Chapter VII
Aesthetic Implications
7.1. **Symbolism**

In literature, symbolism is an art in itself. According to Tom Chetwynd, "Symbolism integrates the particular, restricted life of the conscious Ego with the grand, unconscious dream, and it works both ways. It reintroduces us to the grander reality of our lives, which are in contact with remote stars, remote periods of history, etc., but which we suppress for utility reasons."

(1982 : IX)

For artistic effect, i.e. for eloquence and elegance, the writer chooses different ways of expression. One such is symbolism. Charless Chadwick defines symbolism as "the art of expressing ideas and emotions not by describing them directly, not by defining them through overt comparisons with concrete images, but by suggesting what these ideas and emotions are, by re-creating them in the mind of the reader through the use of unexplained symbols."

(1971 : 2-3)
In Girish Karnad's plays, this device is aptly employed to create the effect of "fusing into a work of art meaning and relevance which otherwise would appear idealistic or didactic on surface." (Srivastava, 1997: xiv) In 'Nagamandala', for example, the 'ruined temple', the 'broken idol' (p. 22) are the symbols of 'ruined humanity' and 'broken heart' (or even 'stale belief') respectively. Similarly, the locking of the house from outside by Appanna (p. 27) symbolises man's anarchy on the one hand and woman's slavery on the other.

Apart from the above-mentioned examples, there are certain references in the play that symbolise the internal complexities of Rani, a woman. Such one is the following conversation between Rani and Kurudavva:

"Kurudavva: You don't mean, he is home only once a day, and that too ... only for lunch?

(No reply.)

And you are alone in the house all day?
(Rani begins to sob.)

Don't cry my child, don't cry. I haven't come here to make you cry. Does he lock you up every day like this?
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Rani: Yes, since the day I came here ...

Kurudavva: Does he beat you or ill-treat you?

Rani: No.

Kurudavva: (Pause.) Does he ...
'talk' to you?

Rani: Oh, that he does. But not a syllable more than required. 'Do this', 'Do that', 'Serve the food'.

Kurudavva: You mean — ? That means —
You are — Still — hum ?
Has he ... ?

Rani: Apart from him, you are the first person I have seen since coming here. I'm bored to death. There is no one to talk to!

Kurudavva: That's not what I meant by 'talk'. Has your husband touched you? How can I put it? (Exasperated.)
Didn't anyone explain to you before your wedding? Your mother? Or an aunt?"

(P. 31)
Here, 'talk', 'touch', and 'Didn't ... explain ...' all symbolise 'that' which cannot directly be 'told', but 'felt' or 'imagined'.

In 'Hayavadana', 'Elephant-headed Ganesha' is the symbol of incompleteness of human creation. The horse-headed man too depicts the incomplete human, but it deepens the incompleteness. "The sub-plot of 'Hayavadana', the horse-man, deepens the significance of the main theme of incompleteness by treating it on a different plane". (Kurtkoti, 'Introduction to Hayavadana', (P. 71)

Similarly, Kapila and Devadatta, the two friends, are symbolic of "one mind, one heart". (P. 76)

Concerning the symbolism of triad of relationships — Padmini, Devadatta, and Kapila, critics have different opinions. One such is that of Ananthamurthy's:

"I am aware that this sociological interpretation of the triangle of relationships of the play is
outside the intention of the play, but the critic is led to such speculation by the playwright's weak hold on the symbolic device he used in that play". (1978 : 42-43)

To the above-mentioned view, Sharma (1978 : 73) has retorted as follows:

"Murty's attribution to a caste system follows from his moral-social bias. While caste could suggest one of these constraints that in habit the nature inclination of the human soul, in the play it remains only peripheral. It does not intrude into the symbolic structure of the play".

Further he adds:

"To suggest that Padmini chooses Devadatta's face only to make her liking for Kapila's body is a gross distortion of the symbolic design of the play".

Veena Noble Dass too has dispelled the contention of Aryanithamurthy saying "that Karnad has not used sociological or caste factors in the
relationship of Devadatta, Kapila and Padmini. Their relationship can be understood better from the point of view of aesthetic psychological factors than sociological. (1988 : 160)

Lord Ganesha is symbolic of "a perfect blend of three different worlds of experience — the divine, the human, and the animal — is the "destroyer of incompleteness". Simultaneously, he is the "embodiment of imperfection, of incompleteness" as well as "the Lord Master of success and perfection." (Dhanavel, 2000 : 69)

M. Sarat Babu (1999 : 227) views 'Hayavadana' symbolically as follows:

"... Lord Ganesha, the elephant-headed God, who symbolises alienation since his head and his body are incompatible."

"... Hayavadana, the eponymous character, comes and like Ganesha he too is a symbol of alienation since he is a horse-headed man."

"The modern man represented by Devadatta and Kapila suffers from self-alienation."
Devadatta is 'the mind' and Kapila 'the body'
(Ibid, p. 228)

"The Stallion's becoming the Gandharva symbolises
the primitive man's becoming the civilised man."
(Ibid, p. 229)

"Thus, Hayavadana and Padmini's son symbolising
the primal unity and the final unity respectively
attain Dionysian ego ... As the Bhagavata says"
(Ibid, 229-30):

"Bhagavata : So at long last Hayavadana has
become complete."  (p. 138)

In 'Tughlaq', Karnad's creative craft
of symbolisation is par excellence in that he has
indicated the theme through different situations,
e.g. Tughlaq's love of the game of chess symbo-
lates his crafty political game (Rajagopalachari
and Krishna, 1989 : 24). Similarly, the death
of Imamud-din is symbolic of the death of Tughlaq's
'inner self'.

In a dialogue between step-mother and
Muhammad, 'the rose garden' symbolises Tughlaq's
ideal world, which, as he himself realises, collapses:

"Step-Mother : What's wrong with you?
You spent years planning that rose garden and now —

Muhammad : Now I don’t need a rose garden. I built it because I wanted to make for myself an image of Sadi's poems. I wanted every rose in it to be a poem. I wanted every thorn in it to prick and quicken the senses. But I don’t need these airy trappings now; a funeral has no need for a separate symbol."

(p. 202)

Muhammad Tughlaq's different stages of 'sleep' are noteworthy by virtue of symbolism. The three stages are — rejection of sleep, an agonising longing for sleep, and finally a state of deep sleep.

"This broadly parallels his journey from romantic idealism to unnerving reality imparting coherence to the many events of the drama with a beginning, a middle and an end". (Rajagopalachari and Krishna'. 1989 : p. 26-27). In the early scenes of the play, Tughlaq
is preoccupied with the thought of his state all the time. The idealist in him is restless and cannot sleep:

"Tell me, how dare I waste my time by sleeping?" (p. 155)

Unable to fulfill his dreams, Tughlaq realises the futility of his dream of idealism and longing for sleep says to Barani:

"Muhammad: Fortunate! You can read when you don't feel sleepy. I can't sleep. I can't read. Even Rumi, who once used to transport me, has become simply a web of words. Do you know, five years ago I actually used to pray to God not to send me any sleep? I can't believe it now." (p. 195)

At last, Tughlaq can't resist the predicament and wants to rest in deep sleep, which is symbolised in the last scene thus:

"Muhammad: I am suddenly feeling tired. And sleepy. For five years sleep has avoided me and now suddenly it's coming back. Go Barani."
But before you go — pray for us.
(Closes his eyes again. Barani bows and exits, obviously in tears. There is silence on the stage for a while, and then a Servant comes in.)

Servant: In the name of ...
(He sees that Muhammad is asleep and goes out. Muhammad's head falls forward on his chest in deep sleep ...)

"Karnad has made effective use of four major symbols: prayer, sleep, rose, and the game of chess. Prayer is in fact most dominating of all symbols. Symbolising as it does the religion, idealism of the protagonist which is reduced to mockery not only when the Sultan's life is threatened at the time of prayer, but also when he is constrained to revive it on the arrival of Aziz, masquerading as Ghiyas-ud-din Abbas-id. It is at a deeper level, the symbol of man's unconscious need for divine protection and guidance in an hour of extreme despair and anguish. This we see when Tughlaq himself suddenly falls to his knees and prays after pronouncing the death-sentence on his step-mother forgetting the ban on prayer, as he confesses to Barani." (Dass, 1988: 146)
"Barani : In the name ...

(Stops. Muhammad raises his head.)

Muhammad : Come in, Barani. You've come at the right moment. You have saved me from treachery, you know. I was trying to pray! Think of that — no one in my kingdom is allowed to pray and I was praying. Against my own orders!"

(P. 206)

In 'The Fire and the Rain', both the fire and the rain are complex symbols in different contexts as follows:

The Fire - (1) Yajna (Dodiya, 1999, Preface)

(2) Passion (Vishakha's & Arvasu's thirst for each other)

The Rain - (1) Life (Dodiya, Ibid.)

(2) Sexual fulfilment.
7.2. Myths

Myths are generalised symbols.

"In the past, even fairy tales and myths were symbolic. In Vishnu Sharma's 'Panchatantra', certain animals like fox and elephant could represent a wily and a respectable person. Rama and Ravana symbolise good and evil. A tale or a myth, fascinating in itself, has a symbolic significance for the reader, depending on his experience, his observations, and his imagination." (Srivastava, 1997 : xiii)

Precisely, myths are traditional or legendary stories concerned with deities or demi-gods that pass on from generation to generation in a particular religion or society.

Girish Karnad is no stranger to the world of Indian myths, including the epics and puranas. As his contemporary playwright Vijay Tendulkar puts it aptly, Karnad was "groomed in mythology" (Ramanarayan, 1989 : 15). Karnad too has admitted on more than one occasion that he grew up with a lot of myths." (C.f. Chakravartee, 1991 : 48)
In almost all his plays, Girish Karnad has used those Indian myths which suit to his purpose. In 'Nagamandala', for example, 'Naga' is a mythological being well-known for its shifting shapes. In ancient literature we are reminded of a separate world as 'Naga-loka'. Later Nagas came to be worshipped by a cult — Naga cult.

The folk has much to do with myths as is the following conversation between Naga and Rani showing the folk belief:

"Naga : What? A cobra?

Rani : (Silencing him.) Shh! Don't mention it. They say that if you mention it by name at night, it comes into the house.

Naga : All right. Suppose a cobra does come into this house ..."

Rani : Don't! Why are you tempting fate by calling that unmentionable thing by its name?

Naga : Why shouldn't it come with love?

Rani : My God bless our house and spare us that calamity. The very thought makes me shudder."

(P. 43)
In her labyrinth, Rani's imagination is based on the mythological world:

"Rani ... So Rani asks him: 'Where are you taking me?' And the Eagle answers: 'Beyond the seven seas and the seven isles. On the seventh island is a magic garden. And in that garden stands the tree of emeralds. Under that tree, your parents wait for you.' So Rani says: 'Do they? Then please, please take me to them — immediately. Here I come.' So the Eagle carries her clear across the seven seas ..." (P. 27-28)

The next play 'Hayavadana' rests on the mythologies of Ganesha and Gandharva. In the epics and puranas, Ganesha has been famous for bringing to the worshipers all success. The same has been invoked at the beginning of the play 'Hayavadana':

"O Elephant-headed Herambha
Whose flag is victory
and who shines like a thousand suns.

O husband of Riddhi and Siddhi,
seated on a mouse and decorated with a snake,"
o single-tusked destroyer of incompleteness,
We pay homage to you and start our play." (p. 73)

Karnad himself agrees to the above. He says, "All theatrical performances in India begin with worship of Ganesha, the God who ensures successful completion of any endeavour. According to mythology, Ganesha was beheaded by Shiva, his father, who had failed to recognise his own son (another aggressive father!). The damage was repaired by substituting an elephant's head, since the original head could not be found." (1995 : 13-14)

The horse to whom the princess married and whose son was Hayavadana was a Gandharva as mentioned in the play:

"Hayavadana : No one could dissuade her. So ultimately she was married off to the white stallion. She lived with him for fifteen years. One morning she wakes up — and no horse! In its place stood a
beautiful Celestial Being, a Gandharva. Apparently this Celestial Being had been cursed by the God Kuvera to be born a horse for some act of misbehaviour. After fifteen years of human love he had become his original self again." (P. 80)

'Tughlaq', as the playwright confesses, is based on the historical myth of Mohammad Tughlaq:

"My subject was the life of Mohammad Tughlaq, a fourteenth century Sultan of Delhi, certainly the most brilliant individual ever to ascend the throne of Delhi and also one of the biggest failures. After a reign distinguished for policies that today seem far-sighted to the point of genius, but which in their day earned him the title 'Muhammad the Mad', the Sultan ended his career in bloodshed and political chaos. In a sense, the play reflected the slow disillusionment my generation felt with the new politics of independent India: the gradual erosion of the ethical norms that had guided the movement for independence, and the coming to terms with cynicism and real politik." (1995 : 7)

'The Fire and the Rain' is based on the mythology inherent in the 'Mahabharata'.
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"The myth of Yavakri (or Yavakrita) occurs in chapters 135-38 of the Vana Parva (Forest Canto) of the Mahabharata. It is narrated by the ascetic Lomasha to the Pandavas as they wander across the land during their exile. I have met Sanskrit scholars who were unaware of the existence of the myth: it is easy to lose track of a short narrative like this in the tangled undergrowth that covers the floor of the epic." (Karnad, 1999: Preface: ix)

Other characters of the play, viz. Indra and Vritra are also mythological. The long verdict of Karnad (1999: 68-69) is worth-quoting here:

"The staying of the demon Vritra by Indra is one of the archetypal myths of India. We find it in the Rigveda: it appears again, needless to say with variations, in the Mahabharata nearly a thousand years later. In the Rigveda, Vritra, 'the shoulderless one' (a serpent) swallows rivers and hides the waters inside him. Indra, by killing him, releases the waters and 'like lowing cows, the
rivers flow out'. The importance of this deed to the Vedic culture is born out by the epithet, 'Vritrahan' or the slayer of Vritra, by which Indra is repeatedly hailed. Yet a passing reference in the myth to how Indra, frightened, fled 'like a falcon across ninety-nine rivers' suggests that even the Rigvedic version probably had elements not entirely complimentary to Indra.

The exact nature of (the) liberation of the waters has given rise to much speculation. In the nineteenth century it was interpreted as bringing down rain ... But the Vritra myth is now generally accepted as a creation myth with Vritra symbolising chaos...

By the time we come to the version recorded in the Mahabharata, Indra has lost his central position in the Hindu pantheon. The sectarian Gods Vishnu and Shiva, now hold sway. In the later version of the myth, Indra is anxious that Vishwarupa (also called Trishiras, the three-headed one), son of Tvastri, may dislodge him from his throne. He therefore destroys Vishwarupa treacherously.
Tvastri then gives birth to another son, Vritra, by a female demon, and tells him: 'Kill Indra'. Indra, unable to overcome the new enemy, again has to resort to ignominious trickery to survive. Having killed Vritra, he suffers from the guilt of Brahminicide.

The myth can be seen as expressing a deep anxiety which informs the whole of Indian mythology, the fear of brother destroying brother. This fear branches out fully and nakedly in the Mahabharata, where the bonding of brothers within the Pandava and the Kuru clans is as close as the enmity between the cousins is ruthless and unrelating. In the Ramayana, the fraternal bonding in the Raghu family — Rama and his brothers — expresses another facet of the same anxiety, with the betrayals of Sugriva and Vibhishana (interestingly in the cause of the ethically correct side) marking the counterpoint.

The tale of Aravasu and Paravasu fascinated me as an unusual variant of this Indian obsession with fratricide and it seemed logical too that
Yavakri should be their cousin, though the Mahabharata does not explicitly say so. I cannot remember when I decided to incorporate the Indra-Vritra legend in my plot, but years later, while re-reading the original version, I was astonished to find that right at the beginning of the tale of Yavakri, Lomasha mentions that the whole story took place on the banks of a river in which Indra had bathed to cleanse himself of the sin of killing Vritra! One of the fascinating aspects of dealing with myths is their self-reflexivity. A myth seems complete in itself and get when examined in detail, contains subconscious signals which led you on to another myth which in turn will act as a conduit to a third one while illuminating the one you started with." (Karnad, 1999: 68-69)
7.3. **Simile**

Comparing two similar things with each other is a poetic device. Karnad's plays are no exceptions to it. There are certain situations where he has used similitude, e.g. in 'Nagamandala', the beauty of Rani is described as follows:

"... When her hair was tied up in a knot, it was as though a black king cobra lay curled on the nape of her neck, coil upon glistening coil."
(P. 27)

"... How beautiful you are. Ears like hibiscus, Skin like young mango leaves. Lips like rolls of silk."
(P. 32)

"What beautiful long hair! Like dark, black, Snake princesses!
(P. 41)

In 'Hayavadana' too, the beauty of Padmini is described in simile:

"But you are so fragile! I don't know how you're going to go through life wrapped in silk like this!"
(P. 92)
The supremacy of human head has been equated with Kalpa Vriksha in the heaven:

"As the heavenly Kalpa Vriksha is supreme among trees, so is the head among human limbs."
(P. 110)

The similarity between Padmini and the Fortunate Lady's flowers is marvellous:

"Padmini: And why a 'Fortunate Lady', pray?

Kapila: Because it has all the marks of marriage a woman puts on. The yellow on the petals — then that red round patch at the bottom of the petals — like on your foreheads — then — here — that thin saffron line — like in the parting of your hair — Then — Uhm ... oh yes size — here near the stem a row of black dots — like a necklace of black heads — "

Padmini: What imagination! (To Devadatta.)

You should put it in your poetry. It's good for a simile." (P. 97)

'Tughlaq' has very few examples of simile, e.g. in Scene Eight, the road from Daulatabad to Delhi
has been compared with a snake:

"Young Man: They say it's the widest road in
the world. But it looks no bigger
than a thin snake from here." (P. 192)

In 'The Fire and the Rain', similes
are for example as under:

"... Words are like water—precious." (P. 15)

"Will he continue to hide like a bandicoot in his
ritual world?" (P. 23)

"Andhaka was there too—but had gone stone deaf." (P. 26)
7.4. **Metaphor**

Metaphorical expressions in the plays of Girish Karnad add the flavour of concretisation or reality to what is called abstract or sometimes they contribute to the theme itself, e.g.

"Nagamandala" "My eyes are all in my fingers."

(p. 32)

Apart from the above, Karnad has used the metaphorical characters as well. Such one is Rani herself. He says: "The position of Rani in the story of Nagamandala, for instance, can be seen as a metaphor for the situation of a young girl in the bosom of a joint family where she sees her husband only in two unconnected roles — as a stranger during the day and as lover at night. Inevitably, the pattern of relationships she is forced to weave from this disjoined encounters must be something of a fiction. The empty house Rani is locked in could be the family she is married into."

(1995 : 17)

"Hayavadana"

"The old friendship flourished as before. Devadatta — Padmini — Kapila. To the admiring citizens of
Dharmapura, Ram - Sita - Lakshmana."
(P. 90)

"You are my saffron, my marriage thread, my deity." (P. 92)

'Tughlaq'

"And four years ago that snake bit a whole city to death." (P. 192)

"It's become a kitchen of death — all because of him." (P. 204)

'The Fire and the Rain'

"You must always extract the honey without ruffling the bees." (P. 7)

"The same old black scorpion. The same horned chameleon. The shower of bird-shit around me." (P. 13)

In addition to it, the 'yajna' is a good metaphor for theatre as already confessed by Karnad :
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"The fire sacrifice was a rite of such central importance in the Vedic society and so completely dominated the mode of thinking that it became the central metaphor, used to underline the importance of any activity. Thus the yajna metaphor has been employed while talking of academic study, lovemaking, the epics, marriage, indeed of life itself. One need hardly mention then that it is also a favourite metaphor for theatre. Kalidasa talks of theatre as the 'desirable fire sacrifice of the eyes' (Kāntam Kratum Chakshushām)."

(Karnad, 1999 : 69)

7.5. Irony

Irony in the plays of Karnad is a pervasive feature. He often ironises the situation or the character as is possible. In
'Nagamandala' for example, Kurudavva, a blind woman, cuts irony as follows:

"Thoo! That's the problem with having eyes: one can't see in the dark. That's why I have been telling you to let me go on my own at least at night — " (P. 35)

In 'Tughlaq', the main character of Tughlaq is ironical. "If irony is one of the strengths of the play, it is through the adroit use of these dramatic devices that the irony is made exceedingly effective in a given context. When Tughlaq who has indigenously manouvered to bring about the death of Sheikh Imam-ud-din on the battlefield declares a day of mourning in honour of the Sheikh and says, "When men like him die, it is sin to be alive?" or when after a long spell of pretended ignorance of the foul game played by Aziz, Tughlaq suddenly flashes the question "Who are you?" It is the voice, it is the facial expression, it is the well-modulated intonational niceties which determine the power and effectiveness of the utterance." (Dass, 1988 : 148)
'Hayavadana' explores a new dimension of irony in that the so-called supreme head confuses not only Padmini, but also the Shastras — the sacred texts. The debate between Devadatta and Kapila throws light on this fact:

"Devadatta : Listen to me. Of all the human limbs the topmost — in position as well as in importance — it is the head. I have Devadatta's head and it follows that I am Devadatta. According to the Sacred Texts ...

Kapila : Don't tell me about your Sacred Texts. You can always twist them to suit your needs."

(p. 107)

In 'Tughlaq', irony runs throughout the play in terms of characters like Tughlaq and Aziz and incidents like prayer and shifting of the capital to Daulatabad. The dialogues between two men — the 'Old Man' and the 'Young Man' — reveals the ironical disposition of Tughlaq, e.g.

"Old Man : God, what's this country coming to ?

Young Man : What are you worried about, grandfather? The country's in perfectly safe hands — safer than any you've seen before.
Old Man: I don't know. I've been alive a long time, seen my Sultans, but I never thought I would live to see a thing like this.

Young Man: Your days are over, old man. What's the use of Sultans who didn't allow a subject within a mile's distance? This King now, he isn't afraid to be human --

Third Man: But does he have to make such a fuss about being human? Announce his mistakes to the whole world — invite the entire capital?" (P. 147)

Anatha Murthy (1971: 144-145) aptly puts it that "the ironic success of Aziz whose amazing story runs parallel to Tughlaq's, and the dualism of the man and the hero in Tughlaq, which is the source of the entire tragedy ... Both Tughlaq and his enemies initially appear to be idealists; yet, in the pursuit of the ideal, they perpetrate its opposite. The whole play is structured on these opposites: the ideal and the real; the divine aspiration and the deft intrigue. Tughlaq
is what he is in spite of his self-knowledge and an intense desire for divine grace. He is aware of the irony of his life when Aziz, the only character in the play who has skilfully used all the schemes of Tughlaq for his own designs, kills Ghiyas-ud-din and comes in his guise as a holy messenger of peace to purify the land and revive the banned prayer. The irony is deeply tragic. In the end Tughlaq and his kingdom are one in their chaos, and he knows it.

Girish Karnad has keenly perceived the implicit irony in human existence. In 'The Fire and the Rain', for example, human's yearning for immortality is ironically tackled:

"Brahma Rakshasa: You talk of immortality. Look, I have been immortal! And I long for death. Release me. You owe it to me." (P. 37)

"Vishakha: They say that pleased with your rigorous penance, Lord Indra has granted you Universal Knowledge. I don't feel equal to the task of —
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Yavakri : Universal Knowledge! What a phrase!
    It makes me laugh now. "The pressure of your austerities forces the God to grant you your wish. And you get 'Universal Knowledge.' Victory!" (P. 13)

7.6. Fantasy

Imagination or fantasy is the act of the mind in that the suppressed desires come out in terms of an art-form like poetry. In 'The Fire and the Rain', for instance, Yavakri's words attest this fact relating to Vishakha's union:

"Yavakri : The strongest thing however is that I've discovered a corner within me — left untouched
by those ten years! Undisturbed by all that self-lashing! So if you feel insulted by what I am going to tell you, go away. I won't see you again. In that case, let these be the last words I speak to you.

(Pause.)

The day I decided my penance was over I fell down in a dead faint. I don't know how long I was in that state. It was terrible exhaustion, the pain of sheer relief. And when I opened my eyes, do you know the first thing that I thought of? Ten years ago I had come to your house to bid you goodbye. And you led me quickly to the jack-fruit grove behind your house. You opened the knot of your blouse, pressed my face to your breasts, then turned and fled. I stood there stunned. The trees were loaded with fruit. Many were ripe and had split open and the rich golden segments poured out. The sweet sick smell of the jack-fruit, the maddening hum of a fly. The smell of your body. Ten years later I opened my eyes and I knew it was hungry for that moment." (P. 14)

Vishakha calls it Yavakri's "Teenage fantasies" (P. 14)
In 'Nagamandala', the following words fantasise the inner will of Naga to evoke Rani's spirit of love by evincing it:

"Frogs croaking in pelting rain, tortoises singing soundlessly in the dark, foxes, crabs, ants, rattlers, sharks, swallows — even the geese! The female begins to smell like the wet earth. And stung by her smell, the King Cobra starts searching for his Queen. The tiger bellows for his mate. When the flame of the forest blossoms into a fountain of red and the earth cracks open at the touch of the aerial roots of the banyan, it moves in the hollow of the cottonwood, in the flow of the estuary, the dark limestone caves from the womb of the heavens to the dark nether worlds, within everything that sprouts, grows, stretches, creaks and blooms — everywhere, those who come together, cling, fall apart lazily! It is there and there and there, everywhere." (P. 45)

Rani's words approve the fantastic world of fantasy in her.
"When I saw your scowling face in the mornings, I would be certain everything was a fantasy and almost want to cry. But my real anxiety began as the evening approached. I would merely lie here, my eyes shut tight. What is there to see after all? The same walls. The same roof. As the afternoon passed my whole being got focused in my ears. The bells of cattle returning home — that means it is the afternoon. The cacophony of birds in a far-away tree — it is sunset. The chorus of crickets spreading from one grove to another — it is night. Now he will come. Suppose he doesn't tonight? Suppose the night-queen bush does not blossom? Suppose it's all a dream? Every night the same anxiety. The same cold feeling deep within me! Thank God. That's all past now." (P. 50)

'Hayaradana' too puts forth many an instance of fantasy, e.g. Padmini speaks about Kapila as follows:

"Padmini : (Watching him, to herself.) How he climbs — like an ape. Before I could even say
'yes', he had taken off his shirt, pulled his dhoti up and swung up the branch. And what an ethereal shape! Such a broad back — like an ocean with muscles rippling across it — " (P. 96)

The lullaby sung by Padmini depicts a fantasy:

"Padmini:

Here comes a rider!
From what land does he come?
On his head a turban
With a long pearly tail
Round his neck a garland
of virgin - white jasmines.
In his fist a sword
with a diamond - studded hilt.
The white-clad rider
rides a white charger
which spreads its tossing mane
against the western sky,
spreads its mane like breakers
against the western sky.
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Sleep now my baby
and see smiling dreams.
There he comes - here he is!
From which land does he come?
But why are the jasmines on his chest
red O so red?
What shine in his open eyes?
pebbles O pebbles.
Why is his young body
cold O so cold?
The white horse gallops
across hills, streams and fields.
To what land does he gallop?
No where O no where."
(p. 117)

Tughlaq's words, in 'Tughlaq', also
remind us of the fantasy he had once cultivated:

"... I built it (a rose garden) because I wanted
to make for myself an image of Sadi's poems. I
wanted every rose in it to be a poem. I wanted
every thorn in it to prick and quicken the senses.
But I don't need these airy trappings now ..."
(p. 202)