகு சுத்தமானவளல்லவா இவள்!

கணி—வா, குழந்தாய், அத்யயனம் செய்.

சாண்—என்ன இங்குமா அத்யயனம்! என் ஆசிரியரிடமே செல்கிறேன். (யோகியிடம் நெருங்கி) சுவாமி! சுவாமி! ஐயோ, யோகி இறந்துவிட்டாரே! ஐயோ! பேச்சாளரே! அதிசயமான யோகம் நிரம்பினவரே! ஆசிரியரே! இவ்வளவு அறிந்தவர்களும் மரிக்கிறார்களே!

(தாயும் வேலைக்காரியும் நுழைகிறார்கள்)

வேலைக்காரி (மதுகரிகா)—தாயே, இதோ, இப்படி வாருங்கள்.

தாய்—எங்கே, எங்கே என் பெண்?

மது—இதோ தோட்டத்தில் பாம்பு கடித்துக் கிடக்கிறது.

தாய்—அந்தோ, என்ன என் துரதிருஷ்டம்!

மது—ஆறுதலடையுங்கள் தாயே! இதோ இவள் நோய் தீர்ந்து சொஸ்தமாயிருக்கிறாள்.

தாய்—ஆகா, சுய நிலையை அடைந்துவிட்டாளா? (அவள் அருகில் சென்று) குழந்தாய் வசந்தசேனா, இது என்ன?

கணி—தியக்கிழமே, என்னைத் தொடாதே.

தாய்—ஐயோ, இது என்ன?

மது—விஷத்தின் வேகம் முற்றிவிட்டது.

தாய்—விரைந்து செல், வைத்தியனை அழைத்து வா.

மது—அப்படியே தாயே ! (செல்கிறாள்).

(ராமிலகன் நுழைகிறான்)

ராமிலகன்—விரிந்த கண்களுடைய, இனிக்கப் பேசும் இவள் முகத்தை, மலர்ந்த மென்மையான தாமரையைச் சுற்றும் வண்டு போல நான் பருக விரும்புகிறேன். (அருகில் சென்று) இதென்ன என்னைப் பார்த்துவிட்டு முகத்தைத் திருப்பிக் கொள்கிறாள் ? (புடவையின் நுனியைத் தொடுகிறான்).

கனி—இருள் மண்டியவனே ! என் சேலைத் தலைப்பை விடு.

ராமி—இது என்ன ?

தாய்—பாம்பு கடித்ததிலிருந்து இவ்வாறு தாறுமாறாகப் பேசுகிறாள்.

ராமி—அப்படியா ? பாவம் !

திண்ணமாக இவளுடைய உயிர் நீங்கியதும் குண்டமான இவள் உடலில், யோகபலம் பெற்ற வேறொருவர் ஆக்கிரமித்திருக்கிறார் !

(வைத்யனும் வேலைக்காரியும் நுழைகிறார்கள்)

வேலைக்காரி (மதுகரிகை)—வாருங்கள், வாருங்கள்.

வைத்யன்—எங்கே அவள் ?

மது—இதோ சொஸ்தமாயிருக்கிறாள்.

வைத்—பெரிய பாம்பு அவளைத் திண்டிக் கடித்திருக்கும்.

மது—எப்படி தங்களுக்குத் தெரிகிறது ?

வைத்—விபரீதமான சேஷ்டைகளைச் செய்வதினால். எல்லா உபகரணங்களையும் எடுத்துவா. விஷத்தைப் போக்குமா முறையைத் தொடங்குகிறேன்.

(உட்கார்ந்து தரையில் மண்டலத்தை எழுதி)

வட்டமாய் வளைந்து வளைந்து போகிற பாம்பே! இவ்வட்டத்திற்குள் வந்து விழு, விழு! வாசகி புத்திரனே, நில, நிச்சகு—,ச்சகு—இதோ நாமபைத் துண்டிக்கிறேன். எங்கே கோடாலி?

கனிகை—முட்டாள வைத்யனே ! வீணாய் கிரமப்படாதே.

வைத்ய—என்ன, பித்தமும் சேர்ந்திருக்கிறது! இதோ, உன் பித்தம், வாதம், சிலேஷ்மம் எல்லாவற்றையும் ஒழித்துக் கட்டுகிறேன்.

ராமிலகன்—ஆம், முயற்சியுங்கள். நன்றி இல்லாதவர்கள் அல்ல நாங்கள்.

வைத்ய—நஞ்சை நீக்கும் சுந்தர குளிகையை எடுத்து வருகிறேன். (செல்கிறான்). (யமபுருஷன் வருகிறான்).

யமபுரு—“(கொண்டு வரப்படவேண்டிய) அந்த வசந்தசேனை அல்ல இவள். விரைவில் இவளை அங்கேயே கொண்டுபோய் விடு. ஆயுள் முடிந்த அந்த மற்றொரு வசந்தசேனையை இங்கு கொண்டு வா” என்று யமன் என்னை அதட்டினான்.

இவள் தேகத்திற்கு நெருப்பு வைக்குமுன்பே இவளை உயிருள்ளவளாய் ஆக்குகிறேன். (பார்த்துவிட்டு) ஆ, இவள் எழுந்து நிற்கிறாள்! இதென்ன இது? இவள் உயிர் என் வசமிருக்கிறது. இந்நங்கையோ பிழைத்து எழுந்திருக்கிறாள். இது மிகவும் விரைத; உலகில் இதற்கு முன் கண்டதில்லை. (நாற்புறமும் பார்த்து) ஓகோ, மதிப்புறகுரிய யோகி விளையாடுகிறார் போலும்! இனி நான் என்ன செய்யட்டும்? சரி, தெரிந்து விட்டது. இந்த கணிகையின் உயிரை யோகியின் உடலில் புகுத்திவிட்டு அவர் விளையாட்டு முடிந்தபின், உயிர்களை அதிதீவிடங்களில் சேர்க்கிறேன். (அவ்வாறு செய்கிறான்)

துறவி—(எழுந்து) மதுகரிகா, மதுகரிகா!

சாண்—ஐயோ! யோகி உயிர் பிழைத்து விட்டாரே! துன்பப்பட வேண்டியவர்கள் சாவதில்லை என்று எண்ணுகிறேன்.

துறவி—எங்கே, ராமிலகன் எங்கே?

ராமி—சுவாமி, இதோ.

சாண்—சுவாமி, இதென்ன? கிண்டியைப் பிடிக்கவேண்டிய இடக்கை சங்கு வளையங்கள் நிரம்பியதாகத் தென்படுகிறது! பகவானும் அல்ல, அஜ்ஜுகையும் அல்ல. பகவதஜ்ஜுக மாக அல்லவோ ஆயிருக்கிறது!

துறவி—ராமிலக! என்னைத் தழுவிக்கொள்.

சாண்—முள்முருங்கையைத் தழுவிக்கொள்.

துறவி—ராமிலக! மயக்க வெறி என்னை ஆட்கொண்டிருக்கிறது!

சான்—இல்லை, இல்லை! பித்தவெறி உன்னை ஆட்கொண்டு இருக்கிறது.

ராமி—சுவாமி, தங்கள் ஆச்ரமத்திற்கு மாறான பேச்சாக இருக்கிறதே!

துறவி—கள்ள குடிக்கிறேனே!

சான்—விஷத்தைக் குடி! சரி, இவ்வேடிக்கை எவ்வளவு தூரம் செல்லுகிறது என்று தெரிந்து கொள்கிறேன்.

துறவி—மதுகரிகா, மதுகரிகா! என்னைத் தழுவிக்கொள்.

மது—போய்த் தொலை!

தாய்—குழந்தாய் வசந்தசேன!

துறவி—இதோ இருக்கிறேன், அம்மா! வணங்குகிறேன்.

தாய்—சுவாமி, இது என்ன?

துறவி—அம்மா, என்னைத் தெரிகிறதா? ராமிலக, இன்று நீ நேரம் கழித்து வந்தாற்போலிருக்கிறதே!

ராமி—சுவாமி, நான் என் வசத்திலில்லை.

(வைத்யன் நுழைந்து)

வைத்யன்—எட்டு மாத்திரைகளையும் பச்சிலை மருந்தையும் எடுத்துக் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறேன். இந்த நிமிடம் உயிர் வந்தால் அடுத்த நிமிடம் போகும். எங்கே, தண்ணீர், தண்ணீர்!

மது—இதோ தண்ணீர்!

வைத்யன்—மாத்திரையை உரைக்கிறேன். ஐயோ! இவளை ஒன்றும் கடிக்கவில்லை; ஏதோ அல்லவா இவளைப் பிடித்து ஆட்டுகிறது!

கணி—மூட வைத்யனே! வீண் வயது முதிர்ந்தவனே! பிராணிகளின் முடிவுகட்டும் யமனைக்கூட நீ தெரிந்து கொள்ளவில்லை. எந்தப் பாம்பு கடித்து இவள் இறந்தாள் என்று சொல்.

வைத்யன்—இதிலென்ன ஆச்சரியம்?

கணி—சாஸ்திரம் ஏதாவது இருக்கிறதா?

வைத்யன்—ஆயிரக்கணக்காயிருக்கிறது.

கணி—கூறு, வைத்ய சாஸ்திரத்தைக் கூறு.

வைத்—இதோ கேள். வாதம், பித்தம், சிலே....ஐயோ, புத்தகம், புத்தகம்!

சாண்—என்னே வைத்யனின் அறிவு! முதலிலேயே மறதி!

வைத்—வாதம், பித்தம், சிலேஷ்மம் இம்மூன்று விதமான இயற்கைகளையுடைய கொடிய நஞ்சு கொண்ட மூன்று பாம்புகள் தான் உள்ளன! நான்காவது கிடையாது.

கணி—இலக்கணத்தவறு நேர்ந்துவிட்டது. மூன்று பாம்புகள் என்று குறிப்பிடுகையில் (त्रयस्पर्शः) த்ரயஸ்ஸர்ப்பா: என்று இரண்டு சொற்களும் ஒரே பாலில் இருக்கவேண்டும். (त्रिणि स्पर्शः) த்ரிணி ஸர்ப்பா: என்று நீ கூறினது இலக்கணத் தவறு.

வைத்—அய்யய்யோ! இலக்கணப் பாம்புதான் உன்னைக் கடித்திருக்கிறது!

கணி—விஷத்தால் ஏற்படும் மாற்றங்கள் எத்தனை?

வைத்—ஆ, அனவ நூற்றுக்கணக்கிலிருக்கின்றன.

கணி—இல்லை, இல்லை. ஏழு மாறுதல்கள் தான் உண்டு. அவையாவன—மயிர்ச்சிலிர்த்தல், முகவறட்சி, நிறம் மாறுதல், நடுக்கம், விக்கல், பெருமூச்சு, மூர்ச்சித்தல். இந்த ஏழைத்தாண்டிய மனிதனை சிகிதனை செய்ய அசுவினி குமாரர்களால் கூட முடியாது. இன்னும் ஏதாவது கூறவேண்டுமானால் கூறு.

வைத்—அது என்னால் ஆகக்கூடியதல்ல. வணக்கம். நான்போய் வருகிறேன். (போகிறான்).

(யமபுருஷன் நுழைந்து)

யமபுரு—நானும் யமதேவனின் கட்டகாயை நிறைவேற்றுகிறேன். (கணிகையிடம் சென்று) சுவாமி, கணிகையின் உடலை விடுங்கள்.

கணி—அவ்வாறே செய்கிறேன்.

யமபுரு—அவரவர் உடலில் உயிரை மாற்றிவிட்டு, என் அலுவலைச் செய்கிறேன்.

(அவ்வாறே செய்துவிட்டுச் செல்கிறான்).

துற—சாண்டில்ய! சாண்டில்ய!

சாண்—ஆகா, இதோ யோகி சுய நிலையை அடைந்துவிட்டாரே!

கணி-- மதுகரிகா! மதுகரிகா!

மது—ஆகா, இதோ கணிகை தன் நிலைக்குத் திரும்பிவிட்டாள்!

தாய்—குழந்தாய் வசந்தசேனா!

ராமி — அருமை வசந்தசேனா! இப்படிப்போகலாம், வா.

(கணிகை, தாய், ராமிலகன், மதுகரிகை-எல்லோரும் போகிறார்கள்)

சாண்—சுவாமி, இது என்ன?

துற—நீண்ட கதை இது. நம் இருப்பிடத்தில் கூறுகிறேன். (நாற்புறமும் பார்த்து) பகல் முடிந்தது. இப்பொழுது, ஆகாயத்தின் விளிம்பில், மூசையின் வாயில் காய்ச்சின தங்கத்தைப் போல ஒளிகொண்ட சூரியன் அஸ்தமடைகிறான். அவனது ஒளியால் சிவந்த மேகக்கூட்டம் நிரம்பின ஆகாயம், தன்னிடையே நெருப்பு கோளங்களைக் கொண்டதுபோல் காணப்படுகிறது.

(இருவரும் போகிறார்கள்)

UPARŪPAKAS AND NṚTYA-PRABANDHAS*

Dr. V. Raghavan

A study of this subject, Uparupakas and Nṛtya-prabandhas, is necessary for the light it could throw on the history and developement of many a dance-form prevalent in different parts of the country.

The ancient Indian stage was a growing one and at one point in its growth it was considered useful to classify the performances into two kinds, the *rūpakas* and the *uparūpakas*. Broadly speaking, the *rūpakas* are major forms of drama and the *uparūpakas*, minor forms of drama in which music and dance predominated and most of which were forms of dance-drama or regular dances. This distinction cannot however be strictly enforced because in the *rūpaka* class, considered to comprise the ten forms—*daśa rūpaka*—not all could be entitled to be characterised as regular or major dramatic types. Barring the two leading types, the heroic *nāṭaka* and the social *prakaraṇa* with their derivative product the *nāṭika* and the farce, *prahasana*, in one or two Acts, the others were lesser or irregular forms. Except probably in the case of the *vyāyoga* we have no survivals of early specimens to know what exactly the ancient forms of *ḍima*, *aṅka*, *samavakara* and *ihamṛga* were like. The *vithī* and the *bhaṇa*, of which latter we have some definite idea from descriptions and old specimens, were not examples of drama proper and could legitimately be classified among the *uparūpakas*.

The technical distinction which *Nāṭya Śāstra* works make between *rūpakas* and *uparūpakas* is that while the former present a full *rasa* with other *rasas* as accessories, the latter could only present a *bhāva* or *bhāvas*; the former were accordingly referred to as *vākyaṛtha-abhinaya* and the latter as *padārtha-abhinaya*. That

*First read as a paper at the Dance Seminar held by the Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi, 1958. First published: *Sangeet Natak* No. 2, pp. 5-25, S. N. Akademi, New Delhi.

is, in the *rūpaka* a full story was presented through all the dramatic requirements and resources fully employed but in the *uparūpaka* only a fragment was depicted and even when a full theme was handled, all the complements of the stage were not present; the *uparūpaka* lacked one or other or more of the four *abhinayas*, thus minimising the scope for naturalistic features—*lokadharmī*—and resorting increasingly to the resources of *natyadharmī*. Thus in some the element of speech, *vacikābhinaya*, was omitted, as in Kathakali, though the representation included a continuous theme and the portrayal of different characters by different actors or dancers. Often, the reduction of the *lokadharmī* element of each character being played by a separate actor or dancer formed the chief feature which made for the performance being classed as an *uparūpaka*. The *bhāṇa* among the *rūpakas* negotiated the theme through a single actor through the device of the 'talk in the air', *akāśabhasita*, or imaginary conversation. This reduction of *dramatis personae* took with it the elimination of one whole *abhinaya*, the *ahārya*. *Ahārya* included also the use of a few stage properties whose renunciation threw the burden of interpretation exclusively on the solo artiste and his or her ability to expound and exploit to the full the possibilities of *āṅgika abhinaya*.¹

The *Nāṭya* and *Alaṅkāra Śāstra* texts in Sanskrit had to codify the *uparūpakas* that were growing and compelling recognition at a particular stage and the texts simply drew a line, which was somewhat historical, though, as explained already, having an artistic and technical basis. Just as there were *bhāṇa* and other irregular types in the *rūpaka*-class, the *uparūpaka*-class too had larger dramatic forms which were placed there on historical grounds, but with this justification for inclusion among them, namely that music and dance dominated in them. Such a type was *saṭṭaka*, exemplified by Rājaśekhara's *Karpūramāñjarī*, a complete Prākṛt counterpart of the *nāṭika*. In the ancient and traditional technique of production, music and dance formed an

1. See the writer's *Bhoja's Sṅgāra Prakāśa* (1963), ch. xx, *Bhoja and Nāṭya Śāstra*, pp. 533 ff., and especially 545 ff.

integral part of drama, but what is meant here specially with reference to the *uparūpakas* is that these elements played a greater part here, as thematic features and motifs too; often, the *vācika*, the spoken dialogue, took a musical form, the story having been composed in songs.

How early do we hear of these lesser varieties of the ancient Indian stage? In the *Kāma Sūtras* of Vatsyāyana, we already hear of the men and women of taste witnessing or taking part in *hallisaka*, *nāṭyarāsaka* and *prekṣaṇaka*. Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, who were primarily rhetoricians concerned with 'read poetry', mention by the way that there were *dvipadī*, *rāsaka*, *skandhaka*, *lasya*, *chhalika* and *samyā*—all of these intended to be 'seen'. These were compositions set to music and dance. As these names come up in regular treatises on *Nāṭya Śāstra*, we shall come later to the consideration of what these actually were. Some of these appear also in descriptions in literature, for example, Kumārila, the great Mīmāṃsaka, speaks of *dvipadī* and *rāsaka* in his *Tantravārttika*, and the *chhalika*, or *chalikya*, occurs as a dance in the *Harivaṃśa* and is mentioned by Kalidāsa as being learnt by Mālavikā.

As already explained, Bharata's text itself mentions one performance which is not included in drama, but is of the form of dance, namely *lasya*. The greatest name in the history of drama and dance after Bharata is Kohala whom some recensions of Bharata's text itself—for example, the one in the Kāvya-mālā edition—mention as the author of the *Uttaratantra*, suggesting thereby that Bharata's text would be the *Pūrvatantra*. All that developed in the post-Bharata period was codified by Kohala: in fact, the labours of Kohala were so significant that it appears from Abhinavagupta's statement that even Bharata's text underwent a redaction on the impact of Kohala's work. From Abhinavagupta's observations, we gather that it was Kohala who for the first time spoke of the stage-performances outside the pale of the *daśarūpaka*. And it is in Abhinavagupta's commentary on the *Nāṭya Śāstra* that we first see some of these *uparūpakas* referred to, occasionally mentioning a technical characteristic of

theirs and an illustrative composition also. The chief of these *uparūpakas* mentioned by Abhinavagupta as dealt with by Kohala is the *toṭaka*. The *toṭaka* is described by post-Abhinavagupta writers, Śaradatanaya for example, but none has any clear idea of it nor even an undisputed example of a *toṭaka*. *Toṭaka* is taken like *naṭika* and *saṭṭaka*, more as a dramatic form and sometimes the *Vikramorvaśiya* of Kalidasa is cited as a *toṭaka*. The correctness of this identification cannot be vouched for. Though the names *saṭṭaka* and *toṭaka*, or *troṭaka*, have been understood as names of dramatic forms, it is not forgotten that they were intended to be danced or that they were dominated by music and dance. It is quite likely that these were originally popular dance-forms. As early as the Barhut Stupa, we hear of the *sāḍaka* dance. These dance-forms might have been taken and used as bases or motifs for sophisticated and elaborate dramatic efforts by the classic poets and dramatists, and gradually the over-emphasis on the literary side might have led to their growth into a species of drama. An element called *toṭaka* occurs among the sixty-four *sandhyāṅgas* or emotional or incidental ideas occurring in a regular drama. Bharata defines it as something said in agitation, under the stress of an emotion.

The following *uparūpakas* are referred to or described by Abhinavagupta in his *Abhinavabhāratī*: *ḍombika*, *prasthāna*, *śilpaka* or *śiḍgaka*, *bhāṇaka* or simply *bhāṇa* as distinct from the *bhāṇa* in the *daśa rūpaka* class, *bhāṇika* separately from *bhāṇaka*, *rāga-kāvya* or simply *kāvya* as distinct from the poetic composition proper called *kāvya*, *preraṇa*, *ramakriḍa*, *rasaka* and *hallisaka*. While these are the forms mentioned by one writing from Kashmir, let us see what varieties of these minor stage-performances a writer from Malwa mentions. Dhanika in his commentary on his brother's standard treatise on drama, the *Daśarūpaka*, refers to the *uparūpaka* forms, *ḍombi*, *śrigadita*, *bhāṇa*, *bhāṇi*, *prasthāna*, and *kāvya*; he cites a verse mentioning these and the verse significantly adds this remark that these seven are executed by a single dancer. In the same region of Malwa arose the royal polymath and patron Bhoja, who, in his *magnum opus*,

shows his acquaintance with the local as well as Kashmiri traditions; his *Śṛṅgara Prakāśa* is the first regular work on poetry and drama to give a codified treatment of types of *uparūpaka*. He defines, citing examples for some, twelve types: *śrīgadita*, *durmilika* or *durmilita* (mentioned by others as *durmallika* too), *prasthāna*, *kāvya* or *citrakāvya*, *bhaṇa* (*śuddha*, *citra* and *saṅkīrṇa*), *bhaṇikā*, *goṣṭhī*, *hallīsaka*, *nartanaka*, *prekṣaṇaka*, *rasaka* and *naṭyarasaka* or *carcarī*. Thus between Abhinavagupta on one hand and Dhanika and Bhoja on the other, we get a good deal of light thrown on a little-known side of the ancient Indian theatre. The ancient Indian stage—to emphasise an important fact—had a rich repertoire and the ancient *rasika* had a surprisingly large variety of stage-performances to witness and enjoy.

Later, three other works, the *Bhāvaprakāśa* of Śāradātanaya, the *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakōśa* of Śāgaranandin and the *Sahitya-darpaṇa* of Viśvanātha, give full descriptions of these *uparūpakas* but their evidence is of less value; they draw their material mainly and ultimately from Abhinavagupta and Bhoja. As maintained at the outset, an examination of these *uparūpakas* is useful as it lights up the history of the surviving forms of popular dance and dance-drama. The *uparūpaka* is the link or common ground where the classic met the popular, and the sophisticated took up the folk-form; and therefore an inquiry into the nature of these *uparūpaka* signifies an effort to codify these lesser and popular forms, and assigns them a place in the framework of the theory; and their relevance and significance to our present purpose will be clear if we refer to them by their other name, *nṛtya-prabandhas*.

Now collating the data available in Abhinavagupta, Bhoja and other sources, let me place before you such reconstructions as possible of the *uparūpakas* and *nṛtya-prabandhas*. First the *śrīgadita*.

This is a composition depicting love in separation—*vipralambha*, featuring a *kulaṅgana* or lady of family, along with a lady friend of hers (*sakhī*); the heroine describes the qualities of her lover and then, referring to his bad behaviour towards herself,

complains against him. According to Bhoja, it is called *śrīgadita*, the utterances of Śrī, because Goddess Śrī or Lakṣmī and her Lord, Viṣṇu, are the prototypes of the beloved and the lover figuring in it. In Abhinavagupta, we come across a form described in similar terms but called *śīdgaka* which is sometimes given as *śīngaka* or in a Sanskrit form *śilpaka*. There may be here a process of wrong Sanskritisation or hyper-Sanskritisation, which is quite common in this process of give and take. According to Abhinavagupta, in *śīdgaka*, a *nāyikā* in separation relates to her friend her husband's bad conduct and perverse behaviour. Students of dance may at once recognise here the similarity of this theme with that of the recurring theme of Bharata Nāṭya songs, particularly *varṇas*.

While the heroine in *śrīgadita* is a *kulāṅgana* and the atmosphere is dignified, that in the next type *durmīlika* or *durmīlita* is less dignified, dealing as it does with clandestine love. The character featured in this type is a female accomplice of a lower type, a *ceṭī*, who takes the audience into confidence over the secrets of the clandestine love-affair she is aiding. After she appears and holds the audience for some time, one of the parties to the love intrigue appears on the stage, and she sets forth her plans and makes her demands, bordering on blackmail. The name *dur-mīlikā* (-ta) may mean the clandestine union. Songs featuring themes approaching this can be found among the *padas* of Bharata Nāṭya.

Prasthāna is a type described by both Bhoja and Abhinavagupta, but by each in a different way. Bhoja says that *prasthāna* depicts all the phases of love in separation including *pravāsa* or that caused by the lover going away on a journey, which last is evidently to be understood by the name *prasthāna*. There is to be the description of the seasons of spring and the rains, and the longing of the heroine. A technical detail of music and dance mentioned by Bhoja is the performance marked by four *apasāras*. *Apasara*, the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* explains, is the name of a section marked by a course of dance, *nṛtyacchinnāni khaṇḍāni apasārāḥ*. The performance enlivens itself towards the close by the

introduction, through some device of the theme, of the heroic sentiment *vīra rasa*. *Prasthāna* means also 'starting of a warrior on a victorious expedition' and if the hero is one such, his triumphant return and the description of his exploits could very well introduce this heroic element at the conclusion of this piece.

Abhinavagupta speaks of different other elements in his version of the *prasthāna*. He says that it should be played in both the styles of *tāṇḍava* and *lāsya*, forceful as well as delicate, with the latter predominating. He too speaks of the going-on-journey, evidently of the lover. But the striking detail mentioned by him is that, in the piece, there is imitation of the gait and movements of animals like elephants. Are elephants and horses to be understood here as forming part of the forces of the hero going on the expedition? In another context, Abhinavagupta refers to a music feature called *varnāṅga* as characterising the *prasthāna*.

Kāvya and *citrakāvya*, in the class of *uparūpakas*, are not to be confused with types of poetry of those names known in *Alaṅkāra Śāstra*. The *kāvya* is here a whole story composed into songs and dances. If the whole song-poem is in one *rāga*, it is just the *kāvya*, if it is in a variety of *rāgas* it is *citrakāvya*. Bhoja's description of these two is full of technical musical details concerning the composition, *rāga* and *tala*. Abhinavagupta gives it the clearer name *rāgakāvya*; it is sung and interpreted in gestures, *abhinaya*. Two examples are also mentioned, on parts of the *Rāmayaṇa* story, the *Rāghava-vijaya* and the *Māricavadha*, the former composed and sung throughout in *ṭhakka rāga* and the latter in *kakubha grāma rāga*. Abhinavagupta makes special mention of the fact that in this type, despite the change of situations and sentiments, the same *rāga* continues to be employed. A verse of Kohala is quoted in the same context, describing a variety of this in different *rāgas* and *tālas*, which would be the *citra-kāvya* mentioned by Bhoja. Elsewhere Abhinavagupta quotes Kohala describing the story of *Tripuradaha* composed in this form, sung and danced to by Śiva. That this was an early development is shown also by a reference in the *Ubhayaḥhisarika* in the *Caturbhaṇī* collection to courtesan-

dancers taking dancing contests on such story-compositions for dance as the *Purandara-vijaya* mentioned there.

It could be seen that the celebrated *Gīta Govinda*, in the wake of which many musical story-poems arose, belongs to the type *citrakāvya* noticed above. The *Gīta Govinda* occupies indeed a key-position in the history of both music and dance and not only inspired numerous Sanskrit imitations but led to the outburst of a class of musical dance-drama in the local languages, sometimes mixed with Sanskrit, in different parts of the country. The compositions of Śaṅkaradeva of Assam, of Umāpati in Bihar, of Bhāgavatanāṭakas and Yakṣagānas and the Kṛṣṇanāṭam and Kathakali of the Andhra, Karnataka, Tamil and Malayalam areas—all turn to the *Gīta Govinda* as the ultimate source and inspiration. In the whole history of music or dance, in any part of the world, I do not think there has been a creation of a genius of greater destiny and potentiality than the *Gīta Govinda* of Jayadeva.

The *raga-kāvya*, particularly of the *citra* variety, has been cultivated in the Tamil country, in the field of music primarily but sometimes with the intention to be performed as a dance-drama too. Thus we have whole *puraṇas*, *itihasas* and episodes thereof and stories on the lives of saints composed in Tamil in the form of *kīrtanas* in different *ragas* and *talas*: for example the well-known compositions of *Nandan Caritram* of Gopālakṛiṣṇa Bhārati and *Ramanāṭaka-Kīrtanas* of Aruṇācala Kavirāyar, and the lesser known *Skandapurāṇa-Kīrtanas*, *Bhāgavata-daśama-skandha-kīrtanas*, etc.

Such *raga-kāvyas* in one or more melodies were produced in some number in Orissa when there was a music and dance renaissance there in the 18th century. This was to be expected of a place where the *Gīta Govinda* was produced and where there had been provision made, at the temple of Jagannath, for its dancing. Puruṣottama who flourished under King Nārāyaṇa of Parīkṣhīmedī, associated with the writing of *Saṅgītanarāyaṇa* produced some *raga-kāvya* and Puruṣottama's son Nārāyaṇa

speaks in his *Saṅgītasaraṇi* of the two classes of the *rāgakāvya*, the *suddha-prabandha* in one melody and the *sūtra-prabandha* in many melodies; in the former class, he composed four and in the latter two, one on the *Ramayāṇa* and one on a Jagannath Temple festival. Puruṣottama composed three *suddha rāga-kāvya*s on the *Ramayāṇa* story.

According to Bhoja, *bhāṇa*, *bhāṇaka*, and *bhāṇika* constitute the singing of praises of the deities Śiva, Viṣṇu, Devī, Skanda etc. Bhoja's description of this type includes a number of music and dance details. It is to be in seven sections, employing one, two or more languages and danced in both forceful and delicate styles. Two noteworthy points found in Bhoja's description may be underlined: as the musician sings, he will go on saying something continuously (*gāyana-sahokti-yuktaḥ*) and some speech appears to be necessary to explain its name, *bhāṇa*. The other point is that things difficult to dance or interpret in *abhinaya*, intricacies of *tāla* and rhythm—all these are to be displayed in the *bhāṇa*. The same type would be *bhāṇika*, if the subject of the *stotra* is God Viṣṇu, with softer dances called forth probably by the love sports of the Lord; nine or ten themes in equal number of sections may be composed into the *bhāṇika*.

That this type called *bhāṇa* is definitely a music and dance composition is confirmed by Abhinavagupta who says that instrumental music is to dominate in the *bhāṇa*. Regarding however the subject matter of the *bhāṇa*-composition, the specimens known to Abhinavagupta were of didactic nature, inculcating principles of *dharma* etc., through symbolic descriptions of animals—lion, boar, bear, buffalo—much in the same manner as the *anyāpadeśa* verses known in poetry; when these animal-examples are used, they are featured in themes of the form of continuous animal-fable, thus necessitating imitation of the gait and other activities of the animals. This would then have been very valuable indeed as affording considerable scope for the different animal-gaits set forth by *Nāṭya Śāstra* texts in the chapter on *gati*. The animal-gaits, it is added, are displayed by the lady dancer who figures here. The scope for speech is also included

in the definition to justify the title *bhāṇa*. From Abhinavagupta's mention of Man-Lion (Narasimha) and Boar (Sukara) and Bhoja's reference to exploits of Hari, we may be tempted to link these up to some imitations of the incarnations of Viṣṇu. I have dwelt on the *bhāṇa* at some length, as I understand from Sri J. C. Mathur that there is a type called *bhāṇa* still surviving round about Mathura.

The *goṣṭhī*, which is known from Bhoja only, depicts Kṛṣṇa's exploits in killing the demons. *Hallīsaka*, more widely known in literature, is a circular dance, in the manner of Kṛṣṇa's dance with the *gopīs*. The circular dance of girls is one of the most widely prevalent folk dances found in all parts of the country; the *garbha* of Gujerat, the *acciarkuravai* of ancient Tamil classics, the *kummi*, *kolāṭṭam* and *kudichuppaṭṭu* of Tamilnad and the *kaikoṭṭikkali* of Malabar are all varieties of *hallīsaka*.

The *nartanaka* is important, as it is just the well-known dance-recital by a single danseuse, such as we have in the Bharata Nāṭya. This is the same as the *lāsya* described by Bharata himself. Bhoja underlines three features of this: slow tempo and elegant movement, and the *abhinaya* of transitory moods of the *rasas*. According to him *samyā*, *dvipadī*, *chhalika* are only forms of this. *Samyā* means the short multi-coloured span-long sticks that girls use for striking the rhythm-beat in their dance, from which the dance gets that name; *samyā* also means one of the hand-actions in beating the palms for keeping *tala*; therefore, as a dance, *samyā* is done by girls either keeping *tala* with sticks, in which case it will be *daṇḍa-rāsaka* or the *kolāṭṭam* of Tamilnad, or with their palms in which case it will be the *kudichuppaṭṭu* of Tamilnad, and the *kaikoṭṭikkali* of Malabar. *Dvipadī* is the name of a *laya*, a music composition and dance based on it. *Chhalika*, as already said, is mentioned by Kalidāsa as learnt by Mālavikā; Kalidāsa says in his play that it was associated with the lady Śarmisthā as its author, that it had four parts or themes and that it was very difficult to perform. Mālavikā performs the fourth part of its theme which depicts *pūrvānūrāga-vipralambha* or longing before the first union. Later commentators fall back on

the word *chhalita*, its possible derivation from *chhala* and so on, or on Malavika's dance itself and offer no enlightening comments on it. The only source, apparently early, which gives a rather elaborate description is the *Harivaṃśa*, but no clear picture of the distinct form of this dance could be had from the text. From more than one context here, we learn that it is primarily the name of a piece of music, from which the dance employing that music gets the name.

The *prekṣanaka* was a show which took place in the open on streets, amidst a gathering of people, in quadrangles, and temple courtyards; it was performed by a number of persons. Bhoja gives also the performance of the *Burning of Cupid* as an example. Even now, at the time of Holi, in Maharashtra, and under its influence in Tanjore District in Tamilnad, the episode of the *Burning of Cupid* is enacted in public, employing a Marathi song-type called *lavani* in which one party contends that Manmatha had been destroyed and another that Manmatha still lived. *Prekṣanaka* has also been used by later authors to denote any kind of irregular stage-performance, not conforming to any of the well-defined types.

While all ancient dance, *tāṇḍava* and *lāsya*, was associated with Śaivism, later dance traditions had come under the sway of Kṛṣṇa and his legends and sports. Already we noticed that the types of *gosthī* and *hallisaka* were associated with Kṛṣṇa and the *gopīs*. *Rasa* is the type *par excellence* with which Kṛṣṇa and the *gopīs* are connected. *Rasa* is also a dance in a circle, by a number of women, sixteen, twelve or eight. The style is delicate or forceful; it is in indifferent *tālas*; in fact *rāsa* itself is a *tāla*-name. The women sing and dance but there is no *abhinaya*. They do only pure dance or *nṛtta* but what is noteworthy in this is that they execute many patterns. As they are in some numbers, they combine into different patterns and designs called *pinḍibandha*, *śṛṅkhalā*, *bhedyaka* and *latā*. The first is the dancers coming together and forming clusters; *śṛṅkhalā* is forming a chain; *bhedyaka* is breaking from the lines of the former and going into different positions and *latā* is formation like creepers, with

intertwining of the dancers standing in two or more lines. As one text says that the number of ladies in a *rāsaka* can go up to sixty-four pairs, wonderful patterns are possible here.

In the description of the next type, *naṭya-rāsaka*, Bhoja goes into further details about these patterns. *Naṭya-rāsaka* otherwise called *carcari* is done in spring and in honour of the King, for example, the one at the opening of the drama *Rātnāvalī*. *Carcari* itself is a *tāla*-name, but Bhoja mentions *varṇatāla* as being used here. The girls who do this in a body execute the patterns *piṇḍī*, *gulma* etc. First one pair of dancers enters and dances, then another and thus groups are formed. Drums, sticks, recital of rhythm-syllables, other instruments, all these are employed. The performance ends with a benedictory verse, making a reference to the Gods having danced thus when they got the nectar by the churning of the ocean.

Piṇḍī is a term already found in the *Nāṭya Śāstra* of Bharata in the description of the dances preliminary to the play proper, the *pūrvaraṅga*. *Piṇḍī* is here described as the *nartakī* executing the form of the weapon or the riding animal of the different deities, Trident for Śiva, Lion for Devī, Elephant for Indra and so on. In the same chapter, Bharata speaks of the patterns *śṛṅkhala* and *lata* and while explaining these Abhinavagupta says that *piṇḍibandha* means in general what dancers do by coming together; they can combine in two ways, the *sajātīya* in which the two dancers would appear as two lotuses from a common stalk or the *viśātīya* in which one dancer will remain in one pose like the swan and the other will be in a different pose to give the effect of a lotus-with-stalk held by the swan-lady; in *gulma-śṛṅkhalikā* pattern, three would combine and in a *lata*, four. *Bhedyaka*, Bharata says, is done with dance; that is, while executing the other types there may not be elaborate dancing in the form of steppings whereas in *bhedyaka*, regular dancing is to be done. Further interesting information given by Bharata here is that these patterns are achieved with the aid of (1) perfect practice, (2) some mechanical device, and (3) some armless seats or similar stage properties. Abhinavagupta however puts a different interpretation



A dance-panel from Amaravati sculpture

Courtesy : Govt. Museum, Madras

on this passage. I have devoted some attention to this, as there may be a wrong impression among some critics that Indian *lasya* is stereotyped, that there is no scope for group work and/or the exploitation of the pictorial possibilities here. That such compositions of pure dance with groups of dancers were done is known also from sculpture and I would draw attention in this connection to a frieze in the Amaravati sculptures (Madras Museum Bulletin, Pl. XIII, fig. 16); there are four ladies here, one kneeling in the foreground with another standing behind her, and both flanked by two others; the placing, the variation of *sthāna* and *karāṇa*, the symmetry, everything is so perfect—we may not be able to identify exactly the *karāṇas* here in terms of the 108 in Bharata, or of the *piṇḍis* etc. mentioned above, but this is one of the simplest and most beautiful compositions. (See illustration).

We lost ourselves in the labyrinth of pattern-dance while speaking about *rāsaka* and *nāṭya-rāsaka*. When on *rāsaka*-varieties, we might refer again to the variety already touched upon, the *daṇḍa-rāsaka*. In Act IV of the play *Karpūramanjari* of Rājasekhara of the *saṭṭaka*-class already explained as being full of music and dance, the poet introduces the *vaṭasāvitri-vrata*, celebrated in summer and as a part of its festivities, depicts different dances. *Daṇḍa-rāsaka* is played here by thirty-two *nartakīs*, and as these, with their steps and sticks in their hands close to the *tāla*, wheel round or cross each other, dividing themselves in two rows of sixteen, they form variegated patterns—*vicitra-bandhas*. According to a detailed Sanskrit extract in a Tamil dance-text in manuscript called *Śuddhānanda-prakāśa*, these patterns executed by them showed hexagonal and octagonal formations. The *Saṅgīta-samaya-sāra* has a long description of the *daṇḍa-rāsaka*; Pārśvadeva gives elaborate and varied instrumental accompaniment to this; cymbals, bells and *tāla-vādyas* like *paṭaha*, *huḍukka*, *mṛdaṅga* and *karāṭa*. Starting with a pair of dancers who entered first and then bringing on further ones, they went up to eight or more pairs; they danced facing each other and as they executed their elaborate dances, by

steppings and wheelings they formed different *sthanas*, *karanas* and *bandhas*. The *Nṛttaratnaṇḍali* has also a long description of *daṇḍa-rāsaka* and mentions that, in the place of sticks, the dancers hold also a fly-whisk, sword, etc. The *Nṛtyasarvasva* refers to dances of *deśi*-type with sword, piece of cloth, stick, garland, fly-whisk, lute and ball. Till recently, it is known, that Nattuvanārs fitted *aḍavus* and *jātis* to sword dances and trained their dancers doing *varṇas* to execute the same with swords; in the course of their movements, they would cut vegetables with the sword tied to the body of a girl lying on the ground; in the course of their footwork, they would at specific points of the dance, bring down their swords on the vegetables in a most uncanny manner, without causing any hurt to the girl bedecked with the vegetables; they would similarly go about their dance movements with pieces of cloth in their hands, which, even as they danced, they would make into a dove.

Apart from these, a *rāsakaṅka* is found in both Abhinavagupta and Bhoja and they quote from a composition called *Rādhāvīpralambha*, on the theme of Rādhā in separation, by poet Bhejjala.

We now come to a type, important in a different way—the *ḍombī* or *ḍombalikā*. Abhinavagupta refers to it several times and quotes from a composition called *Cūḍamaṇi Ḍombikā* by poet Rāṇaka, and perhaps from another composition also called *Guṇamālā*. The *ḍombī* is a type like the *nautch*, done by a single *nartakī*; songs are sung by accompanying singers, and the dancer, the *ḍombī*, dances. The difference is in the person of the *ḍombī*, and the nature of the theme. *Ḍombī* is a kind of drum and also a class or community of people accomplished in music and dance. The *Rajatarāṅgiṇī* refers to *ḍomba-gāyanas* and a *ḍomba-maṇḍala* consisting of one Rāṅga and his two daughters called *ḍomba-gāyikās*. The *ḍombakūttādis* were, till some time back, common in the countryside in the South, moving about with their women and drum and displaying their difficult rope-dancing. The *ḍombas* must once have been a community of people highly accomplished in the arts of music and dance. The kings used to

receive them or entertain parties of them and spend time seeing their dances in which they sang songs of secret love-episodes, of how such and such a lady in love fared and what her accomplice achieved for her, themes not far removed from those of some of the lower specimens of *padas* in Bharata Nāṭya. One important thing to be noted which makes for its difference from *nautch* and for its being a popular form is that the *ḍombī* does not interpret the words and meaning of the songs closely in *abhinaya*; on the other hand she does some action in accordance with the character and the theme, like the suggestive action of brows and eyes and some simple movements of hands such as figure in normal human activity and speech. The *ḍombī* concentrates on the song and the dance movements and poses she executes according to the *laya* of the song. During these dance interludes the *huḍukkā* drum is played as accompaniment, and Abhinavagupta says that in the vernacular this is called *cill-mārga*.

Two more *uparūpakas* or dance-compositions are mentioned by Abhinavagupta: the *preraṇa* which is said to be comic and the *ramakrīḍa* which is said to describe the different seasons. In a second reference to *preraṇa* along with *bhāṇa* and *bhāṇika* Abhinavagupta speaks of descriptions of animals and animal fables having a didactic import as figuring in this type also.

References have already been made to the *chalika* and *carcari* dance featured in the plays of Kālidāsa and Harṣa. The *Karpūramāñjarī* of Rājaśekhara is an interesting source of information and it describes dances other than the *lasya* and *daṇḍa-rāsaka*, noticed already. We may note them as they are quite out of the way and add to our knowledge about the richness and variety of dance forms; Rājaśekhara speaks of comic dance, and dance of women dressed as hunters; he describes a terrible type depicting *raudra rasa* called *Śmaśāna-abhinaya*, with facial masks of fierce spirits, emitting weird noises. Another dance done by the women here is called *yoginī-valaya-nartana-keli* but no details of this dance can be gathered from the description. To the accompaniment of the *huḍukkā* in rather fierce sequences and of

the *mardala* drum in soft sequences, another woman performs the *cillikarma*. *Cilli*, also called *cillimarga*, is, according to Abhinavagupta, what is done as pure dance in between the sections of the *ḍombī* already described. This vernacular name shows the popular character and origin of the *ḍombī*.

The *Bhāvaprakāśa* describes some *uparūpakas* not noticed by Abhinavagupta and Bhoja. These are *sallāpaka*, *silpaka*, *ullopyaka*, *mallika*, *kalpavallī* and *parijāta*. A few of these names may be traced elsewhere also but the variants in the names themselves and the descriptions, such as are available, give us no help to get a clear picture of these.

Having dealt with dance-forms that could be gleaned from sources which are of somewhat remote accessibility, I might turn now to those found in sources more accessible to general students of music and dance; the sources to be tapped now are of a later date, and if we follow a chronological order, they would, by steps lead us to the present survivals in different parts of the country. It may also be noted that while the folk-affiliations of the *uparūpakas* had to be traced vaguely, the series of dance-forms to be taken up now, disclose their popular origin clearly; they are, in fact, dealt with in these treatises under *deśi-nṛttas*. Another point to be noted is that from the *rūpakas* to the *uparūpakas* and from the latter to the *nṛtya-prabandhas* there is a progressive reduction of the *vācya* or text or speech till it is completely replaced by songs; a literary composition of some length or size gives place to short songs and dance-music. The music and dance treatises used for the collection of this material, some of which are still in manuscript, are: the *Mānasollāsa* of Someśvara, Music and Dance Section (Ms)¹, the *Saṅgītaratnākara*, the *Saṅgītasudhākara* of Haripāla (Ms), the *Saṅgītasamayāsāra* of Paśvadeva, the *Nṛttaratnāvalī* of Jāyasenāpati², the *Saṅgīta Cintāmaṇi* of Vemabhūpāla (Ms), the *Saṅgīta Rāja* (*Nṛtyaratna-kośa*) of Kumbhakarna (Ms), the *Aumāpata*, the *Saṅgīta Muktavalī* of Devendra (Ms), the *Saṅgītaḍamodara* of Bhaṭṭa

1. Since published in the *Gaekwad Oriental Series*, Baroda

2. Govt. Oriental Mss. Library. Madras. 1967.

Subhāṅkara (Ms)¹, the *Saṅgīta Darpaṇa* of Dāmodara, the *Saṅgīta Saramṛta* of Tulaja, *Saṅgīta-sāra-saṅgraha* of Ghanaśya-madāsa and several other works dealt with by me in my account of *Later Saṅgīta Literature*², as also some amorphous complications in print as well as manuscript.

The *gōṇḍalī* is the most important of the dances described in these treatises. From the *Nṛttaratnāvalī* of Jayasenāpati we learn that this was organised into an art form for recitals from the folk dance of the *gōṇḍalīs* of Mahārāṣṭra by King Someśvara of Kalyāṇ, after seeing a *gōṇḍalī* dancing before his camp. *Gōṇḍa* and *gōṇḍalī* mean hunters. Without a knowledge of this history, some writers had needlessly made *gōṇḍalī*, into *kuṇḍalī*, made her a divine damsel learning this dance from Pārvatī and propagating it ! In *gōṇḍalī* the difficult music compositions are to be eschewed and easy and delicate dance movements are to be resorted to. The danseuse may or may not herself carry or play the instrument called *trivālī*. She is to wear Kārṇāṭaka make-up, for Kārṇāṭaka extended upto Someśvara's capital at that time. The progress of the *gōṇḍalī* dance also follows the Kārṇāṭaka mode, starting first with *melāpaka*, then after instrumentation, going to *puṣpañjali*, and then the danseuse beginning her dance. Either the dancer herself or a supporting musician should sing after a course of dancing with the accompaniments of instrumental music. The singing should include recital of rhythm-syllables and end with *kalāsa* or *tīrmāna* as we might now say. After this she should resume dance involving various *cāris*.

The next important dance on which detailed technical information is given by Śaṅgadeva, Jayasenāpati etc., is the *peraṇī*, also given, in a slightly more Sanskritic form as *preraṇa*. The connection of this with the *preraṇa* of Abhinavagupta is not clear. The *peraṇī* is a gifted male dancer, highly accomplished in music of voice and instrument, and in dance, capable particularly of doing the *deśī bhramarīs* and *karaṇas* involving jumps or

1. Since printed from Calcutta, from a single ms.

2. *Journal of the Madras Music Academy*, Vol. IV and *Bulletin of the Sangeet Natak Akedemi*, New Delhi, Nos. 17 and 18.

utplutis. The most striking thing about him is his make-up : with a shaven head mounted with a tuft and a replica of a hooded serpent, with stripes of holy ash on his limbs, with ornaments of cowries, gold pieces and stones, and with a number of small bells on his lower leg, bearing in one arm a stick and in the other a fly-whisk, he enters the stage ; before him singly or in pairs four, six or eight associates of his in the same dress being already present there ; taking his stand in their midst, the chief *perani*, assuming the *samapāda* or *bhujāṅga-trāsita karaṇa*, shows himself to the audience on the rise of the curtain. His dance has five sections ; first, pure dance in both *tāṇḍava* and *lāsya* styles ; the next is *kaivara* or *kavīcaraka*, a poetic composition in praise of the king ; the third *aṅga* is *garghara* in which instruments of *tāla* are played along with the steps of the dancer ; this instrumentation and footwork has six or seven stages, involving different kinds of floor-contacts of the feet or *aḍavus* as we might now call them in the terminology of Bharata Nāṭya ; the fourth section is called *vikāṭa* and comprises the imitation of the acts of goblins, monkeys, etc., and movements of face, lips, eye, abdomen arms and legs, displaying contortions and exciting laughter ; the last *aṅga* is the singing of songs. I mentioned that the *perani* entered surrounded by associates, with make-up like his own ; one of these called *aṭṭa-boḍaka*, that is a *deśi* word meaning one with a completely shaven head, is said to indulge in some comic dancing before the *perani* arrives in their midst.

Side by side with this *perani* or *prerani*, texts like *Nṛttaratnāvali* and *Saṅgītasāraṁṛta* speak of a *pekkhaṇa* or *prekṣaṇa* or *preṅkaṇa*. This comprises six *aṅgas* of music and dance and involves *cāris* and *karaṇas* of *utpluti* type in *udhhata* or forceful style. It is danced by men as well as women.

Śivapriya is a form described by Jāyappa, and following him, by Kumbhakarna also. This is done by devotees of Śiva, men or women, wearing stripes of holy ash and *rudrākṣa* rosaries, standing in a row and singing of Lord Śiva. Quite a large number of *tāla* instruments are played, each member of the party playing a different one. They recite the rhythm-syllables, form

into two rows facing each other or circles, and dance in delicate style executing many movements. The occasion of this dance is festivals of Śiva.

Kollāṭa borders on circus. In this, with the sounding of horns, drums, cymbals, bells and the like the dancers walk on ropes on high, cutting difficult poses, mount high poles and wheel round on the top, play with edges of swords, endangering their lives in these movements, strut about lightly with heavy loads on their bodies, jump up into air like birds and brandish swords and other arms. Some of these were referred to above under the *ḍombikā* and *ḍombas*. During the Dussera festival, displays of some of these feats were common a short while back. The story of *Vivarta* in ch. 8 of the *Daśakumāracarita* describes the wonderful display of dancing with swords and the execution by the dancer of many *karaṇas*, of the *mārga* and *deśī* varieties. In the *Naiṣadhīyacarita* of Śrīharṣa and the poem *Hirasaubhāgya* there is a description of a party going in front of processions and making display of sham fighting etc. The same *Naiṣadhīyacarita* refers also to dancing on the top of the pole. These artistic displays of sword-play etc. are not later developments; they are very old. In fact, the four *vṛttis* and four *nyāyas* of Bharata's *Nāṭya Śāstra*, as I have shown elsewhere, were derived from sports like sword-play, javelin-throwing etc.¹ Dances connected with weapons still survive in the dramatic *baris* of Bali. Unfortunately the decay of national games and physical exercises, as a result of the rise of more fashionable Western games and sports, has had its repercussions in the field music and dance too.

Kanduka-nṛtta or the dance with the playing of the ball was a wide-spread and at the same time important form. The simple beating of the ball by the flat palm, as it springs from the ground, was worked out into a regular dance with the dexterous execution of different swift movements, turns, wheelings etc. This *kanduka-*

1. 'The Vṛttis', *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras. Vols. VI and VII. See also 'Sanskrit Drama and Performance,' *J of the Madras University*, Vol. XXIX. i.

nṛtta forms a motif in one of the stories of Daṇḍin's *Dasakumāra-carita* (of c. 700 A. D.) ch. VI, the story of Princess Kandukāvati of Damalīpta who was, till her marriage, propitiating Goddess Vindhyavāsini by performing before her on the day of the Krittikā constellation every month, the *kanduka-nṛtta*. In this dance which the Princess did before an admiring crowd of spectators, Daṇḍin says, she adopted the three tempii of *madhya*, *vilamba* and *druta*; she displayed very rapid to and fro steps also; plied both her hands, sang, sent the ball in every corner and made it come back, executed numerous and varied *kaṇṇas* and moved in circles (*maṇḍalas*), wavy lines (*gomūtrikās*) and other movements referred to as *gītamārga* and *pañcabinduprasṛta*; and displayed further many a beautiful game with the ball. The commentary refers even to a text on ball-playing as an art, called *Kanduka-tantra*. Describing this *kanduka-nṛtta*, Jāyappa refers to the playing of music instruments, *cārīs* and rhythm patterns of steppings called lotus, wavy line, serpentine gait, and circle (*padmabandha*, *gomūtrikabandha*, *nāgabandha* and *cakrabandha*), and soft and delicate actions. Jāyappa speaks of the *kanduka-nṛtta* as a group dance in which the women, besides beating it on the ground, threw and exchanged the ball and ran to catch it.

The *cindu* is a dance-form of the Dravidian-speaking areas taken up and set in a standard form in the Sanskrit texts, *Nṛttaratnāvalī*, *Saṅgītadarpaṇa* etc. The songs are in the Dravidian tongue (Telugu is meant) in a *dvipada* form, having *udgrāha* and *dhruvapada* only and bearing the name *cindu*; young women in fine dress dance this, to the recital of *yatis* or *jatis*; movements are graceful and there is *abhinaya* of the meaning of the songs. It may be noted that, in the movements, the *cindu* in common with other *deśī* forms makes a liberal allowance to heavings and swayings of the chest, arms and hip. According to the *Saṅgītadarpaṇa*, which speaks of two varieties of it, the dancer carries in his or her hand a trident, etc. In an anonymous and fragmentary text, printed recently from Jaipur as many as six varieties of *cindu* are described, and the poses occurring in *cindu* dance are also indicated. In the variety of *cindu* dance still prevalent in rural

parts of the Āndhra-Karnāṭaka border-region, there is indulgence in some obscene songs also, and sometime back, a legal suit also, arose out of this. In Tamil *cindu* is a dignified and beautiful song, featuring love or devotion and a particular votive offering and pilgrimage to God Kumāra and is accompanied by devotional songs of this class called *kavadi-cindu*.

Bhāṇḍika is a comic dance indulged in by jesters. They strike their palms according to *tāla*, recite the drum-syllables orally, and imitate lame men, dwarfs, children, monkeys, peacocks, water-birds, parrots, asses, camels, dogs, imitating their cries, speaking and disporting their limbs indecorously. Though obviously hilarious and intended for fun, these buffoons dance extremely difficult rhythms.

The *cāraṇa-nṛtta* is a dance contributed by Saurāstra; here minstrels sing beautifully composed *dohaka* songs in the local language along with recitation of rhythm-syllables and dance with forceful steps, wheeling movements and variegated hand-movements; as men go about this in *uddhata* style, women with veils covering their faces, dance in circle and in delicate style.

Bahurūpa is, as its name signifies, a pageant of the world; the varied forms, dresses and actions of different types of people are here portrayed. This is done by a quick change of dress, voice, etc.; he or she may also have assistants. Despite its avowed realism, it is stressed that this should not descend to the imitation of low characters. This is the same as the *paṭṭi-veśa* and *pahal-veśa* of Āndhra and Tamilnad in which a series of impersonations of characters in life by two actors, male and female, is presented on successive days of a week.

Ghaṭisiri (-sani ?) is a rather interesting form mentioned by Jāyappa, the correct form of whose name is not recoverable from the corrupt manuscripts. In this figures a *caṇḍāla* woman-dancer who sings with fine voice different songs including philosophical ones, *caryāgītas* to the accompaniment of a *huḍukka* drum hanging from her shoulder; she is supported by male and female singers and

G. 761



players of flute, horns, cymbals and drums; the subject of the songs is Śiva and Pārvatī in their appearance as the Hunter and Huntress; as these songs are sung and instruments played, she dances in the delicate style with graceful movements.

Jakkaḍi or *jakkani* is a Muslim dance-form with songs in Persian and bunches of peacock feathers in the hands of the dancers. The *Saṅgīta Cintāmaṇi* of Vema and the *Saṅgītasāra-saṅgraha* of Ghanaśyāma speak of a *pārasika mattalli*, or simply *mattalli*, another Muslim dance-form.

In addition to the *gonḍali* which has its origin in the hunter's dance in Dekkan, there are other hunters' dances also; Ghanaśyāma speaks of two such; the *śabda-nṛtta* and the *kurūñji* or *kurañji nṛtta*.

In the *Saṅgīta Darpaṇa* and *Saṅgīta Muktaṭali* we come across *yati-nṛtta* and *rāgaṇuga-yati-nṛtta* and *śabda-nṛtta* and the *abhinaya* of particular types of songs—all of which brings us to the threshold of the modern period and form really the fore-runners of the *jatisvaram* and *śabdham*, the second and third items of the Bharata Nāṭya programme. Many other items or songs intended for dance set forth in such works disclose features similar to those forming part of the dance recitals as we know them now or in the near past. But the works produced in these later times show such a variety of names and in-flow of vernacular technical terms and jargon from all regions of India—sometimes different names for the same aspect or its varieties—that it is a highly difficult task to collate all these and work out their respective connotations and relation to what survives now. When probably the projected scheme of a Dictionary of Dance and Music Terms is put through we may be able to classify this data to some extent. For example, the *madhupas* or *cāris* of different kinds inclusive of floor contacts, *urupa* or *uḍupa* which is of twelve kinds, *neri*, *kuraṇaneri*, *bhitṛā*, *citrā*, *natṛaka*, etc. the *dhvāḍa* of twelve kinds, *lāgava*, the *daru* which is the contribution of Andhra, *nibandha*, *lavaṇi*, *chaṭu*, *kaṭṭarī*, *kalpa*, and *vaipota* in Kannada and Telugu languages. The *Laysa puṣpāñjali* refers

to dances of Jaunpuri, Tirhut, Tamil, Telugu, Persian and Maharāstrian regions.

In the foregoing survey only the literary sources in Sanskrit have been used. An examination of Telugu and ancient Tamil literature would reveal many other forms which require to be collated with the material set forth above. It is not possible here to include the material in ancient Tamil literature, which has been collected by the writer.

These dance-forms which had a popular origin have in many cases parallels in all parts of India, and have even become part and parcel of our talk, thought and philosophy, for example, the puppet-play, than which man has not been able to employ a better simile for the way the Almighty controls and moves him. Some of these common popular forms are things that surprisingly persist from the most ancient times, such as the *karakam* or the sacred decorated pot poised on the head of a votive dancer, which came here from Tamilnad for one of the Republic Day Festivals of Folk Dances, is something which goes through the *Upaniṣad* to early Vedic times, when as part of the sacrifice and at the end of the *māṛjālī*-act, eight servant maidens carried water-pots on the heads, singing songs to Indra.

What are the results of this long sweep? We know from this that the ancient Indian stage was rich and had numerous forms of performances in its repertoire. The art of dance was not static, it was putting forth new forms continuously. In the creation of these fresh forms, the classical authors took freely from popular forms and built them up in the classical idiom. The regional and popular elements enriched the dance art with their own contributions which were, far from being ignored, utilised. In the art of dancing a whole new section became a regular part of treatises in the later times devoted to *deśī* counterparts of the classical *cāris*, *karaṇas*, *lāsyaṅgas*, etc.

When we look for literary sources or authorities for poses and other aspects in current practice and attempt to identify the

latter in terms of those found in theory, we should, therefore, look as much among the *desi-karanas* and *desi-lasyangas*, as among the things said by Bharata or depicted in Chidambaram or Tanjore.

While all this intake of new nomenclature from different regions was going on, it is to be noted¹, there were two features which helped their smooth assimilation—one the underlying similarity or even identity, and the other the consistent technique of *nritta* and *nriya* with which they were harmoniously adapted and fitted into the framework of a national tradition. Indian dance is one more illustration of that genius of Indian culture which synthesised and evolved a pattern of unity in diversity.

1. See the author's "Variety and Integration in the Pattern of Indian Culture", *the Far-Eastern Quarterly*, U.S.A., Vol. XV. iv. Also "The Popular and Classical in Music", *Journal of the Music Academy*, Madras, XXVIII, pp. 100-6.

TWO MORE OLD FARCES*

The Kuhanabhaikṣava and the Somavallīyogananda

Dr. V. Raghavan

When we met last year at this same place for our Sixth Annual Meeting, we had Dr. G. Artola of the University of Hawaii speaking to us of the short plays of Harijivana Miśra of Jaipur, of the 17th century. He was working with me on those plays, and to his accounts of these, I added mine of one of them—the *Sahṛdayānanda*. In addition to the publication of these papers in the latest issue of our *Sanskṛita Ranga Annual*, one of these, the *Palāṇḍumanḍana* was also recently produced by us. Continuing this line of work, we may devote some more attention to these short plays coming under the category of *Prahasana* or farce.

I

The Kuhanabhaikṣava of Tirumalanātha

The *Kuhanabhaikṣava* of Tirumalanātha alias Ayyalunātha is represented by five manuscripts, two in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (R. 2361, 5224), one in the Adyar Library (Des. Cat. V. 1352) and two in the Oriental Institute, Mysore (Cat. I. p. 275). The author is Tirumalanātha alias Ayyalunātha, son of Bommagaṇṭi Gaṅgadhara who is evidently related to or came in the same family as Bommagaṇṭi Appayārya alias Mārapota, of the Court of Sarvajña Śiṅgabhupala (1381-1421 A.D.) of the Recarla dynasty of Āndhra deśa to whom the well-known treatise *Rasarnavasudhākara* is ascribed. From the Prologue, it is learnt that the play was written for the spring festival at the Krishna (Gopīnātha) temple at Rājāśekharanagara, which may be the Recarla capital Rājācala or Rācakonḍa.

This, as well as the other farce, we shall speak about after this, uses Prakṛt for the ladies and some other characters. My

* Paper read at the 7th Annual Meeting of the Sanskrit Ranga, Madras on 14-10-1966 with Dr. R. K. Sharma, Secretary, Central Sanskrit Board, in the chair.

account now of this farce is based on its two manuscripts in the Government Oriental Mss. Library, Madras, one complete and the other incomplete, in both of which however, the Prakṛt is, as is common in South Indian manuscripts, badly preserved. The Chāya which is provided for in places is helpful.

The Prologue itself is interesting. In the customary dialogue between the Sūtradhāra and Naṭī, we are told of their stupid son-in-law who has suddenly torn his ears and has become a Khanpat yogin, abandoning his wife, their daughter. A lady fortune-teller (Vipraśnikā) is also brought in and there is a lively and realistic portrait of this folk-character (the *Kuratti* we are familiar with)—her taking a measure of paddy, her shaking the winnowing basket with her arm resounding with bangles, her singing in verse and prose of Gods and sacred places, predicting the union of the daughter and son-in-law and asking for her presents flower, pan-supari, and grain-flour and molasses (*kappariṣi*). The Sūtradhāra observes that the oncoming Spring season, if not fortune-tellers, will bring the separated pair together. For what is the fortitude of recluses or those in austerities before the Spring season?

This inducts the play proper which opens with the last-mentioned character, a recluse. Ātmayoni, with his pupil Dāmodara, enters. The pupil Dāmodara who enters first reveals that the previous evening his Guru went for worship to the temple of Gopīnātha, and seeing there the dancing girl Candrarekhā, became enamoured of her and has since been conducting himself in an unbecoming manner. Himself being the most trustworthy pupil, the Teacher had laid on him the burden of bringing the two together. Unfortunately, the situation was difficult as Candrarekhā was in the custody of a Muhammedan, Ahmed Khan, the umbrella-bearer of the King; but the Teacher would not mind the depletion of the Maṭh treasury for achieving his end. The pupil pities the perverse infatuation of his Teacher for the fickle dancing girl, ignoring Saṅkarakaśikī, a lady pupil long attached to him. Enter Saṅkarakaśikī desiring to know from the male co-pupil the cause of the Teacher's malady. She is also a member of the

sect, clean-shaven, dressed in spotless white and robust in body. She knew that the Teacher's new infatuation is for one Candrarekhā, for he has already started calling others, like herself, by Candrarekhā's name. He even pushed aside the *Sālagrāma* etc. of his pūjā and started drawing on the wooden seat of the Deity the figure of the dancing girl. She is all the more angry with him, as he had enticed her from her home and mother while she was yet a girl. If the Muslim Ahmed Khan would only come to know of this, he would make her Teacher shudder before him. Having been with this Teacher from her young days, she lets out to Dāmodara, the more recent pupil, a secret about their Teacher, namely that he is not really an orthodox recluse; he was really a Jain Śādhu who fled from the Jain Sangha afraid to pluck out his hair, and without any one as his proper Guru, and calling himself Ātmayoni, a name ironically enough correct (meaning as it does an upstart), he has been masquerading as an orthodox Sannyāsin. Dāmodara, although surprised at his Teacher's fraud, comforts himself and Śaṅkarakaṣikī that himself as well as the other pupil Govinda are no better, that is, they too are not Brahmans proper and are just pretending to be so.

The pupil moves into the Math to take away the vessels to a side lest in the current state of his mind, the Guru might break them to pieces. The two think of diverse methods to bring round their teacher: they might tie him up to a pillar or Śaṅkarakaṣikī, when she goes to the temple to draw the Rāṅgavallī-decorations, might accuse the dancing girl as having brought about the downfall of their Guru and assault her; but all this is not possible; in the temple, several of the amorous fellows who would congregate would side Candrarekhā and belabour Śaṅkarakaṣikī. She could of course go to Ahmed Khan himself and report the affair, but that tipsy fellow might lay hand on herself forcibly. She then hits upon a stratagem: "I am stout and can well impersonate Hamid Khan, the Muslim servant of Ahmed Khan; in his guise I shall take my stand in the garden and when the teacher comes there, I shall threaten him and ask him to give up his ideas about Candrarekhā; I have only to hide my sundered earlobe".

As she is planning thus. the Teacher comes with his other pupil Govinda. He is waiting to hear if Dāmodara would return with any fruitful plan to bring about his meeting with Candrarekhā. As the Teacher has to visit the temple too, he goes to the garden to take an offering to the Deity.

Candrarekhā also enters the garden, with her friend Kaumudikā. Having come immediately on the sound of the temple bell, they propose to spend some time there collecting flowers, till their friend Kanakarekhā also comes.

This brings the recluse Ātmayoni and Candrarekhā together. After enjoying for a moment the sight of Candrarekhā stretching herself upwards for plucking flowers, the Teacher asks his pupil to make her aware of his presence there. The pupil Govinda accosts the two ladies and asks who they are, disturbing their Teacher's meditation. The two ladies offer to pay their respects to the holy man and bow down and touch his feet. Thrilled at this, the Teacher conveys his inner desire through Kaumudikā; anxious to help Candrarekhā to collect more flowers, he offers to bend himself to enable her to get upon him and reach the flowers on the higher boughs; then at the suggestion of their pupil he adopts the better course of lifting her up by his arms. However, as there are monkeys on the higher branches, he has to drop her. The monkey which first makes the Teacher drop the lady helps him later; for as it comes down, she is frightened and runs into the recluse's arms. The recluse blesses the monkey as his best pupil, for he has helped him to achieve what his two pupils had failed to do.

"I shall beat this red-faced monkey looking like a Muhammedan" says the recluse, when, as irony would have it, a Muhammedan comes on the scene, with drawn sword, shouting "Who is it who is frightening my master's beloved? I am Ahmed Khan's servant, Raja Khan, come to present to her his compliments with flowers and pan."

The recluse and his pupil withdraw into a thicket. After explaining to the Muhammedan, Candrarekhā and Kaumudikā

enter the temple for service. The Muhammedan agrees to their going and proposes to stay in the garden and drive off the monkey. Unfortunately the recluse has hidden himself in the same thicket which the Muhammedan started beating for driving away the monkey. The dilemma and agony of the Teacher are taken by the pupil as a fit punishment for his unnatural infatuation for the dancing girl. As the monkey is luckily caught by some one and bound, the Muhammedan departs and the recluse heaves a sigh of relief and comes out of his hiding.

Some of the beatings on the bush by the Muhammedan had landed on the recluse inside and produced swelling on his face and body. When the pupil remarks about these, the Teacher alleges that some wild ants etc. had bitten him. "Enough with flowers; I am afraid another Muhammedan may come". No sooner had the recluse said these words, there arrived Hamid Khan, that is, Śaṅkarakaśikī in the guise of a Muhammedan servant of Ahmed Khan and searching for her Teacher. The Teacher is frightened and as if not seeing him, she swears, "I shall cut the recluse doting on my master's beloved". A scuffle follows between Śaṅkarakaśikī in disguise on one side and the pupil and the Teacher on the other. Her sword and the Teacher's stick and the wooden sandals which the pupil takes up cross in the fray. In the end, afraid of being found out, Śaṅkarakaśikī retreats but not before sufficient suspicion had been aroused in the Teacher and pupil about her identity. The Teacher surmises that Śaṅkarakaśikī might have adopted this plan as a vengeance against his turning his love from her to Candrarekhā. The Teacher stays behind and commissions Govinda to go and meet his co-pupil Dāmodara and urge him to arrange for a meeting with Candrarekhā.

Govinda repairs to Candrarekhā's house and as he was about to enter, he sees his co-pupil Dāmodara issuing out of her house. Govinda asks if any arrangement for the meeting has been made. Dāmodara says that there has been a quarrel over Candrarekhā between Ahmed Khan and one Dastur Khan and from that time onwards her parents have been vigilant. No

amount of money could tempt them. Dāmodara has therefore hatched a plan. In the evening, Ahmed Khan is usually in a drunken state. Their Teacher could be dressed like the female companion Kaumudikā, with her own ornaments, and thus smuggled into Candrarekhā's house. Then the Teacher and Candrarekhā could meet in the garden inside. The two pupils are also to dress themselves as other Cetiis and assist in the plan.

Evening sets in and the first to arrive is Ahmed Khan, reeling and dancing in his drunken state.

Then enters the Teacher dressed as Kaumudikā. The pupils warn him of Ahmed Khan's presence. They make their Teacher shroud his face and hasten inside. The obvious thing, which they were afraid of, now happens. Thinking that it is Candrarekhā who is somewhat cross and turning away from him, Ahmed Khan comes up to the Teacher in lady's robe to entreat and appease her; he embraces that figure and dragging it, starts dancing. The shocked Teacher calls out "Nārāyaṇa, Nārāyaṇa" and the intoxicated Muhammedan offers his partner the pan-juice from off his mouth. The recluse turns aside and not knowing what to do, mutters more prayers. Finding the partner not dancing, he administers some knockings on the head and says affectionately "You perverse danseuse! Now you do some of your beautiful dance." The dismayed Teacher executes some dance and the pupils laugh and lament aside. Ahmed Khan goes to the next stage and having himself drunk some wine gives its remnant to his partner.

As time is dragging on and Ahmed Khan's intoxication may subside and things may be discovered to their great trouble, Dāmodara wisely decides to go to Ahmed Khan and break the news to him that he was dancing about not with Candrarekhā but with her friend Kaumudikā. Dāmodara adds further that finding him playing with her Ceti, Candrarekhā who is having head-ache is resting inside. Seeing his mistake, Ahmed Khan retires, proposing to come later, allowing Candrarekhā time to get over her mood.

Now the Teacher and his pupil are happy that they have past the mortal danger of Ahmed Khan. The eunuch now appears and announces that Ahmed Khan has gone from the place because Candrarekhā was keeping inside in anger and that they should all therefore remain quiet. The Teacher and pupils draw themselves close to a corner of the wall, fearing that the perverse Ahmed Khan may make his appearance again. At the corner, a scorpion bites Govinda and from his cry, the eunuch comes to know of this party including the Teacher in female guise. They offer some excuse, escape his attention and even get his permission to go in.

The Teacher congratulates the pupils on their resourcefulness in managing to get him inside the house of Candrarekhā. They go to the garden inside and there, in a short while Candrarekhā comes with her maid Cakorikā. She checks up with her maid if it is true that the Teacher, coming in the guise of Kaumudikā, was held up at the entrance-chamber by Ahmed Khan, made to dance, knocked on the head and so on. Cakorikā confirms all this, having been an onlooker through the window.

In the garden they first catch sight of Dāmodara who was in the guise of Mādhavikā, the maid who arranges Candrarekhā's flowers, perfumes etc. As she has been delaying obviously, Candrarekhā orders that she might be tied up with a creeper and beaten; but when the Ceṭīs begin to do so, they discover it is really Dāmodara in Mādhavikā's guise. Dāmodara then informs Candrarekhā that his Teacher was sitting on a platform within the bower.

Candrarekhā approaches the bower and bows to the Teacher. As he pronounces his blessing with "Nārayaṇa, Nārāyaṇa", Candrarekhā observes that he should rather chant 'Kandarpa, Kandarpa'. They all squat down and remove their disguises. After the strain of going through their plan to get in, they all now relax; almost bare-bodied, thanks to his minimum recluse-clothing, the Teacher is happy as Candrarekhā attends upon him with sandal etc. Following Candrarekhā's precept, he now

chants "Kandarpa, Kandarpa" instead of "Nārāyaṇa". After sandal, the series flowers, pan etc. goes on. The beatified teacher asks the pupil how he looks; one pupil compares him to a decorated monkey and another to "Arjuna-Sannyāsin". The moon is up now and it is time for the pupils who have successfully contrived all this to retire. Dāmodara does so after telling his Teacher that as the night-guards who keep vigil usually fall asleep in the early hours of the morning, it should be easy for the Teacher to slip out. The Teacher thanks and blesses the pupil.

With a simple and elegant style, Tirumalanātha gives excellent descriptions of the female form, of Spring season, of flower and creeper in the garden and of the moon. The theme strings together a number of comic situations, employing more than once the machinery of disguise, particularly with a change of sex, all these situations however hung on the main string of the Teacher's desire and the pupil's effort to contrive the meeting of the Teacher and the courtesan. The novel feature of Tirumala's farce is of course his introduction for the first time of Muhammedan characters. Apart from depicting a false recluse the title character-whose main preoccupation is the penultimate *puruṣārtha* instead of the ultimate one, the style and diction of the play, it must be said, does not show any coarseness.

II

The Somavalliyogānanda of Dīṇḍimakavisārvabhauma Aruṇagirinātha

The *Somavalliyogānanda* is a *Prahasana* available in five manuscripts, one in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscript Library (R. 1611 (b)), two in the Sarasvati Mahal, Tanjore (Nos. 4637-8), one in the Oriental Institute, Mysore (Catalogue I. p. 287) and one in the India Office, London (No. 8216). It is said to have been printed in 1895 by Paravastu Venkataranganathasvami, presumably on the basis of a manuscript in their family collection, the Arsha Library, at Vizagapatam, noted in their list as *Dīṇḍima-prahasana*. This printed copy is no

available and the present account is based on the Madras manuscript of the play (R. 1611 (b)).

The author belongs to the celebrated family of Arunagirināthas of Mullundrum village near Tiruvannāmalai, patronised by the Vijayanagar kings and well-known in the 15th-16th centuries in the literary history of Vijayanagar. On our author who flourished about A. D. 1422-50, I have given a detailed note in Vol. I of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, p. 276. He was the son of Rajanātha and Abhirāmanāyikā and grandson through daughter of Diṇḍimaprabhu, and grandson through son of Sabhāpati who defeated a poet named Nāgaṇa and the poets of the Ballāla court and gained thereby the title of Kavi-prabhu. He gained the titles of Diṇḍimakavi Sārvabhauma and Birudakavipitāmaha and was father of Rajanātha, who wrote the *Saluvābhyudaya* Kāvya on their Vijayanagar patrons, and grandfather of Kumāra Diṇḍima Kavirājaraja Arunagirinātha who wrote the play *Virabhadravijaya Dima*. Our Arunagiri wrote three works : the *Mahanāṭakasūktisudhanidhi*, the *Rāmābhyudaya* Kāvya and the *Prahasana* we have now taken up. He wrote also probably many panegyric poems for the royal patrons of their family, for one of his titles refers to him as *Biruda-kavi-pitāmaha*. It is in the prologue to the *Prahasana* we are to review now that we have most of these interesting historical data about the author and his family. The *Mahanāṭakasūktisudhanidhi* is inscribed by him in the name of his royal patron Devarāya II or Immaḍi Devarāya (1422-40 A. D.) and it is this king who figures as Devarāja in the *Bharatavākya*-benediction at the end of our *Prahasana*.

The farce takes its name after a recluse (*Maskarin*) named Yogānanda and a lady named Somavallī. The main incident relating to their clandestine and illicit love comes towards the end of the play. In the former part of the play, Yogānanda, whose own false outer robes and amorous inner inclinations are made sufficiently clear, is presented as a witness to a sequence of scenes featuring, among others, fellow-recluses of other religious persuasions, Jain and Kāpālīka, and their involvements with women.

The scene is laid at dawn on the banks of Tungā river in the Vijayanagar Capital, not far away from the Virupākṣa temple. Enter the recluse Yogananda with his pupil, recalling the meeting with Somavallī. He asks his pupil if she bears love towards him and as to how they could come together. The pupil comforts the Teacher that she is in love and would herself fulfil his desire; and assures his own help in the matter.

The first to arrive then is the lame Brahman Dāmodara Bhaṭṭa, with a walking stick in one hand and a book in the arm-pit; he laments that he entertained a guest the previous day with the result that the guest walked away with his wife. It is not so much the elopement or her misconduct, to which he has been accustomed, that matters; but he has been planning to perform a sacrifice and it has been hindered by her going away in this manner. A costly expiation is proposed.

There is a hubbub now in the street. A young merchant Vasantadatta, a courtesan Kāmavallī and a barber are seen. Kāmavallī had proved faithless and Vasantadatta, in his anger, had decided to punish her by asking the barber to give her a complete shave.

The next person to come on the scene is a farmer whose wife is clever enough even to hide her paramours from her husband's view

Enter then a Digambara Jain and a Ceṭī. The latter is Kāmavallī, bawd of a merchant named Maṇikiraṇa, and mistress of a Kāpālīka. The depravity of the Digambara Jain is described, as also Kāmavallī's audacious behaviour. But soon the Kāpālīka arrives; he is greatly intoxicated and afraid of him, Yogananda shrouds himself in his orange robe; unfortunately the Kāpālīka mistakes him for his mistress and hugs him. Yogananda enlightens the Kāpālīka of his mistress' conduct. He then pursues the Digambara Jain who tries to run away. The Kāpālīka sets his dog on him and holds him. The Jain falls at the Kāpālīka's feet and the liberal distribution of liquor by the Ceṭī neutralises the animosity. In the tipsy state, the Kāpālīka

decides to go to the Candika temple to perform his dance before the Goddess.

It is noon time now. Yogananda and his pupil move to a grove on the river-side. As Yogānanda's thoughts go to Somavallī, she enters, equally eager to meet him. The two forget each other and as they begin embracing, the pupil warns them that pilgrims are passing by, on their way to the temple. They then engage themselves for the whole afternoon in ingenious sexual talk, employing the terminology of different Śāstras, grammar, Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta.

Evening sets in. The moon rises. Yogānanda dresses himself as a clandestine lover, and with sword in hand proceeds to the tryst to meet Somavallī. To the same spot Somavallī also goes in male-guise, with sword in hand. The two see each other's figure hazily and start shouting at each other, taking the other to be a real armed male. Somavallī shouts that she is Bhadrakālī, and would go in for the other's blood.

The city guards who were going round hear the shout and come in to save the person or persons whom Bhadrakālī is going to overpower. They also pray to the Goddess that as the King was propitiating her every day, she might leave harassing the people. Realising the difficult situation that was developing, Somavallī reveals her identity to Somānanda and the two anxiously exercise their minds as to how they could escape from the city guards. They even think of each putting an end to the other with the sword or of committing suicide.

The city guards Sūlamitra and party have now approached them. The pupil desiring to prevent further trouble, reveals that there is no Bhadrakālī at all, that the lady was Somavallī, daughter of the court priest Yajñadatta and wife of Mādhava-bhaṭṭa and that the other person was his teacher Somananda. The guards are however glad that they were able to catch Somavallī and Yogānanda whom they have been after for a long time. They want to take them to the king, as the king was rather partial towards her father Yajñadatta and by bringing this to the knowledge of the king, they could get rid of Yajñadatta.

The guards bring the two culprits to the king's presence and disclose their identity. The chief guard represents that it would be proper for the king to banish the lady's father and husband (Yajñadatta and Mādhavabhaṭṭa) and then punish her and the recluse.

The king thinks over and decides that the best thing to do was to make the recluse give up his *āśrama*, marry the harlot and lead a householder's life. The proposal is only welcome to the recluse who now praises the king.

The above summary would show that the play does not set any store by a running story or a striking comic situation functioning as a central incident. The poet handles the customary *prahasana* personnel, the depraved hypocritical ascetics of diverse faiths and the equally depraved women of professional and non-professional types, and the frank portrayal of the whole milieu of their illicit unseemly life. The coarse presentation of all this is common to the farces ; there are indeed some ingenuities which our poet works on these conventional things : there is, as already noted, a context in which the terminology of the different Śāstras is given a pornographic orientation (S's. 78-82, pp. 31-33) ; but what is especially noteworthy of this poet is his stark realism, his not refraining from description of sexual perversities, of all that goes on in this dark underworld, to which the complacent world shuts its eyes or over which it draws or maintains the curtain of double life. He reminds us of some of the latest American playwrights who are shocking the conscience of people by their all too open presentations. Aruṇagiri is a poet of great gifts and some of his images and descriptions of raw life and the dirty and the detestable strike one as those of a modern realist. Not only is his live imagination and fancy conspicuous when he makes his characters see sexual imagery even in sun-rise or sun-set or in snakes gliding into their holes or lotuses unfolding ; but also in his other pictures of the background, he catches not the usual objects and animals or their customary forms, poses and activities which conventional and decadent poetising had made stale and tiring.

Here are some of Arunagiri's powerful and original descriptions and pictures: the play opens in the small hours of the morning and as the darkness gradually lifts and light spreads, the poet greets the rising sun as the great Barber who shaves the heavy hair of darkness from off the oval head of the globe:

स एष समुदयति ब्रह्माण्डमिररोमावरोपणग्रामणीः प्रहृग्रामणीः ।

A little earlier, with a ridge of light, tinged with red glow, and darkness like a hollow all round, the horizon appears, says the poet, like the yawning mouth of a monkey with its gleaming row of teeth:

विवृतदशनकिरणावलीदरीमुखीव (वलीमुखीव) वेलेयमालोक्यते ।

The dawn is not a picture of sweet birds chirping, fine lotuses blooming or swans swimming around them on the river-waters; it is the picture of the crow performing its wonted *Kakasnāna*, splashing water over itself with its wings; dogs getting up from their sleep on ash-heaps and giving their dirty bodies a vigorous shake-up; and owls stealing themselves back into their tree-hole homes. (Śl. 23, p. 9).

काका मज्जनमाचरन्ति पयसि व्याधूतपक्षाञ्चलाः

श्वानो वध्मं धुवन्त्यमी च भसिताक्षौण प्रसुप्तोत्थिताः ।

... ..

साशङ्कं प्रविशन्ति कोटरगृहं क्षोणीरुदां कौशिकाः ॥

The whitening patch of east throws itself up like a bare piece of bone; the doctor of dawn makes all the glistening boils of the stars subside on the body of the sky; the long-drawn sound of the conch drags on like the wind that the harlots of the quarters (*Diks*) break as they rise from their slumber (Śl. 24, p. 9).

सन्ध्या शून्यास्थिलेखा मुख इव कलिता प्रागियं श्वेतभासा

नक्षत्रस्फोटपीडां शमयति नभसो वासरारम्भवेदः ।

कर्षन् शङ्खप्रणादं मरुदयमधुना मंथु स्रोतोत्थितानाम्

आशावेश्याङ्गनानामवशभर इवाधोमस्तसन्निधत्ते ॥

And then, there are other sights and sounds which you have and you do not take note of: there is the distant yell of the

jackal and the ominous howl of the owl ; on the left is the lusty ass with its waxing tempo of braying and in front, the dog urinating and taking its own time about it (Śl. 28, p. 20).

पेक्षार्शितमातनोति तनुते घूकः स्वयं घूत्किमां
वामं क्रन्दति हन्त गर्दभयुवाश्वा मूत्रयत्यग्रतः ।

This is the time when pious Brahmins at the river-edge do *Sūrya-namaskāra* and go on alternately bowing and lifting their heads, like chameleons (Śl. 26, p. 9). Only those who have closely watched these creatures on boughs and shrubs could appreciate the appropriateness of the description.

अधुना हि नूतनदिनाधिनायक-
प्रणतिक्रमावनमदुज्जममुखः ।
बहुधा बहुधाशनजनो धुनीतटे
बहुधा दधाति कृकलासखेलनम् ॥

Look at this evening, which you may all recall when the poet draws your attention to its constituents: the fishermen are returning home putting the stale fish in the baskets on their slings; on the way-side, the asses of the pedlars, having cast off the goods weighing on their backs, are rolling on the ground; and naughty boys take off their sacred threads, some leaving it on the banks and some tying them up round their heads, and take their leisurly neck-deep naked bath in the rivers (Śl. 83, p. 33).

निर्गन्धान् विनिवेश्य वीवधपुटेष्वायान्ति दाशा क्षपान्
श्रृङ्गाटे विलुठन्ति पान्थवणिजात्माक्षिसभाराः स्वराः ।
केचिदोघसि केऽपि मूर्ध्नि दधतो यज्ञोपवीतं चिरा-
दाकण्ठस्नपनं जले द्विजविटा नग्ना इमे कुर्वते ॥

THE WINTER'S TALE AND THE ŚAKUNTALA—

A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Prof. A. C. Subrahmanian

(Professor of English, N.S.S. College, Pandalam, Kerala)

A close examination of *The Winter's Tale* and *The Śakuntala* shows remarkable similarities in theme, dramatic technique, purpose and achievement.

The theme in both dramas is that of love, suspicion, forgetfulness, rejection, repudiation, repentance and final reconciliation. Leontes, king of Sicily, conceives a sudden and violent suspicion which develops into a frenzy of tyrannical jealousy and orders the poisoning of his dearest friend, Polixenes, king of Bohemia. Camillo, the minister entrusted with this villainous task, reveals the truth to Bohemia, and he and Camillo flee Sicily. He imprisons Hermione, his innocent wife, orders the baby girl born to her in prison to be exposed to death in some distant land and brings his queen to the shame of a public trial. Hermione makes a dignified appeal to his better sense and invokes the judgement of the Oracle of Delphi: the Oracle declares that Hermione is innocent, that Leontes is a jealous tyrant, and that the king should live without an heir unless that which was lost is not found. The king rejects this verdict of the Oracle and proceeds with the trial.

Then a messenger informs him that his son, Mamillius is dead of grief. Hermione swoons, is carried off the stage and report soon follows that she too is dead. The king is shocked by this obvious divine punishment and repents as suddenly as he conceives his jealousy. He lives in retirement for years grieving for his dead wife and son and the baby girl exposed to death.

Out of this tragedy, however, regeneration comes. The child that is exposed to death on the wild coast of Bohemia is picked up by an old shepherd though Antigonus who did the errand was eaten by a bear and the ship he travelled sunk in the sea with all its crew. The fourth Act opens after an interval

of sixteen years with a chorus by Time explaining the gap of time. The child exposed to death is called Perdita, and she has grown up into a most beautiful young lady. By chance or divine providence the falcon of prince Florizel, son of Polixenes, descends near the shepherd's cottage; the young people see each other, fall in love, and resolve to marry. Polixenes discovers the romance, and threatens to separate them. The prince and supposed shepherdess flee the land and go to Sicily. Camillo and Polixenes follow. By the intrigue of the merry rogue, Autolycus, the identity of Perdita is established. The friends are reconciled; the young people are married; and, to crown all, a statue of Hermione executed by Julio Romano comes back to life and the play ends in a scene of blessed re-union. (The statue is Hermione herself, who had kept away from her repentant husband out of respect for the words of the Oracle.)

Turning to *The Śakuntala*, the same theme is easily discernible. Duṣyanta, king of the Purus, goes hunting; by divine providence he arrives in the forest near Kaṇva's hermitage. He is requested by Vaikhānasa not to kill the hunted stag; the king graciously accedes to the request. They bless him and say that soon he would have a son who would have all his father's good qualities and who would be emperor in the land. Sending away his chariot and taking off his royal robes, Duṣyanta humbly enters the sage's hermitage. By a chain of lucky accidents he finds Śakuntalā like a fresh-blown flower in the very first flush of youthful grace and beauty watering the trees? Daughter of Menakā and sage Viśvamitra, she is an adopted daughter of Kaṇva and she can be married by the king. The scene of their first meeting and the birth of their mutual love is a masterpiece of world literature and vies with the sheep-shearing scene in *The Winter's Tale*. Their mutual love ripens into a secret marriage and the king departs, promising to send for Śakuntalā. The sage who was away on pilgrimage knows of the incidents in his hermitage by his spiritual powers. In one of the most touching scenes in this great play Kaṇva takes leave of Śakuntalā who in turn takes leave of the sage and also all her childhood friends.

trees, shrubs, nymphs and companions with whom she had grown in beauty.

In the meantime, all unknown to her, the choleric sage Durvāsa had visited the hermitage and Śakuntalā, lost in thoughts of Dusyanta, had failed to notice it. The sage cursed her and said that she too would be forgotten by him whom she was so deeply thinking of, to the neglect of the rules of hospitality. On being pacified by Śakuntalā's friends, the sage modified his curse, saying that when she produced some symbol of their union the king would recover his memory. Accident once again steps in when the signet ring, the Abhijñāna, that the king has given her slips into the Śacīrtha while she is offering worship. Therefore, when Śakuntalā is presented to the king, the curse of the sage operates. He repudiates her, but is afraid to break Dharma. How can he take to himself another's wife? How can he reject his wedded wife, if what she says is true? The dilemma is resolved by the king's priest, who says that the hermit girl should live in his house till delivery. If the child is found to have the marks of an emperor, the lady should be received as the queen. Śakuntalā leaves the stage in tears, appealing to the Gods and a miracle happens. A radiance in the form of a nymph descends on her and she disappears.

This news is received by the king with awe and wonder. Before long the police bring before him a fisherman accused of having stolen a royal ring. The man had got it from a fish he was cutting open. The king recognised it and memory comes to him in a flood: of the watering of the flowers, of the secret meeting, of the marriage, etc. He is stricken with grief and for some time it looks as though he was doomed to misery, having lost his wife and child.

But the Gods will it otherwise. The harshness of sorrow is broken by the song of Spring. Mātali, Indra's messenger, comes to take the king to heaven to fight against Indra's enemy, Durjaya. The demon is defeated, and on the way back they come to Mārīca's āśrama. There the king sees his son Sarvadamana and is reunited with his lost wife. Śakuntalā had lived in penance

and prayer, waiting for her lord ; no word of reproach escapes her lips. The sage tells her of Durvasas' curse and the reconciliation is complete.

This account of the themes of the two plays does not take into account a good deal of recent criticism on the last plays of Shakespeare. These have been the happy hunting ground of imagists, symbolists, myth-lovers and specialized critics of various kinds who try to take some part of the play and exaggerate its importance at the expense of other aspects. Lytton Strachy found in them a boned Shakespeare, a Shakespeare whose powers were declining. Other critics have found in them the perfection of Shakespeare's craftsmanship. In this paper the play as a unit, as a drama meant for acting, is considered in the light of a masterpiece in the same genre from the greatest poet of India.

The view of this writer is that the last plays are not the result of decadence, negligence, experimentation or desire to keep in the fashion or anxiety to provide a type of play suited for a particular theatre. They are the expression of the final view of life of a great artist, an awareness of the wholeness of life which transcends the exclusively comic or the fundamentally tragic but which has been fashioned by the Gods. We are such stuff as dreams are made of and our little life is rounded with a sleep. Ay, but the dream implies the dreamer, and His ways transcend the wit of man. All the world is a stage and all the men and women but players. Ay, but who is the dramatist, and what is the play ? It is the realization of this, a calmness, a serenity, a confidence that presents luck or chance or fate or accident as not inimical to man but as on the whole friendly to goodness, endurance and virtue and inimical to wickedness and evil. Virtue is in the end rewarded ; wickedness is transformed, forgiven and reconciled and regeneration effected.

Let us now pass on to dramatic technique. Both plays are tragi-comedies. The first part of *The Winter's Tale* ends in a tragedy. The king loses his wife and children and is left grieving. The fourth and fifth Acts bring in the element of youth, love and happiness, and the sins of parents are rectified by the inter-

vention of divine providence, good sense and good luck, and by the grace of the children. Similarly, the part ending with the report of Śakuntalā's disappearance and the king's realization of his grave error on finding the Abhijñāna is highly tragic. But redemption, rebirth and reunion come by the grace of the Gods.

Critics of *The Winter's Tale* have been very much exercised by the gap of time, of 16 years between Acts III & IV. There is a similar gap of about 5 years in *The Śakuntala* also. The trouble is mainly theoretical based on the supposed unities of time, place and action. Sidney in his *Apology for poetry* seriously complains of this kind of play. Sidney wrote before Shakespeare's plays were staged and Dr. Johnson sensibly remarks that if a man in the audience could imagine that a day had passed in two hours, he could as well imagine that years had passed. In other words, this objection disappears in actual production. No one who witnesses the play is worried about it. There is a willing suspension of disbelief. He wants to be amused, and he does not bother to ask questions.

The other objection of Sidney, however, is that the first set of actors is forgotten and a new set of characters monopolise the stage. This would be valid if the illusion of the stage was destroyed by a violent change of atmosphere.

It may be noted that this difficulty does not arise in *The Śakuntala* when the idyllic scenes of love open the play and there is a gradual transition from earth to heaven.

Wouldst thou the young years' blossoms
 and the fruits of its decline,
 And all by which the soul is charmed,
 enraptured, feasted, fed,
 Wouldst thou the earth and heaven itself
 In one sole name combine?
 I name thee, O, Sakuntala, and all
 at once is said.

(Goethe)

The great German master sees in *The Śakuntala* the meeting of earth and heaven, earth gradually growing into heaven. That

is the range, the scope, the vision of Kalidasa, and that too is the vision of Shakespeare in *The Winter's Tale*.

Critics who find the last word of perfection in Greek or Shakespearean tragedy find it difficult to appreciate plays which do not have the vital relationship between action and individual character as in *Oedipus Rex* or *Hamlet*.

It may be remembered that pre-conceived theories are a danger not merely to the scientists and the statesman, but they are also a serious handicap to a critic. The critic is neither a judge nor one who has in his possession an infallible touchstone of art and poetry. On the other hand, he is a highly sensitive soul who shares in some measure the creative genius of the poet. He by an effort of imagination, understands, realises, feels, experiences and becomes one with the poet. So the muse of poetry advances her cause by the help of the poet and the critic. The critic is the poet's Boswell and he draws out his Johnson so that the different facets of his experience may be understood and shared. Each poet is an individual and each act of appreciation, a creative effort.

If this is realized, critics will not search for the features of tragedy in Shakespeare's last plays. They will realise that Shakespeare's mind is engaged with eternal verities, certain truths which are common to all humanity ; certain tendencies, emotions, impulses, reactions which are the features of every man. The young Shakespeare who played with words and juggled with plots, later got interested in character and the profundities of individual experience which brought out the greatness of stage. He realised that there was a special providence in the fall of a sparrow and strove to present an experience in terms of the fundamental human emotions, the *Sthayibhavas*. Shakespeare got interested in Rasa and so naturally the emphasis shifted from plot and character to human destiny and human reactions to the world order which is essentially beneficent to man.

And that leads us to the question as to what purpose Shakespeare set before himself in his last plays, specially, *The Winter's Tale*. It has already been noted that the problem of forgiveness

and reconciliation, of regeneration after destruction, interested Shakespeare most at this period. In *The Winter's Tale*, Shakespeare presents a good period of time, with the scenes set in two different countries. The story reveals how time finds a solution to many insoluble problems, and when people pride themselves on their modernity it is well for them to remember that what is ancient now was once modern and what is modern to-day will become ancient in future. In *The Winter's Tale*, in this story of love and suffering, of strange adventures of loss and gain, of love and jealousy, don't we find kinship with the actors, however fantastic they may appear at first flush? In other words, Shakespeare, celebrates the triumph of time and the workings of a beneficent chance which leads man from error to truth, from darkness to light, from the death of hatred to the immortality of love and forgiveness.

In this view, this play is a treasure-house of marvels, full of strange adventures, great beauty and goodness, and above all the strange ways of Providence. The jealousy of Leontes is accordingly a sudden and strange affliction as surely as fate led Oedipus to murder and incest. Adverse fate makes Leontes persist in his tyranny, persecute his wife, send his daughter to death, and defy even the Oracle of Delphy. Then the reversal starts with the news of the death of Mamillius, the report of Hermione's demise, the change of heart in the king who repents. Then fate has its victims in the ship's crew and in Antigonus. Most marvellous of all, fate turns into good luck, Perdita is saved, she meets the prince, the young prince falls in love, the old misunderstandings are cleared, and most marvellous of all, Hermione comes back to life.

This is romance, a marvellous tale of love, goodness and strange adventures.

How does *The Śakuntala* resemble this play?

Tagore, in a famous essay, endorses Goethe's view that *The Śakuntala* portrays the development of flower into fruit, of earth into heaven, of matter into spirit. But one cannot accept the

Brahmo view that earthly love is something unclean, that the first union of Śakuntalā and Duṣyanta marks a fall, that the young Duṣyanta is a rake, and that they both make up by *tapasya* for their passionate unrestraint in the first part of the play. On the other hand, the story of Śakuntalā is a story of marvels in which Gods, nymphs and men work together to bring into existence Bharata, the eponymous hero of India. By a marvellous chance Śakuntalā was born of Viśvāmitra by Menakā; the child was exposed to the mercy of nature; birds looked after the baby; Kaṇva adopted it. The Gods willed it that Duṣyanta should stumble into the hermitage during Kaṇva's absence and there see that marvel of youth, beauty, and innocence and fall in love with her. The love is reciprocated. The Gandharva marriage, the wonderful foreknowledge of Kaṇva, the marvellous send-off that the nymphs give to Śakuntalā, the grief of the sage, his blessing that Śakuntalā should come back to the hermitage after entrusting the kingdom to her son, Durvasas' curse, its fulfilment, the errand of Mātali, the final meeting and reconciliation, each event is strange, unexpected and fascinating, showing how the powers wanted to produce a great emperor in whom nymphs and saints, kings and emperors united. Kālidāsa idealizes the character of Duṣyanta, who, far from being a rake, refuses to receive Śakuntalā because he is not sure she is his wife. The central Rasa is no doubt Śṛṅgāra, but how large is the element of Adbhuta, wonder?

Parallels between the two plays are numerous; the scenes of idyllic love, the court scenes, the musical interludes, the scenes of final reconciliation. *The Śakuntala* presents a play without ugliness or evil; *The Winter's Tale* transmutes these. Death and destruction are avoided in the former; in the latter Mamillius, Antigonus and his companions die. But these are superficial differences.

The essential achievement in either case is the creation of a classic which presents whole life and presents it steadily, true to all time and marvellous in its beauty.

and reconciliation, of regeneration after destruction, interested Shakespeare most at this period. In *The Winter's Tale*, Shakespeare presents a good period of time, with the scenes set in two different countries. The story reveals how time finds a solution to many insoluble problems, and when people pride themselves on their modernity it is well for them to remember that what is ancient now was once modern and what is modern to-day will become ancient in future. In *The Winter's Tale*, in this story of love and suffering, of strange adventures of loss and gain, of love and jealousy, don't we find kinship with the actors, however fantastic they may appear at first flush? In other words, Shakespeare, celebrates the triumph of time and the workings of a beneficent chance which leads man from error to truth, from darkness to light, from the death of hatred to the immortality of love and forgiveness.

In this view, this play is a treasure-house of marvels, full of strange adventures, great beauty and goodness, and above all the strange ways of Providence. The jealousy of Leontes is accordingly a sudden and strange affliction as surely as fate led Oedipus to murder and incest. Adverse fate makes Leontes persist in his tyranny, persecute his wife, send his daughter to death, and defy even the Oracle of Delphy. Then the reversal starts with the news of the death of Mamillius, the report of Hermione's demise, the change of heart in the king who repents. Then fate has its victims in the ship's crew and in Antigonus. Most marvellous of all, fate turns into good luck, Perdita is saved, she meets the prince, the young prince falls in love, the old misunderstandings are cleared, and most marvellous of all, Hermione comes back to life.

This is romance, a marvellous tale of love, goodness and strange adventures.

How does *The Śakuntala* resemble this play?

Tagore, in a famous essay, endorses Goethe's view that *The Śakuntala* portrays the development of flower into fruit, of earth into heaven, of matter into spirit. But one cannot accept the

KŪDIYAṬṬAM - ITS FORM AND SIGNIFICANCE AS SANSKRIT DRAMA*

Dr. V. Raghavan

As I look back, I find it a coincidence, worth mentioning on this occasion, that among the earliest studies I published thirty-four years ago are papers on various aspects of *Nāṭya Śāstra* and among them was the one on *Kathakali* and other forms in which Bharata's Śāstra has been surviving in this part of the country; and in this paper, I drew attention to the *Kūḍiyāṭṭam* and the *Nāṭāṅkusa*.¹ In the Drama Seminar organised in Delhi by the Sangeet Natak Akademi in 1956, which opened with my paper on *Sanskrit Drama and Performance*,² I again drew the attention of the wider world of theatre-lovers to the only surviving form of traditional presentation of Sanskrit drama anywhere in India, namely the *Kūḍiyāṭṭam* of Kerala. Subsequently I persuaded Sri J. C. Mathur, a great theatre-enthusiast, when he was Director-General of the All India Radio to come here, to witness a sample display of this art and to do something through the Radio to make it better known. A further effective and signal step could be taken by me when, thanks to the financial aid of the *Central Sanskrit Board* on one side, and the persuasion and help of Kerala friends on the other, I could, under the auspices of the *Samskrita Ranga*, Madras, afford an opportunity to Sanskrit scholars and those devoted to the arts of drama and dance in Madras to witness this art and gain a first hand knowledge of it. Sri Mani Madhava Chakyar and his associates came out of Kerala for the first time, I suppose, and presented at Madras on three nights scenes from three plays-*Subhadrādhanañjaya*, *Abhiṣeka* and *Nāgānanda*. In our *Samskrita Ranga Annual* (II) was also published a detailed article on this art by Dr. K. Kunjunni Raja, which

*Opening paper at the Kūḍiyāṭṭam Seminar on 2nd and 3rd June, 1966 at the Kerala Kalamandalam, Chiruterutti under the joint auspices of the American Institute of Indian Studies and the Mandalam.

1. *Triveni*, Madras, VI. ii. Sep.-Oct. 1933.

2. *J. of the University of Madras*, XXIX. i. July 1957, p. 28.

prepared the more serious students of Sanskrit drama to understand these performances. From Madras to Delhi and elsewhere, Sri Madhava Chakyar's tours and performances have proved an eye-opener to all those interested in theatre and the traditions of Sanskrit play-production. This is therefore the most appropriate time to have this Seminar on *Kūḍiyāṭṭam*, in which we are having four groups of participants - the active exponents of the art themselves; local scholars who have seen it often; and outside scholars and Sanskritists who have had opportunities to see and study it on the background of the large and long space-time sweep of the *Nāṭya Śāstra* and Sanskrit drama; and lastly votaries of theatre in general who are not only interested in its significance as a theatre-form, but also desire to get through it an idea of how a Sanskrit drama was enacted traditionally, what practical form some of the principles and directions in Bharata's text took and how the classical technique adapted itself when the art had to live among the people at large and had to be made understandable and enjoyable by them. As an old friend of the late poet Vallathol and sympathiser of the Kalamandala, and as a Member of the Indian Advisory Committee of the American Institute of Indian Studies, I am very glad that such a seminar has been organised.

As some persist in asking "Was Sanskrit ever spoken?", so also some may ask 'Was the Sanskrit drama enacted?'. The best evidence of its having been enacted is the practical nature of the treatise of Bharata, embodying teachings to the actors, and before Bharata's text the *Nāṭyasūtras* of the same character. A host of evidence is available in general literature bearing out the production of the Sanskrit plays. The plays themselves contain sufficient data bearing on this. When the art of presenting Sanskrit drama was perhaps at its peak in Kashmir, we have the evidence of the *Kuṭṭanīmata* of minister Dāmodaragupta of the 9th century A.D. who gives a detailed technical description of the playing of *Ratnāvalī*. So far as the South is concerned, we have Cola inscriptions, e.g. the one of A.D. 994 (130 of 1925) of the time of the great Rajarāja, granting *Nṛtyabhoga* for actor Kumāran Srikanthan for performing the seven *Ankas* of *Āryakkūttu* at the

annual festival of the temple at Tiruvāvāḍuturai in Tanjore District. The Cola inscriptions mention also the actor *Kūttaccāk-kayan* and the grants given to him, *Śakkai-k-kaṇi*. *Śakkai* has other meanings besides actor and although the word has been discussed by several scholars, and several old and new etymologies have been proposed, there is as yet no satisfactory explanation of the word. The *Bhavaṇṇaprakāśa* of Śāradātanaya was a product of the later Cola period and there, its South Indian author says that he wrote on the *Rūpakas* and *Uparūpakas* after witnessing all the varieties in Śāradā's temple, in front of the image of the Goddess enacted in the *Nartana* hall of the temple, by *Naṭas*.

आसीनां नर्तनागारे तां देवीं प्रेक्षकैः सह ।

प्रणम्य तैरनुज्ञातस्तस्याः पार्श्वे उपाविशत् ॥

त्रिंशत्प्रकारमिहानि रूपकाणि पृथक् पृथक् ।

नटैः प्रयुज्यमानानि भावाभिनयकोविदैः ॥

दृष्ट्वा स देवीं वरदां नाटयवेदमयाञ्चत ॥ Ch. I, P. 2. ll. 9 to 13.

A popular *Uparūpaka* form of dance-drama, employing the local language had developed, earlier than *Kṛṣṇaṭṭam* and *Kathakali* in Kerala, in South India as well as in other parts of India. But in all areas, the popular forms have a lineage going to the classical Sanskrit production. In Kerala, it is well known that the *Kathakali* or *Ramanāṭṭam* goes through the *Kṛṣṇaṭṭam* to *Kūḍiyaṭṭam*. The *Kathakali*, with its popularity, has overshadowed the *Kṛṣṇaṭṭam* and *Kūḍiyaṭṭam* but to the serious scholar and earnest student, the two earlier forms and the *Kūḍiyaṭṭam* in particular, offer many data of historical value, academic importance and aesthetic beauty and significance. Here is something, the only living source, from which the authentic traditional Sanskrit play production could be reconstructed, and given the resources needed, enthusiasts could endeavour at producing Kālidāsa, Śūdraka and Harṣa in a way different from the modern realistic style in which they are handled now in any part of India. With music, dance and *abhinaya* the ancient Sanskrit production as I have emphasised in more than one paper on the subject, was really an art of dance-drama, utilising fully the intrinsic and purely artistic resources of *Naṭya-*

dharmā. Although the plenitude and perfection of this display could not be seen in *Kūḍiyāṭṭam*, yet it is in it that one gets glimpses of the glory of the *abhinaya* of the Sanskrit play, glimpses which, aided by imagination and knowledge of the Sanskrit *Nāṭya Śāstra*, could help one in visualising how it would have all been done in the heyday of the classical Sanskrit stage.

The name *Kūḍiyāṭṭam* may be interpreted in different ways so as to bring out the various aspects of this art. It might refer to the fact that as against the form in which one person impersonates the different characters, here we have several actors coming together to enact their respective roles or as a corollary of this, full complement of all the four *abhinayas* are together availed of for the enactment. The distinction of *Ekaharya* and *Aneka-harya* is a fundamental one in the definitions of the varieties of *Rūpaka* and *Uparūpaka*.

As regards the date of this tradition of Sanskrit production in Kerala, available evidence would point to the 10th century A.D., the time of King Kulaśekhara, author of the *Subhadrādhanañjaya*. The common nomenclature of some Rāgas in the music of *Kūḍiyāṭṭam* with the *Devāram* music tradition in Tamil - e.g. Indalam, Śikāmarāma, Kaiśika - points to the same period. But the presentation should have grown and gathered increasing adaptations to the local milieu during the course of a few centuries. The critique of *Kūḍiyāṭṭam*, namely *Nāṭāṅkusa*, should belong to this later developed stage of the art. Towards the end of the *Nāṭāṅkusa*, the text gives among possible replies to its criticism, that the discrepancies shown are coming down for some time in their practice इमा विप्रतिपत्तयश्चिरन्तन्यः— which presupposes a certain passage of time for this tradition. Another evidence on this is the growth or prevalence of diverse practises among the different Chākyār-families in respect of adding a verse or omitting it or doing or not doing it or doing in a different manner,—a fact which figures among the criticisms of the *Nāṭāṅkusa*.

The most obvious feature of the *Kūḍiyāṭṭam* which will strike any onlooker is the free admixture of the local language,

a point included among the several criticisms in the *Naṭāṅkusa*. It is not so much the bilingualism as such, for that is basic to the very text of the Sanskrit drama in which characters speak in Sanskrit and the different Prakṛts. But it is the further use of contemporary local language. The historical and cultural necessity and significance of this as part of the endeavour to put across the Sanskrit play to the people at large and to educate them are obvious. But what should be noted is that this phenomenon is not isolated but appeared in different parts of India. In the *Parijatapaharaṇa* of Umāpati (C. 1400 or 18th century A.D.) of Bihar, the local language is used for the songs; and right from this, we have a whole crop of plays in Sanskrit-cum-Newari in Pattan and Kathmandu in Nepal. The *Ankiya-Nat* of the Sankaradeva tradition in Assam employs Assamese and Sanskrit. In the *Dhurvāgana*, the musical outfit of five kinds of songs, set forth elaborately by Bharata, there are two ideas which it is worth while for us to remember in the present context: one is that these are to be in *Prakṛt* and the other is, as I have maintained in my papers on the subject, they had to be composed, on the guide-lines available in the poet's text and verses, by music-composers forming part of a drama troupe and added to the text. It is in this light that we have to understand Act IV of the *Vikramorvaśīya* which has come down to us in manuscripts in a version fitted with Apabhraṃśa songs. This solves the question of un-orthodoxy regarding additions raised by the *Naṭāṅkusa* as also to some extent the discrepancy of an actor enacting a verse referring to himself, in the third person, instead of in the first, a criticism advanced by the *Naṭāṅkusa*. For we know from the surviving regional dance-drama traditions, particularly from the Telugu Bhāgavata plays, that when the entrance-song, the *Pravesikī Dhruva* or *Daru* is sung, the actor who is described, himself enters dancing to it and rendering in gesture what is described in it about himself in the third person.

To return to the use of Malayalam, the criticism of the *Naṭāṅkusa* would be proper in respect of the disproportionate length, vulgarisation, and introduction at the slightest pretext of

lengthy excursions into different branches of learning. The explanation that these have played a great role in mass and adult education and spread of Sanskrit and learning is of course there. There is also some justification when characters like the Vidusaka indulge in this, as this could be taken as providing comic relief. Comic interludes or improvisations in local language seem to have been resorted to in other parts of the country too, although no written manuals have come down there. At any rate, these should have been short and not matters of hours' or days' duration as in *Kūḍiyattam*. The *Naṭāṅkusa* cites in further justification of criticism that such vagaries are not introduced in the presentation of the *Śakuntala*. It is in respect of length, irrelevance and the splashes of vulgarity that the criticism of *Naṭāṅkusa* is justified. Otherwise, the vernacular interludes seem to have been prevalent in other areas too; for the *Bhāvaprakāśa*, which was written in the Kāñcī region, says (Ch. X. ll. 15-6. p. 311) that at the finales of song, speech etc., the *Naṭas* etc. may, for the diversion of the audience, do some comic interludes through the local languages.

विश्रामे गीतपाठवादेः सदस्यानां वटादिभिः ।

परिहासाय (वाः प्र)योक्तव्याः देशभाषाभिरन्विताः ॥

The printed edition reads wrongly : परिहासाय योक्तव्याः । It should read परिहासाः प्रयोक्तव्याः ।

It may be noted that as against the criticism of the *Naṭāṅkusa*, the reply is given in one place that Bharata's treatise contains *Anuyogas* or permissive directives to enlarge or adapt or extend the application of his directions. This is true but as the *Naṭāṅkusa* rightly insists, these should be done without loss of *Aucitya* and without *Rasa-bhaṅga*, that is, without endangering the requirements of proportion or propriety and without impeding the flow of *Rasa* or spoiling it by things in bad taste.

As I have shown elsewhere, the intensive treatment of the poet's text by the stage-artists enlarged the dimensions of the play and the production of a play had to extend in duration and

most probably only one Act could be presented at a session. This would also explain the prevalence from most ancient times of individual Act-names in plays like *Mrcchakaṭika* and *Nāgananda* in manuscripts as well as in treatises on dramaturgy.¹ Such separate Act-names *Mantrāṅka*, *Anguliyāṅka*, etc. are well known in *Kūḍiyattam*. A direct outcome of this is that when these Acts are taken separately, on different days, the continuity has to be given to the audience and the resume or flash-back of the story upto the Act on hand—what is called here *Nirvahana*—is required and a further development from this is new compositions of verses for the story recapitulated, including a new *Nandī* for the Act—all of which figure among the aberrations cited and criticised in the *Nāṭāṅkusa*.

In my paper on *Music in Ancient Indian Drama*² I have devoted special attention to the different ways in which this twin-art was harnessed to augment the Sanskrit production. Without going over the ground again, I might draw attention to the preservation of the relation of *Rāgas* and *Rasas* and *Bhāvas* in the *Kūḍiyattam* scheme, in whatever modified or attenuated form it may be; particularly as borne out by the emotional and thematic, rather than melodic, nomenclature in certain cases—*Ārta*, *Tarka*, *Duḥkha* and so on. The big pot *Mizhāvu* reminds one of Bharata's *Bhāṇḍa-vadya*, which was however multi-faced. The prominence of the preliminary drum playing in the *Pūrvaraṅga*-part is also very old and had given rise in the olden times to the Sanskrit saying 'Amṛdangam Nāṭakam', 'play without drum', referring to anything happening without its due attendant noise and hubbub, an idiom misunderstood³ by some unacquainted with dramatic practice as a reference to a lost *Nāṭaka* or a type of it called *Amṛtāṅka*.

1. See particularly Sāgaranandin's *Nāṭakalakṣaṇa-ratnakōśa* for a large number of these separate Act-names in well-known plays.

2. *Art and Letters*, London, XVIII. i. 1953, pp. 10-18; *J. of the Music Academy*, Madras, XXV. 1954, pp. 79-92.

3. Some regrettable papers have also been published recently under this delusion.

The *Pūrvaraṅga* was a very elaborate affair and included several items of religious and propitiatory significance mixed with all this music and dance. The full details of these became obsolete long ago, as the *Sahityadarpaṇa* says (VI. 27/28) : इदानीं पूर्वराङ्गस्य सम्यक् प्रयोगानावादेक एव सूत्रधारः सर्वं प्रयोजयतीति व्यवहारः ।

But in the regional dance-drama traditions, where the religious background is important, some part of the old *Pūrvaraṅga* survives. In *Kūḍiyāttam*, we have some elements of the old *Pūrvaraṅga* and it is necessary to understand fully the details of the preliminary dances here, the *Cārīs*, the *Gātīs*, and also the meanings and significances of certain dances bearing names like 'Yasi Yasi'.

It is, in fact, with the preliminary acts and dances called *Kriyā* that the *Naṭāṅkuṣa* starts its criticism and concerns itself for the greater part of its discussion. The question as to why, if it belongs to *Pūrvaraṅga*, it should be done by Hanumān after his entry is discussed at length. We may however remind ourselves that on the ancient Sanskrit stage, there was the practice of the character or characters of the opening scene of the play figuring in the *Prastāvanā*, as the *Sūtradhāra* and the *Naṭa*. In the two plays of Bhavabhūti, the *Uttararāmacarita* and the *Malatīmādhava*, the *Sūtradhāra* and *Naṭa* in the prologue announce themselves as citizens of Ayodhya of Rāma's time and Kāmandakī and Avalokitā and it is in the dress of those characters that they carry on the *Prastāvanā*. Hence the question in *Naṭāṅkuṣa* whether the person dances as *Naṭa* or as Hanumān does not arise, as it is all governed by convention. There is the more telling universal phenomenon of the *Bharata-vākya* which is uttered by a leading *pātra* in dress, but well understood as recited by an actor, *Bharata*.

Two points struck me with reference to *Vācikābhinaya*. In the scenes from three dramas which I witnessed, I kept the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series editions of the three plays and followed closely the dialogue spoken on the stage with the printed texts. I found that practically the oral and the printed texts agreed,

but there were some small differences here and there. It appears that for satisfying our scholarly curiosity we might as well collate the oral and the printed texts of the plays in the *Kūḍiyattam* repertoire. The second point relates to the recitation of the text by the *Chakyars* in a sing-song tone, the prose dialogues too being evidently correlated to some tune. The evidence on the musical accompaniment of the Sanskrit play, instrumental and vocal, shows that this was a continuous one, particularly the instrumental which kept up a background and tempo, but the instructions regarding *Paṭhya-guṇas* qualities of the delivery of speech, given by Bharata, do not warrant any sing-song delivery of *vacika* as seen in *Kūḍiyattam*. The *Naṭāṅkuṣa* criticises the adoption of a particular tone *Svara-viśeṣa*, with reference to Malayalam speeches; probably this spread to the Sanskrit part also.

I have kept to the last what I consider as the most precious part of *Kūḍiyattam*. The essence of this art lies in the *Āṅika-abhinaya*. Drama or *Rūpaka* is called *Vakyarthābhinaya* while *Uparūpaka* and forms of dance-drama are called *Padārthābhinaya*. The actor has first to show the whole *Rasa* or *Bhava* which is the *Vakyārtha* and then come to its break-up and interpret word by word, *Padārtha*. The *Vakyārtha* is shown prominently by the actions of the parts of the face chiefly by the eyes, that is, in terms of Bharata, by the *abhinaya* of the *Upāṅgas*. The second aspect of this *abhinaya*, especially of the beautiful verses which blossom forth on the dialogues like flowers on the boughs, is the improvisation. The possibilities of ideas and sentiments that could be drawn out of the lines, whereby the main idea could be enriched are unfolded and gone through in *abhinaya*. The very scheme of *Sāncari-bhāvas* and the detailed description of the *Anubhāvas*, and again the elaboration of the interpretation through the six stages of *Śarīrabhinaya*-all set forth by Bharata, show that this should have been the ancient and traditional way of interpreting the text of the plays. Although there are no old manuals of such *abhinaya* handed down in Sanskrit for the classical plays, we have some indications of this line of interpretation in the *Kuṭṭanīmata*, and

in the *Kuḍiyattam* tradition, we have actual manuals. This technique is quite familiar to the spectators of the well-known dance form referred to as *Bharata Nāṭya*, in which *Padas* especially are interpreted in variations, whose range and number are in proportion to the imagination, knowledge, culture and maturity of the artist. The third point which I would like to touch upon is one which the *Naṭāṅkusa* mentions and criticizes, namely, a character in a particular role, for example Hanumān in male dress, enacting the feelings and actions of Sītā, a female, not present, but indicated by a mere symbolic gesture of taking up the end of the garment. This would apply also to Rāvaṇa portraying the actions and feelings of Pārvatī, as also of Śiva. The unknown author of *Naṭāṅkusa* is no doubt an erudite scholar in Bharata's *Nāṭya Śāstra* but some of his critical observations will have to be modified. Taking the present case, the inapplicability of the criticism will be clear if we recall cases like Duṣyanta recapitulating before the Vidusaka the incidents of his meeting Śakuntalā in verses like *Snigdhāṃ vikiṣitam* and *Darbhaṅkureṇa*; and if he has to render these in *abhinaya*, he will naturally have, while being in his role and make-up of the male Duṣyanta, to display all the feminine *bhāvas* and *Anubhāvas* of Śakuntalā. Indeed it is this mastery of the whole art of expression that makes it possible for whole troupes of female actors, as the one figuring in the *Kuṭṭanimata*, or for whole troupes of male actors, as in all *Bhāga-vata*-plays, to portray successfully any role, male or female.

This brings us to the proper perspective of what to do at the present time with this art of Sanskrit drama. What is of intrinsic and artistic value and intimately fused with the text of the Sanskrit plays and flows directly from the ancient production technique as seen in Bharata or even later texts should be preserved. The digressions in local language may be completely left out, if this is to be produced abroad, outside its Kerala-home, and it is not necessary to venture on the task of translating all the *Nirvahaṇas* and *Puruṣārthas* into Hindi. The preliminaries could be confined to the first show or reduced to the minimum by drastic slashing of the number of prayer verses etc. They

may even be omitted except when some are specially interested in them. Music may be brought in tune with contemporary Carnatic or Hindustani style in its pure classical form and capable singers employed. Instead of the whole thing disappearing by its sheer prodigiousness, its sprawling out, and its overgrowths, let its essence be retained so that, by adopting its technique, not only the thirteen in its repertoire, but also several other classics of the Sanskrit theatre could be produced in the indigenous style all over the country. Our hopes are not airy, as the masters of the art who are participating in this Seminar are alive to the situation and willing to co-operate.

INDIAN CLASSICAL CONCEPT OF TOTAL THEATRE*

Dr. V. Raghavan

For its antiquity, the Sanskrit or the Classic Indian theatre had dramatic conceptions which are, on one hand, aesthetically sound and satisfying, and, on the other, would find acceptance among those in other parts of the world to-day who are evolving fresh conceptions of the theatre. Bharata, in whose name the first known full treatise on drama has come down to us, says that drama comprised, in main, four parts and called these *Abhinayas* or media of bringing the thing to the audience. The first of these four is the Word and Voice, that is, the text of the drama written by the dramatist which embodied the story and was spoken by the actors (*Vacika*); this included song and music. The idea of actors brought on the second, the Make-up and the other extraneous aids; because these aids were put on and/or brought from outside, they were called *Aharya*, implying the idea that, being external, they were dispensable; indeed, apart from make-up which is elaborately dealt with and was meticulously done, Sets and others Properties were mostly dispensed with, as we shall see in more detail presently. The two other modes of expression - for modes of expression these four *Abhinayas* are - come under actual acting; the third is acting in general, *Angika* (meaning 'belonging to the limbs of the body') and the fourth, a department of it, the *Sattvika*, that is representation of the physical and voluntary modifications that appear on one's body in tense emotional states, that is, the representation of tears, perspiration, becoming pale and so on, things which cannot be shown by an actor except by completely entering into the soul of the character, his situation and feeling. All these present not only the story and reproduce the situations, but convey to the spectator completely the emotions of the story and situations and evoke in the spectator his response and rapport (*Rasa*).

*Paper presented at the East-West Theatre Seminar, New Delhi, 24th to 30th October, 1966.

A complete drama should have the full complement of all these; deficiency in one of these reduces the status of drama as such. Thus when speech is eliminated or only one actor impersonates all characters, the presentation is classified among minor dramatic varieties or forms of dance.

In brief it may be stated that the above points to a type of the total theatre concept. But while ancient Indian drama went the whole length in this conception in some departments, in others it dispensed with those elements themselves and adopted in their place an idealist and symbolic technique. An element which they used fully and most effectively is music. In the text of the drama itself which was written in prose and verse, the latter representing the highlights or nodal or effective points, in the dialogue the classical Indian actor sang the verses, supported by the musician in the orchestra; a correlation of melodic modes and emotional moods and situations, which they were suitable to suggest, was worked out and this scheme was followed. A theatrical company included music composers who composed fresh songs corresponding to the situations in the text and in symbolic language, and such songs introduced a character, showed his exit, suggested a new situation and burnished further a current situation. The vocal songs were not the only music; in fact, the more important music was that of the instruments of which there were many - flute, string and percussion. Besides accompanying the songs, they also followed and underlined the prose-speeches and accentuated also mere action like walking. A scheme of instrumentation and set rhythms, tempo and measures appropriate to moods and situations was followed to suit the gait of characters according to sex, age, mood and situation.

I said Sets and Props were not used. Bharata laid an emphasis on the artist's own ability and his own intrinsic artistic resources and did not call in extraneous aids. Characters did not even carry small things in their hand like bow and arrow; the action of drawing a bow and releasing an arrow was shown; no mounts, vehicles etc. were brought on to

the stage. The limitations of the Stage and the difficulty of accumulating all these material aids were realised and the problem was solved by utilising to the full the possibilities of acting and miming. How did they manage the locations? Instead of providing painted curtains or bits for forests, hills etc., they conventionally apportioned parts of the stage - space as standing for the different locations as required and the actor came round to the appropriate places as required by the text and context. This was called *Kakṣya-vibhāga*. In addition to this, the song which introduced a character, contained a symbolic description which supplied the information as to who was entering, where and in what mood and form. In further realisation of the situation, the poet-author of the play had poetic verses and speech-bits in the text which also enlightened the audience about everything which spectacular sets and long stage directions strive to convey. Thus the poetic or lyric or descriptive portions of the text of a Sanskrit drama have to be properly understood on the background of the indigenous production - technique. All these, instead of merely pleasing or striking the eye or making things too ready-made for the onlooker or necessitating him to look into a hand-out of a summary or programme book, called forth his attention and imagination and cultured his mind and attuned it to the play in an effective manner. This avoidance of the Sets thus affected directly, as already pointed out, the technique of writing the text of the play; as in a Radio play, which is heard, everything including the actor coming on or his situation had to be orally indicated in advance and thus do we get the lyrical descriptions of Nature and the surroundings and of the poses and postures of the characters themselves as observed by other characters on the scene on whom they have repercussions of dramatic value. As spoken by one character, these passages of the text affect him and through him the audience which sees and hears him is affected.

A further refinement in the presentation is that, instead of mere realistic action, which follows automatically as the

concomitant of speech, close gesticulation or miming of each word, of the verse or the prose, was adopted. The pose of hand or movement of some limb or part of the face was precise and stylised and not casual. When a verse or part of speech was thus rendered in gesture, the actor-artist interpreted it, bringing out its implications and complimentary ideas, augmenting and enriching it by his imaginative improvisation. The acting was thus a commentary and the actor as well as the spectator were participating in a highly concentrated art which called forth the utmost attention and absorption on both sides. Together with the song and music of instruments on which the movement of the actor was set, this kind of enactment made the ancient Indian drama really an art of dance-drama.

The style of presentation and production described above was called *Natya-dharmi* meaning the conventions and the idealistic and symbolic technique which were adopted.

The ancient Indian total stage conception was thus a total conception in respect of the essential and intrinsic and purely artistic aspects of the play and not in respect of the other extraneous elements. For example, we may take the question of lighting which has assumed such a large place in modern production that playwright and actor are nobody before a stage-engineer and light-expert. If it is mid-day, for instance, the text contained words and the actor represented the whole situation of hot sun, scorched earth, perspiration etc.; the whole picture and the complex of the natural fact and the actor's reaction to it with the sort of gait which showed that the sand below was too hot for the feet, with his look at the sun above under cover of his palm and fingers, and with his wiping off of his perspiration-brought home to the spectator's eye and mind the time-factor, not by itself as something abstract but as related to a character in the blazing mid-day better than the high power bulbs and the switching on the lighting apparatus.

I have made my present statement of the Indian Classical Conception of the Total Theatre in a brief and compact

manner as I have written on the subject often. Those who are desirous of knowing this subject in greater detail may read the following published papers of mine:—

1. *Sanskrit Drama and Performance* — Paper at the Drama Seminar of the Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi. *Journal of the Madras University*, Vol. XXIX. i. 1957 — Humanities, pp. 11-29.
2. *Music on the Ancient Indian Stage* — *Indian Art and Letters*, London Vol. XXVIII. i. 1963 pp. 10-13; *Journal of the Music Academy*, Madras. Vol. XXV. 1954, pp. 79-92; *Bulletin of the Sangeet Natak Akademi*, New Delhi. No. 4, 1956, pp. 5-12.
3. *Producing Sanskrit Plays* — *Natya*, Bharatiya Natya Sangh, New Delhi, 1959, Spring Number, pp. 9-13, 60.
4. *Nāṭya Dharmī*, *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras. Vol. VII. 1933. pp. 359-75.
5. *The Aesthetics of Ancient Indian Drama* — World Theatre Special Number, Paris, 1956; *Indian literature*, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1. ii. 1958 pp. 67-84.
6. *Production of Sanskrit Plays and its Value for Contemporary Play-writing and Play-Production* — Bharatiya Natya Sangh, Delhi, Report of Seminar, 1961, March 31, pp. 53-7.
7. *Koodiyattam* — *Natya*, Bharatiya Natya Sangh, VI iii. 1962. pp. 21-3.
8. *Uparūpakas and Nṛtyaprabandhas* — Dance Seminar Paper — Sangeet Natak Akademi. First published in *Sangeet Natak* No. 2. 1965-66. pp. 5-25; again in the present issue of *Sanskrita Ranga Annual*, pp. 31-54.

KĀLIDĀSA, SANSKRIT DRAMA AND INDIAN THEATRE*

Dr. V. Raghavan

In different arts and intellectual pursuits, to-day, in this country, different ideologies and notions of progress are being held. In music and dance, authenticity and perfection according to the classical tradition is prized; in literature and drama, foreign models are taken for guidance, translations and adaptations from them form a regular line of activity and whatever new theories, trends, styles and schools have developed in the West¹ not only in drama-writing but also in acting and production, have their Indian replica. While in this country the ideal is to aspire to a condition of being not more than carbon-copies of the foreign originals, in the West, particularly in America where, at University as well as outside centres, drama-activity is full of fresh experiments; writers and producers are looking out on all sides, and particularly towards the theatre of the Orient, Japan, S. E. Asia and India, for fresh ideas and techniques which they could incorporate in their work. During his visit to several such centres in the States, the writer found a great desire to know more of Indian drama, and to secure printed materials on Indian theatre and English versions of Sanskrit plays. In fact, an institution in New York regularly sponsors a non-American and non-European play every year and in University Departments, *Śakuntala*, *Mṛcchakaṭika* and *Bhagavadajjukīya* have been produced.

In Delhi, from time to time, Drama Seminars come up and when participants like the writer bring up the ancient Indian production and the classical drama, an ultra-modern group, among whom are some Professors of English and some whose native roots are negligible, raise up their hands and smother all such discussions by calling all this historical material and not relevant to-day. As against this attitude in this country, we may place the following passages from some of the recent American

* A Talk on All India Radio, Madras Station, on 28-11-1966 in connection with the Kālidāsa Day.

publications relating to Sanskrit drama. In a book called the *Classical Drama of India*, we read: "It is from the standpoint of world drama and world literature that the Indian plays are reviewed, with confident belief that from this perspective they will be found worthy of high place among plays in a harvest comprehending all times and lands." (p.3). In the chapter on Theatrical Technique on the Sanskrit Stage, the same book says (p. 110): "This was at once an intensely literary theatre and an intensely choreographic theatre, combining the greatest possible attraction for both ear and eye. One medium is never sacrificed to another". Concluding a discussion of dramatic style, the book observes (p. 130): "The world today stands in a period of transition for the musical, the choreographic, and the poetic stage. The plays of ancient India offer us a wealth of suggestion." Introducing in English version, some leading specimens of the Sanskrit theatre, the book *The Genius of the Oriental Theatre* says regarding the technique of sophisticated acting on the Sanskrit stage which dispenses with props: "Any one who has seen an Indian or S. E. Asian dancer imitate with his body or even with just his hands and arms a serpent or a tiger, realizes that a stuffed animal or a man dressed in a skin and attempting a realistic imitation is far less effective".

The theory, technique and aesthetics of this Sanskrit drama are set forth in the elaborate and earliest available treatise, the *Nāṭya Śāstra* of Bharata. But what is set forth in abstract in the treatise could be more clearly seen and appreciated better from the actual plays. Of Sanskrit plays which we have and of which the time or authors are definitely known, the earliest are those of Kālidāsa. Kālidāsa is foremost not only in poetry but also in drama. In his first play, he mentions three predecessors of his, two of whom are mere names; to the third some plays recently discovered have been attributed but not without controversy. One or two other pre-Kālidāsa dramatists are known only through brief citations or fragments. It is therefore in Kālidāsa's plays that we have to see for those principles of Indian dramaturgy which Bharata enunciated. Kālidāsa was indeed proficient in drama.

turgy ; in his first play *Malavikāgnimitra*, he mentions many of the important ideas associated with the art of drama and acting, its definition, scope, its different forms, its essential elements, the supremacy of appeal and the high value that had been attached to the art (l. 5). In his second drama, the *Vikramorvaṣīya*, again, the poet introduces the enactment of a drama in heaven as a motif, and mentions Bharata the teacher of drama and the essential features of the production. More valuable is the preservation in some manuscripts of an actual stage-edition of Act IV of this play from which we get an idea of how music was employed on the ancient Indian theatre. If we go through his *Śakuntala*, we come across a number of brief stage-directions which throw light on how the Sanskrit play was enacted.

As the drama opens, we have King Duṣyanta and the charioteer on the scene ; they are shown as riding a fleet chariot and giving chase to an antelope. Here the poet's stage-direction is *Rathavegam nirūpya*. For shooting at the antelope, the poet says *Śarasaṅdhānam naṭayati*. When in the last Act, Duṣyanta and Indra's charioteer Mātali get down from the chariot, the direction is *Naṭyenu avatīrṇau*. Similarly in the opening Act of the *Vikramorvaṣīya*, King Pururavas rescues Urvaśī and brings her on the chariot with her, and as the chariot is supposed to go down and there is jolting, the poet gives the instruction *Urvaśī rathavataṛakṣobham naṭayanti* etc. Now what do these brief stage-directions mean ? They mean that there is no chariot at all on the stage ; the characters get on the chariot and get down from it by *Naṭya*, that is, by action appropriate to getting up through suitable poses of legs and other limbs ; similarly when the charioteer is said to represent the speed of the vehicles he does so by appropriate physical action such as that of the hands which are in the pose of holding the reins. And the coming down of the chariot on uneven ground with jolting is shown not by the chariot as a stage prop, but by the character-occupant showing the suggestive bodily movements from which we visualise in the mind the chariot and its particular movement. At the beginning of Act IV we have *Śakuntala*'s two friends Anasuyā and Priyamvadā

plucking flowers in the Āśrama, *Tataḥ praviśataḥ Kusumavacayam natayantyaḥ sakhyau*, says the poet. How do they do this? There are no flower pots, or paper-flowers nor do they carry any flower baskets. From imaginary creepers, with one flat left hand palm in *Pataka*-pose, representing a receptacle, the two ladies pluck flowers by the right hand in *Arala*-hand pose. The *abhinaya* of the creepers and plants and the two ladies plucking flowers from them, is, instead of being merely realistic, really effective so far as the audience's realisation is concerned. A similar scene recurs at the beginning of Act VI of *Śakuntala*. Spring season is setting in and two maids of the palace come to the garden and having plucked the tender fresh sprouts of the mango offer them to the God of Love, to serve as his arrows. Here the poet's direction is found *Kapotakam kṛtvā*. *Kapota* is the cup-like palms brought together, as if containing a handful of things, flowers in the present context.

If stage properties were thus dispensed with, how was the scenic location known? Further, how was the identity made known of a character who entered a scene? This question takes us to a prominent feature of Sanskrit drama, namely its poetic character. A foreign reader may wonder at the descriptive, sometimes self-descriptive, passages, generally in verses, that he comes across all through the Sanskrit play. There is, as the American writer quoted above observes a "dexterous inter-weaving of stage-business and dialogue" in the Sanskrit drama. When in Act I Duṣyanta approaches the hermitage of sage Kaṇva, he says, "these are certainly the grounds of the hermitage" and goes on describing the several signs and characteristics of the sage's dwelling and its environs; and when, during reciting this descriptive verse, he interprets the ideas in it with gestures, elaborating them and reinforcing them with complimentary ideas, the whole picture begins to live before the mind's eye of the spectator more vividly than a painted curtain. One reads when Duṣyanta or Puruṣas is on the stage, a stage-direction *Parikramya* at places; it is where he is to move from one location to another on the empty stage but graphically described in the text and the song that the direction

Parikramya occurs. In the version of the lyrical IVth Act of the *Vikramorvaṣīya*, found in some Mss., as already mentioned, we have additional songs corresponding to such descriptive verses relating to the location and the characters and objects introduced— a number of birds and animals. Five types of such songs called *Dhruvas* in *Prākṛt* language and symbolic imagery composed by the musicians of the stage were sung by the vocalists of the orchestra, which, augmented by the poet's own text, attuned the hearts and minds of spectators to the situation and made them not only visualise the scene such as the Himalayan wooded region but also be in a mood ready to receive the character in a given mood such as Pururavas in a half-mad state.

This is the full meaning of Sanskrit drama being defined as *Dṛśya* and *Śravya*, a complete and continuously integrated experience of the eye and ear, without having to evolve a type which has been characterised in the West as the 'epic-narrative theatre.' What was said of scene, character and action, applies even more to the presentation of feelings, the subtle play of which in a character evokes the minute observation and description of the other related character on the stage who is deeply affected by it and it is as emanating from one character and as affecting the other and expressed in the latter's words and gestures that the whole emotional situation goes to the heart of the spectator. The verses of Duṣyanta in Act I, giving those memorable pictures of Sakuntalā, *Sarasijam anuviddham*, then *Calāpāṇ-gam dṛṣṭim* when she is harassed by the bee, then *Srastāmsau* depicting the strain on her limbs, caused by watering the trees, attain a special significance when we understand their role in the enactment of the play.

When Goethe read the translation of *Śakuntala*, he was not only moved to sing its beauty and sublimity in a sonnet, but was also taken up by the idea of the prologue to the play which he adopted in his own *Faust*. This provided for the poet a means of preparing and conditioning the minds of the audience and supplying or suggesting the essential clues to follow the play and appreciate its whole meaning and message. This prefatory piece

called *Prastavana* has its complement in the concluding piece called *Bharata-vakya*. This device of Sanskrit theatre, which in the words of the recent American writer on Sanskrit drama quoted earlier, "subtilizes by conjugating intricate inter-relations between 'real' life and theatrical life, the audience and the play" is employed by Brecht continuously in his short play *The Exception and the Rule*, and has been traced to the influence on Brecht of the Japanese *No* theatre. All such oriental traits ultimately go to the Indian theatre.

The Sanskrit stage has over forty types of plays and performances, each characterised by a specific dramatic idea, theme, character, sentiment, technique of production or emphasis on one aspect of it. This wealth and variety have been further enlarged by the dance-drama traditions in the different regional language areas which developed in its wake. Without any rigidity, the concept of drama has been freely handled on the Sanskrit stage and within the wide spectrum of its dramatic ideas, could be seen the germs or counterparts of most of the new trends, including ideas like *meta-theatre* or the *theatre of the absurd*, that had been developed or written about in the West by modern dramatists, producers and critics.

BHĀSA*

Dr. V. Raghavan

The boundaries of Sanskrit drama which had for long been marked by Kālidāsa were suddenly extended by some centuries by two discoveries round about 1910. In the North West, the German scholar Dr. H. Luders discovered at Turfan in Central Asia fragments of Sanskrit drama by the Buddhist poet Aśvaghōṣa and in the South-West corner of India, in Kerala, Pandit T. Ganapati Sastri discovered a bunch of palm-leaf mss. of some new dramas, which were anonymous, but which, by putting together the bits of evidence in Sanskrit literature already known, he presented to the world as the plays of Bhāsa. He shook as it were the world of scholars who were first unwilling to accept his identification and opposed him strongly; Ganapati Sastri defended his discovery with further arguments and the world of scholars fell into two camps, the anti-Bhāsites and the Bhāsites; the latter included stalwarts like A. B. Keith who completely accepted him. There is also a third group of scholars, with a more open mind on the question of Bhāsa and his plays, who accept part of the discovery and discount the rest. The present writer himself is in this third group.

Kālidāsa was the earliest Sanskrit dramatist whom the world outside came to know, study and enjoy through translation. The state of perfection seen in his works presupposes a long development of drama. There is also the evidence of the earliest theoretical treatise on drama, Bharata's *Nāṭya Śāstra* which Kālidāsa knew and which already described at length ten kinds of drama and the elaborate art of producing Sanskrit drama, with music and dance. More than all this, in the prologue to his first play, the *Malavikagimitra*, Kālidāsa mentions three predecessors of his and adds: 'How will people prefer a contemporary poet's play when they have the works of such celebrated masters, BHĀSA, Saumilla and Kaviputra?' The name of Bhāsa was thus

*In a somewhat abridged form this was broadcast in the External Services of the All-India Radio, New Delhi on 12-5-1967.

known from Kālidāsa himself. That there was an eminent dramatist named Bhāsa and that he wrote several plays was known also from the great prose-master Bāṇa who praises him in the prefatory verses of his *Harṣacarita*. Vakpati, the Prakṛt poet, mentions Bhāsa along with Kālidāsa and some others, and refers also to a favourite dramatic motif used by Bhāsa, namely Fire. The poet and critic Rājaśekhara mentions Bhāsa not only as author of a whole cycle of plays and of his use of Fire, but also the actual name of a plot of his, obviously his greatest production, the *Svapnavāsavadatta*. A close reading of Rājaśekhara's verse on Bhāsa and his play gave also an indication of the central theme of this play and implied further also that the other plays of the poet were lost even in Rājaśekhara's time (10th century). All the data mentioned above Ganapati Sastri found in one of the thirteen plays he discovered. In the other twelve plays, he found several features common to the *Svapnavāsavadatta* and from this he extended the authorship of Bhāsa to all the thirteen plays. Subsequent search for evidence brought forth more data to confirm *Svapnavāsavadatta* as Bhāsa's work, although the text discovered was not either the full or the correct text of the poet. The Anthologies in Sanskrit have several stray verses of remarkable beauty and finish which are not found in any of these plays. None of the plays in this group, other than the *Svapnavāsavadatta*, has been quoted in the large mass of works on Sanskrit dramaturgy or poetics.

Kerala has preserved not only mss. of Sanskrit literature but also an active tradition of producing Sanskrit plays, called *Kuḍiyattam*. In this tradition five of the thirteen plays discovered by Ganapati Sastri had been on the repertoire of the actors, which shows some antiquity, although no authenticity so far as Bhāsa's authorship is concerned. In fact, some critics have argued that these plays might be the work of the Kuḍiyattam-players. Anyway, these thirteen plays added to the already known variety and richness of the Sanskrit stage, certain minor types, particularly of one-Act play, old specimens of which were not available before. Indirectly a greater gain of the Bhāsa-discovery is that further search brought out

some other plays of great importance, like the farce *Bhagavadaj-jukīya*, which revealed new aspects and achievements of the Sanskrit theatre.

Whatever the accurateness of the ascription to Bhaṣa of twelve plays in this group, we may have an idea of the themes, treatment and dramatic quality of the thirteen plays. These thirteen plays fall into four groups: two based on the *Ramāyaṇa*, seven on the *Mahabharata* and Kṛṣṇa story, two on the Udayana-cycle and two on romantic tales. In the first group are *Pratimā* and *Abhiṣeka* Nāṭakas in 7 and 6 Acts, covering between them, more or less, the whole story of the *Ramāyaṇa*. In the second group, there are seven, of which five are one-Act plays; two of these are on the theme of Embassy: the mission of Kṛṣṇa is an attempt to prevent the war, *Dūtavākya*, and the mission of *Ghaṭotkaca*, the demon-son of Bhīma; the *Karṇabhāra* is on the episode of Karṇa's suicidal gift of his armour; *Ūrubhaṅga* is on the last tragic scene of Duryodhana's life; *Madhyamavyāyoga* is an imaginative piece bringing about a meeting of Bhīma with his demon son Ghaṭotkaca, without their knowing each other's identity. Like Kṛṣṇa in *Dūtavākya*, Droṇa in the *Pañcarātra*, in three Acts, makes a futile attempt to prevent the forthcoming conflict; the plot is an imaginative creation on the Virāṭaparvan of the Great Epic. The *Bālacarita* depicts the boyhood life of Kṛṣṇa in Gokula, in the midst of Gopas and Gopīs, his killing of several demon-emissaries of Kāṁsa and finally of Kāṁsa himself. From the romantic cycles, there are two plays, *Avimaraka* in six Acts on the love of Kurāṅgi and a Prince cursed to be an untouchable for some time, and *Daridra-Carudatta* a fragment related to the well-known full play, *Mrcchakaṭika*.

The remaining two plays are from the Udayana-cycle: the *Pratijñāyaugandharayāna* in 4 Acts dealing with the earlier part and the *Svapnavāsavadatta* in 6 Acts with the latter part of the story of how King Udayana was captured by ruse by the king of Ujjain who wanted him to marry his daughter Vāsavadatta,

how Udayana eloped with her to Ujjain, her reported loss in a fire, his second marriage with the Magadha princess Padmavatī and final discovery and union with Vasavadattā.

The one-Act plays form a distinct enrichment to Sanskrit drama; of these the *Madhyamavyāyoga* is an example of one of the ten types of drama, Vyāyoga, for which old examples have been so far wanting. The meeting of father and son without knowing each other has been very well handled by the poet here. The symbolic presentation of abstract ideas like curse and of weapons in human form in *Dūtavākya* and *Bālacarita* use a special technique of Sanskrit drama. The *Avinaraka* has scenes which are very effective on the stage. Simplicity and pathos mark the poet's handling of the plots of the two Rāmāyaṇa-plays. In all plays, the diction is simple, and without too much poetic effusion, action progresses; the situations of emotional possibility are not left un-exploited.

On many of these points, particularly grammatical solecisms, simplicity of style, irregularity of form, non-conformity—such as the end in tragedy in the *Ūrubhaṅga*, which is prohibited—the Bhāsa-enthusiasts have claimed for these plays antiquity and also great influence on Kālidāsa and other dramatists. It has been proposed that the *Daridra-Carudatta*, a mere rag, is the source of the rich drapery of *Mṛcchakaṭika*. Even those who contest these claims cannot deny that the greatest play in this set is the *Svapnavāsavadatta*, that on all evidence that play at least is a genuine work of Bhāsa, that the play shows Bhāsa as a truly great dramatist, fit to be mentioned with respect by Kālidāsa.

Quotations from Bhāsa's *Svapnavāsavadatta*, as already mentioned, confirm the authenticity of the play and its opening scene; at the same time they also show that what has survived is a shorter version, as some crucial motifs and situations cited in works on drama are missing. Also in parts where gaps were found in manuscripts, the text must have been made up, for some of the citations, as also the Bhāsa-verses in the

anthologies, show a composer and a style of composition of greater artistry than what is seen in the available texts. In our appreciation of this play, the masterpiece which, as Rājaśekhara's verse shows, stood the test alike of critics and of time, we should take also the passages quoted but missing in the mss.

The theme is something fit to be handled by a master; a Queen is told that for her King's welfare and the good of the State, she should not only accept that she is dead in fire but also be witness to the King's second marriage; it does not stop here, The brain behind the moves, the Minister Yaugandharāyaṇa, places the chief Queen *in cognito* in the custody of the Queen to be, in the latter's place; and then she is made to help in the getting up of the marital garland, the marital make-up of the new Princess and so on. Of course King Udayana's love for Vāsavadattā and his grief at her reported death are too deep and strong to be easily got over, whatever the requirements of the strategic marriage he is made to go through. The new Queen is poignantly made aware of this greater and unforgettable love for Vāsavadattā. Frequent upsurges of this under-current create situations of great dramatic significance and emotional appeal. The continuous series of evidence of Vāsavadattā not being really dead, but alive and present in the very same premises, culminate in the title-scene of the play, of a *Svapna*, a half-wakeful state in which Vāsavadattā finds herself by accident by Udayana's bedside and Udayana is addressing her in a dream-like state; as he rises to clasp her, she rushes out.

While it is unnecessary to discover non-existent virtues in Bhāsa, particularly from the doubtful plays, the superiority and dramatic merits of his real play *Svapnavāsavadattā* are beyond question. Indeed the *Svapnavāsavadattā* entitles him to the tribute which Kālidāsa pays him as a dramatist of established renown-*Prathita-yaśas*.

BOOK-REVIEWS

V. R.

THE CLASSICAL DRAMA OF INDIA. Henry W. Wells. Asia Publishing House, Rs. 16/- THE CLASSICAL DRAMA OF THE ORIENT. Same author, same Publishers, Rs. 30/-. SANSKRIT PLAYS. Same author and same Publishers, Rs. 40. THE GENIUS OF THE ORIENTAL THEATER. Edited by G. L. Anderson. Mentor Book. The New American Library, New York and Toronto.

Contrary to the prevailing attitude among theatre-enthusiasts in this country, there is a growing interest in University centers and non-University organisations in U. S. in Oriental theatre and Sanskrit drama. The interest there in the *Noh* and the *Kabuki* of Japan has a longer history but recently, as the reviewer had occasion to observe during his visits to these centres in the States, there is a great desire for the study of Sanskrit drama, its technique and aesthetics and for the production of Indian plays. Mr. Henry W. Wells, till recently of the Columbia University, and responsible for three of the books under review, had collected a good deal of material relating to Eastern theatre in the Brander Mathews Dramatic Museum of the Columbia University.

In the first-mentioned book, he writes wholly on Sanskrit drama. Without aiming at 'an historical survey or a comprehensive description', he reviews the ancient Indian plays "from the standpoint of world drama and world literature" and says in justification of his book which he addresses to the Western readers: "Many of the qualities which we do actually value most highly in all Western theatrical masterpieces are found in the Sanskrit works together with some which are at once almost unique achievements and still valuable for our modern world". When the author observes more than once that the aim of Sanskrit drama is 'spiritual composure' and 'serenity', he is evidently having in mind the theory of *Rasa* and *hṛdaya-viśrānti*; in a whole chapter (6th), he illustrates how in Sanskrit drama there is an achievement of equilibrium through the balancing of several elements, characters, episodes etc. In two chapters (3rd

and 4th), he analyses Sanskrit plays *vis-a-vis* the world stage and modern stage. In this respect, the most important chapter of the book is the tenth, Theatrical Technique on the Sanskrit Stage, in which the author has some noteworthy observations to make. As examples of the social play and the heroic play (*Prakarāṇa* and *Naṭaka*), he gives detailed analysis of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* and the *Uttarāmacarita*.

The weak chapters in the book are the 5th, Sanskrit Drama and Indian Thought, the 7th, Sacred Drama, and the 8th on the several deficiencies of the Sanskrit plays; the last-mentioned chapter would admit of considerable revision. 'Art of Swooning' is not that important to be allotted a whole chapter. In the summary of *Malatīmādhava* on p. 88, there are errors. More than once the author goes out of the way to say that few Indian scholars have written about Sanskrit drama, interpreting its interest and value adequately; but this is a distortion of fact, as his book does bear evidences of his having had the benefit of reading the writings of this kind of Indian scholars.

The second-mentioned book of the author is a companion volume, a very much larger one, devoted to the Chinese and the Japanese drama. The Chinese part deals with different types of Chinese plays, tragedy, comedy, the ethical theatre and a type that could be called 'extravaganza'. The religious elements and the mythological theme of these plays are also described. The author is more at home in the Japanese theatre, of which the *Noh* alone is analysed, although there are passing references to the *Kabuki*. In addition to the principles underlying the *Noh*, the music, the dialogue, symbolism etc., its influence on Western writers, chiefly Yeats, who was greatly responsible for the knowledge of it in the West, receives attention. The concluding chapter on the future of the *Noh* considers the possibilities of adapting the art to modern times or other parts of the world.

To one who has seen the performances of the Peking Opera or of the *Noh*, the continuity of the Indian tradition and technique in the Far East is clear. However, in this study of the Chinese and Japanese theatre, the author devotes no attention to this aspect.

The third and fourth books are collections of English translations of Sanskrit and Japanese plays. The first collection is edited by Mr. Wells and forms a companion to the first book reviewed above; in it, the following are included: The Vision of Vasavadatta (translation by A. C. Woolner and Lakshman Sarup), the Little Clay Cart (R. P. Oliver), the Sakuntala (A. H. Edgren), the Vikramorvacie (Sri Aurobindo), Rama's Later History (C. N. Joshi) and the Nagananda (P. Boyd). Mr. Wells has written a General Introduction also to the Volume in about thirty pages. He regrets that Sanskrit drama is not well-known to the wider world of writers and theatre-artistes in the West. The presentation of some of the best Sanskrit plays in translation, as in the present Volume, will help to remove the above-mentioned defect.

The fourth book edited by Mr. G.L. Anderson offers a collection in English translation of plays from India and Japan which form in the words of the editor "two of the great civilizations of the Oriental World" which "have considered the drama as a major art of form." Appropriately the editor has chosen for India the *Sakuntala* and the *Mricchakatika*, which he gives here in the versions of Monier Williams and Arthur W. Ryder. Part two gives five *Noh* and two *Kabuki* and *Joruri* plays, taken from the versions of Arthur Walley, Donald Keene and A. C. Scott.

The Sanskrit plays in the above volume have a Preface on Sanskrit drama in fourteen pages which concludes with the observation: "Any one who has seen an Indian or South-east Asian dancer imitate with his body or even with just his hands and arms a serpent or a tiger realizes that a stuffed animal or a man dressed in a skin and attempting a realistic imitation is far less effective." The Japanese plays have similar short introduction on *Noh*, *Kabuki* and the *Joruri* (the puppet theatre). In his general Preface, the editor says that these plays "are not of historical interest only and they have been performed in New York and a rising interest in Asian civilisation will bring more of them to our local stage and cause more Americans to seek them out abroad."

DRAMA IN RURAL INDIA. By J. C. Mathur. Indian Council for Cultural Relations. New Delhi, 1964.

Sri J. C. Mathur, the author of this book and an author of some Hindi plays, has been well-known for his keen interest in Indian drama. Member of the Indian Civil Service and formerly Education-Secretary of Bihar Government, he became Director-General of the All India Radio and in this capacity, had a great opportunity to visit different parts of the country and study forms of indigenous dramatic tradition. The results of such first-hand study are embodied in the present book which is a valuable addition to the meagre printed material available on the subject.

The line of treatment adopted by the author in this book is original and useful for a correlated study of these traditions in different parts of the country. The putting together of features or practices observed in different forms discloses suddenly identities and ties with common source and the ultimate unity in the midst of diversity. Thus instead of regionalising the accounts, the author classifies his field of study into (1) places of performance (2) the stage-preliminaries (3) the actual performances (4) the themes and social purpose (5) the art and the aesthetics of the enactment (6) the music and dance involved in the presentations and (7) lastly the puppet-drama. The pooling together under these heads of practices in the various forms found in different parts of the country shows details which can be recognised survivals of some very ancient features going upto Bharata. On p. 16, the author notes under places of performance that, in the Assam valley, on both sides of the *Rangasthali*, there are small low-plinth pavilions, — wooden platforms — with their own canopies, where actors who have finished their part and are to come on again, rest. This reminds me of the *Mattavarāṇī* described by Bharata on either side of the *Raṅgapīṭha*. What is said by the author in continuation of this about the change of situations being indicated merely by moving from one platform to another, is just what is envisaged in Bharata's *Kakṣyāvibhāga*. Similarly the two levels mentioned in the Rajasthan Stage (p. 19) of a

higher platform from which actors descend to the lower for performing (cf. *raṅgāvataraṇa*) supports my contention, against some writers, that Bharata's *Raṅgapīṭha* and *Raṅgaśirṣa* refer to two different parts of the Stage.

In the rural play of North Bihar called *Vidyapat*, as the author notes, the preliminary drum-playing before the show, locally called *Jaminika* (i.e. within the curtain), is a survival of a part of the *Pūrvaraṅga* music.

The 'procession' of the characters that enter (p. 22) can be compared to the *Purappādu* of Kathakali and the similar practice in Bhāgavata plays. As the author says (p. 39), more than the other features, "the essential unity of Indian traditional and rural drama is seen in the 'preliminaries' to a performance."

The paragraph (p. 47) entitled 'The Call of the Drum' points to the abiding tradition of *nirgīta-vādyā* of Bharata and the role of the *mṛdaṅga* which resulted in the proverbial saying 'a-mṛdaṅgam nāṭakam', as shown by me elsewhere.

The author describes briefly a form surviving in Kashmir called *Bhaṇḍ Pathar*; *Pathar*, as the author suggests may be *pātra*, but *Bhaṇḍ* is related, not as he says to the monologue *Bhāṇa*, but to *Bhaṇḍa*, clown; Sanskrit texts describe a form called *Bhaṇḍika Nr̥tya*.

The day-performance described on p. 56 has its parallel in the *pahal-veṣam* of the South; this as well as the *Veṣas* of Gujarat and Maharashtra described on p. 90, are all offshoots of the *Bahurūpa* form described in texts.

It is not the data and information we have on forms of traditional drama all over the country that are valuable in this account by Sri Mathur; but the underlying unity of the forms which emerges out of this account, the higher aesthetics of the traditional concept of the art, and the underlying social purpose and the way the people and the art became fused together, in a way not possible at all in the modern surroundings. One would

feel along with the author and echo wistfully what he says (p. 65): 'Standing behind the responsive crowd, one could only wonder how the genial current had been frozen among us townspeople.'

THE FOLK THEATER OF INDIA. Balwant Gargi. University of Washington. Publication on Asian Arts, Seattle, Washington, U. S., 1966.

The publication of this book, on the theme same as that of the previous book, from a University center in U. S. shows the growing interest among American theatre-circles in Indian drama. The author who has been in the States more than once has recently been at the Center for Asian Arts at the University of Washington and taught and assisted in the production of Indian plays. The book deals with *Jatra*, *Nautanki*, *Bhavai*, *Tamasha*, *Ramlila*, *Rasalila*, *Terukkuttu*, *Yakṣagāna* and *Chhau* in a detailed manner, and in the last chapter touches briefly upon other forms. There is an introductory chapter at the beginning on 'The folk and the classical'. A glossary of Indian words and an Index are provided for to help the foreign students.

The book is very well produced and has, besides a number of excellent photographs, numerous line drawings by the well known artist S. Chavda, all of which would help the foreign student to get a mental picture of what is verbally described in the pages of the book.

The Director of the Center for Asian Arts at the University of Washington, Mr. Millard B. Rogers, writes in the Foreword: "The folk theater of India . . . offers excellent material for horizontal investigations since it combines elements of literature, performance, dance and music with aspects of painting and sculpture as expressed in costumes, masks, make up and setting. . . . Further investigations of other Asian theatrical traditions are being sponsored by the Center and the results are planned for subsequent volumes of the Series."

We welcome the publication of Gargi's book in this Series and look forward to the other ones that are promised.

NEW SANSKRIT PLAYS—ANCIENT AND MODERN

V. R.

In the *Gaekwad's Oriental Series* (University of Baroda), three short plays have been published. Of these two belong to the Vyāyoga class, dramatising a heroic encounter. The *Śaṅkha-parābhava-vyāyoga* by Harihara is historical and celebrates the defeat of Śaṅkha of Lāṭa at the hands of Vastupāla of Dholka in the first half of the 13th Century A.D. An interesting festival in honour of Goddess Ekallavīrā is introduced.

The *Bhīmavikrama-vyāyoga* in the same Series (No. 151) is on the well-known theme of Jarāsandha's death at the hands of Bhīma, taken from the Mahābhārata. The play was written in A.D. 1328.

The *Dharmoddharana* included in the same volume (GOS. 151), belongs to the class of philosophical and religious plays employing allegorical characters and following the model set by the *Prabodhacandrodaya*. The deterioration of values in the Kali age and the restoration of *Dharma* and *Dāna* form the theme of the play which seems to have been written in the Moghul period.

The *Trivandrum Sanskrit Series* did not lag behind ; it brought out, among its several recent releases, the following plays :

The *Śrīṅgārasundara* (TSS. 214) of Īśvara of Bimbali or Vadakkumkūr is a Bhāṇa (monologue). The *Adbhutapañjara* (No. 210) is a full-size Nāṭaka by Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita of Tanjore, on Shahaji, the foremost of the Maratha rulers of Tanjore ; this a marriage romance. *Vasumatīcitrasenīya* (No. 217) is by Appaya III, younger brother and pupil of Nilakaṇṭha Dikṣita. To the normal material of a love-romance—to which class this belongs—the playwright adds a number of new motifs and devices.

The *Bhairavavilāsa* by Brahmātra Vaidyanātha is on the story of the Tamil Śaiva Saint Śrūttonḍar. It is in the form of a single-act Prekṣanaka and Sri Narendra Nath Sarma of Jubbalpur has brought it out from a single manuscript.

The *Kṛṣṇabhyudaya* by Lokanātha Bhaṭṭa of Kāñcīpuram, near Madras, is an one-act play on the birth of Kṛṣṇa. It has been edited by the same scholar.

The *Sattaka* is an all-Prākṛt play on the model of a *Nāṭikā*. Of the few examples of this class, composed after the pioneering example *Karpūraman̄jari* of Rājaśekhara, the *Candralekha*, of Rudradāsa of 17th Century A.D. of Kerala deserves mention. The credit of publishing this play goes to Dr. A. N. Upadhye of Kolhapur. A second edition of this play has just appeared in the *Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan Series* in which it originally appeared.

The President of the Samskrita Ranga in his capacity as Chairman of the Central Sanskrit Institute, Tirupati, edited the short one-act play *Vibudhamohana*, a farce by Harijivana Miśra of Jaipur, described in the last *S. R. Annual* (pp. 44-5). It is published in the inaugural issue of the *Malayamāruta* (pp. 113-127), a collection of minor literary works in Sanskrit, undertaken by the Central Sanskrit Institute.

As the Editor of the *Samskrita Pratibhā* of the Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, he brought out also a special volume in honour of Rabindranath Tagore, called *Samskrita Ravindram*, carrying Sanskrit renderings of select poems, prose and plays of Tagore. In this volume are included three plays of Tagore rendered into Sanskrit: *Vartagr̥ha* by Sri Dhyanesa Narayana Cakravarti, and the *Valmikipratibhā* and *Nāṭirpūjā* by the Editor; the last two were produced on the Radio and the Stage in Madras by members of the Samskrita Ranga.

Two more Tagore plays which appeared in Sanskrit at the time of the Tagore Centenary celebrations are: *Muktādhara* by the same Dhyanesh Narayan Cakravarti and *Ratharajju* by Vimalakrishna Matilal.

Sandhyā, Malayalam play by G. Sankara Kurup, has been rendered into Sanskrit by Dr. E. R. Krishna Sarma, Professor of Sanskrit, S. V. University, Tirupati. The Ahalya-episode is suggested here in a symbolic manner. Twilight is the heroine, Day her husband, Sky, the paramour, and Star, the maid.

Another translation into Sanskrit of a play famous in the regional language is *Bhūmi Kanyā* in Marathi by the late Mama Warerkar, which Dr. Ratnamayi Devi, Delhi, has rendered into Sanskrit.

In the pages of his own Sanskrit journal, Sri Ananta Tripathi Sarma, M.P., Berhampore has been regularly publishing Sanskrit renderings of Shakespeare's plays. Of these *Twelfth Night* and *Much Ado About Nothing* have been brought out in separate book form. The rest will follow in due course. In the pages of another Sanskrit periodical has appeared serially a Sanskrit rendering of the *Tempest*.

A number of Sanskrit plays by contemporary Sanskrit writers were also published recently. The *Vimukti* written and produced by the President of the Ranga, was published in the pages of the *Sanskrita Pratibha*, Vol. V, No. 2. Sri S. B. Velankar of the Postal and Telegraph Directorate of Government of India brought out a Sanskrit rendering of the Marathi play *Saṅgītasāubhadra* of Anna Saheb Kirloskar; the Sanskrit version was played by the Sanskrit Drama Wing of the Brahmana Mahasabha, Bombay. The Volume *Raṇasrīraṅga* by the same author consists of three short plays *Kalindī*, *Kailāsakampa* and *Svātantryalakṣmī*, two of which had been broadcast. *Kalindī* named after the Jamunā river, presents the prominent geographical features of Uttara Pradesh in the form of a romance. *Kailāsakampa* which features Śiva and other allegorical characters related to the Himalayan region, was prompted by the Chinese aggression on the Himalayas. The last is on the Rani of Jhansi.

One of the last plays that Dr. J. B. Choudhuri wrote and produced at many places, before his demise, is the *Bhārata-viveka* on Swami Vivekananda.

Srijiya Nyayatirtha who is author perhaps of the largest number of Sanskrit plays among the contemporary writers, put forth a play on the great poet Kālidāsa, the *Mahākavikālidāsam*, which is one of the many which several writers were inspired to compose at the instance of the All-India Kālidāsa Samaroh Samiti of Ujjain.

Prof. V. P. Bokil has been well-known for his books on Sanskrit Pedagogy. He has recently come out with some new Sanskrit plays composed by him. The *Kṛṣṇa-Rukmīṇīya* of his is a Nāṭaka on a traditional theme. In his *Śrī Śivavaibhava*, he brings out in five Acts the greatness of Śivāji by highlighting five episodes in his life.

In his *Caṇakya-vijaya* nāṭaka, Viśveśvara Vidyabhushana Kavyatirtha dramatises the old story of Caṇakya and Candragupta and brings out the former in his role as a dispassionate fighter for a dhārmic cause.

A volume of Radio Talks on Kālidāsa, his genius and works, collected and edited by the President of the Ranga, when he was Special Adviser to the A. I. R. for Sanskrit, was recently published by the Publications Division, New Delhi. The Talks here, apart from touching, indirectly, upon the poet's dramas and dramatic genius, include two talks on the poet's two dramas, the *Vikramorvaṣīya* and the *Śakuntala*; the former by the Editor, deals also with Kālidāsa as a dramatist and the technique of Sanskrit drama.

*

*

*

*

The President of the Samskrita Ranga received during the year the Prize for Sanskrit Research awarded annually by the Sahitya Akademi, the National Academy of Letters. The prize which was awarded by the President of India, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, was for his work *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāsa* on Sanskrit Poetics, Dramaturgy and Aesthetics. Students of Indian Theatre may be interested not only in the general theory of the *Rasa* which has been expounded here at length but also in the long chapter devoted to Nāṭya Śāstra and varieties of Uparūpakas and the reconstructions of a number of rare old lost Sanskrit plays of significance to the history of Sanskrit Drama.

APPRECIATION OF THE SAMSKRITA RANGA'S WORK

Āgamaḍambara

2-1-1964

The Dinamani Chudar, 1-3-64 :

. . . . The Samskrita Ranga produced this play very well indeed. Dr. V. Raghavan who had brought to light this 10th century play from Kashmir was the main pillar of this production, which came off at the Museum Theatre. Lovers of Sanskrit who witnessed it felt that they should have more and more Sanskrit plays.

The Swadesamitran, Madras, 8-2-64 :

. . . . This 10th century play of Bhatta Jayanta of Kashmir emphasises unity and tells the great truth to people caught in the sectarian religious controversies that all faiths lead to the same goal. This has a significance in the present times also.

The Indian Express, 22-1-64 :

A philosophical drama by a 10th century Kashmiri poet Jayanta Bhatta was to-day staged by the Samskrita Ranga at the Museum Theatre.

The actors did their part well, considering the toughness of the scheme. Special mention must be made of Pandit Gopala Sarma (" Vraddhambhi ") and K. Ganesan (" Sankarshana ") for effective portrayal of their roles.

Dr. V. Raghavan spoke on "The philosophical and allegorical play in Sanskrit". Prof. Warder, Professor of Sanskrit, University, of Toronto said the intrinsic merit and charm of the ancient plays deserved special attention. Mr. T. K. Shanmugam, President of the Madras Nataka Sangh, said such rare, superb dramas should be presented in Tamil.

THE SAMSKRITA RANGA, MADRAS

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT

1964-1965

The last Annual Report of the Samskrita Ranga was presented at the Sixth General Body Meeting of the Ranga held at the Music Academy premises, on 27th May 1965. The Report for the year ending with 15th November 1965 is now presented at the Seventh Annual Meeting.

Members

During this year, Sri R. Aravamuda Aiyangar became a Life Member; Sri V. Krishnaswami, B.Sc., Mrs. Parvati Krishnamurti, B. A., Miss. Sita, B. A., M. Litt., and Miss. Renuka Rajan, B.A., Dip. Lib., became ordinary members.

Donation of Rs. 25/- was given by Sri T. N. Gopala Sarma, of Rs. 15/- by Sri D. M. Agrawala and of Rs. 10/- by Sri A. Ranganathan.

Production

Śvaśrūvijaya (Triumph of the Mother-in-law) :

On the Sixth Annual Day Celebration held on 17th February, 1965, *Śvaśrūvijaya*, a modern social play in Sanskrit, written as a direct reply to the *Snūṣāvijaya* of Sundararāja Kavi of Trivandrum, staged previously by the Ranga, was presented by the Samskrita Ranga at the Museum Theatre, Egmore, Madras. Written by Sri V. K. Subrahmanya Sastri of Kumbakonam and printed in 1922, the play depicts how an unruly daughter-in-law, in alliance with a wicked friend, seeks to bring under her dominance her husband by administering some herbal drug to him and to send her parents-in-law away from the home. The play ends with the daughter-in-law becoming submissive after she realises her mistakes. The play was produced by Dr. V. Raghavan, assisted by Sri C. S. Sundaram and S. S. Janaki. The play was well received by the audience which included well-known actors like Sri T. K. Shanmukham and Sri V. Nagayya, the latter being

the chief guest at the function. The occasion was availed for felicitating Sri Nagayya on his being awarded the title of Padmasri by the Government of India.

The following participated in the play: Kum. Kanaka, Kum. R. Usha, Sri T. R. H. Sundaram, Sri K. S. Rajan, Kum. K. Sabita Rani, Pt. S. Rajagopala Sastrigal, Pt. T.N. Gopala Sarma, Sri M. Narasimhachari, Kum. S. Renuka Rajan, Smt. Meenakshi Natarajan, Sri B. Krishnamurthy and Kum. R. Vedavalli.

The enactment of the play was preceded by an informative talk by Dr. V. Raghavan, President of the Ranga, on the wide range and thematic variety of the modern Social play in Sanskrit. He gave a survey of a large number of modern social plays, mentioning the central theme of each specimen.

On 27th May 1965, the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Samskrita Ranga was held at the Music Academy premises. After Tea and the General Body Meeting, Dr. George Artola, Professor of Sanskrit University of Hawaii spoke on *Harjivana Misra and his Short Sanskrit Plays*. This was followed by a talk on the *Sahrdāyānanda* of the same Harjivana Misra by Dr. V. Raghavan. The texts of these talks have been printed in Volume IV of the *Samskrita Ranga Annual*.

Special Items

During the period under report Dr. V. Raghavan, President of the Samskrita Ranga and of the Madras Natya Sangh, delivered three lectures on the history, development and technique of Sanskrit drama at the Madras Natya Sangh for the students of the training course in Drama. He gave also a talk on Sanskrit Drama to the students of the National School of Drama at New Delhi.

The President gave also help and guidance to the following scholars interested in drama who visited Madras: A. C. Scott, Director, Asian Theatre Program, University of Wisconsin, Madison, U.S.; Ch. Brysky, Polish Research Scholar; Sri Balwant Gargi; Mr. Clifford Jones, U. S. Research Scholar, and Dr. (Mrs.) Satyavrat, Delhi University.

S. S. Janaki, one of the Secretaries of the Ranga was awarded the Doctorate degree by the University of Madras during this period.

Affiliations

During the year the Ranga continued to be affiliated to the Madras Natya Sangh and the Music Academy, Madras.

Office-Bearers

The following formed the Executive Committee of the Ranga during the year :

<i>President :</i>	Dr. V. Raghavan
<i>Vice-Presidents :</i>	Sri G. Venkatachalam Prof. A. Shanmukha Mudaliar Mrs. Indira Ramadorai
<i>Trustees :</i>	Sri M. M. Gurunath Sri T. S. Rangarajan
<i>Secretaries :</i>	Sri C. S. Sundaram Kum. S. S. Janaki Sri T. K. Venkateswaran
<i>Treasurer :</i>	Sri R. Kalidas
<i>Members :</i>	Prof. P. Thirugnanasambandham, Sri U. Venkatakrishna Rao, Sri T. N. Gopala Sarma, Mrs. Kamalam Unni, Sri R. Ramakrishna Iyer, Sri K. Ganesan, Sri S. Rajagopala Sastri, Sri S. Ramanathan, Kum. V. Ranganayaki, Kum. E. R. Rama Bai, Sri E. P. Aravindakshan, Kum. R. Priyamvada and Sri K. M. Anantanarayanan.

Income and Expenditure

During the year under Report the Samskrita Ranga received Rs. 182/- by way of Subscriptions and Donations and Rs. 7.25/- by sale of publications.

The chief item of expense during the year related to the production *Śvaśravijaya*, for which an amount of Rs. 441.88/- was

spent. The Ranga is thankful to the Madras Natya Sangh for its aid for this production. The other details of Income and Expenditure can be seen in the Audited statement of Account for the year under Report.

Acknowledgements

The Ranga is thankful to its friends and supporters who helped them during the year. Special thanks are due to the Music Academy for the permission to use their premises for the meetings and Lectures and to the Madras Natya Sangh for including the Ranga production under their theatre workshop programme.

SAMSKRITA RANGA, MADRAS

Receipts and Charges Statement for the year ended

15th November, 1965.

	Rs.	P.		Rs.	P.
To Opening Balance			By Drama Staging Expenses	302	52
on 16-11-1964 :			Subscription to Music		
Cash on hand	10	38	Academy and Natya Sangh	60	00
Punjab National Bank			Printing and Stationery	32	00
Ltd., Madras	32	04	Meeting Expenses	18	47
United Commercial Bank			Conveyance	79	40
Ltd., Madras 4 :			Postage	29	34
S. B. Account No. I	90	80	Bank charges	0	75
do. II	1,323	73	Pooja expenses	9	59
Subscriptions collected	132	00	Closing Balances (15-11-65):		
Donations received	455	50	Cash on hand	4	50
Sale of Publications	7	25	Punjab National Bank		
Interest received	49	63	Ltd., S. B. Account	32	04
			United Commercial Bank		
			Ltd., Madras-4;		
			S. B. Account No. I	163	42
			do. II	1,369	30
	2,101	33		2,101	33

GOVERNMENT GRANT ACCOUNT

To Interest receipts	45	57	By Closing Balance :		
Opening Balance (16-11-64)			(15-11-65)		
United Commercial Bank			United Commercial Bank		
Ltd., Madras :			Ltd., Madras-4	1,369	30
S. B. Account No. II	1,323	73			
	1,369	30		1,369	30

V. Raghavan
President.

S. S. Janaki
C. S. Sundaram
Secretaries.

S. S. Janaki
Treasurer.

Verified and found correct.

(S. Venkatram & Co.)
Chartered Accountants.
6th August 1966.

761