Nātyasāstra ascribed to Bharata is a unique work in Sanskrit language. It is a veritable mine of valuable information about the origin and growth, not only of dance and drama but also of poetry and music. It is an encyclopaedic work treating all possible subjects connected with Nātya, in modern terminology with all the arts concerning the theatre.

It consists of 36 or 37 Adhyāyas. As the title of the work indicates, it is a Sāstra or discipline of Nātya. Nātya is very often equated with Abhinaya. It is therefore, to be expected that it is the principal theme of the NS. Of the 36 or 37 Adhyāyas, 28 are devoted to it. Abhinaya in the NS, however, is not merely acting with the body. The latter is only one variety of Abhinaya, viz. Āngika though an important variety. Four Adhyāyas 8-11 are devoted to it. The other three varieties are Vācika, Āhārya and Sāttvika. Vācika primarily means Abhinaya based on Vāk - speech. It includes the arts of recitation of prose and verse. As an aid to this it describes elementary grammars of Sanskrit and Prakrits, Sanskrit and Prakrit prosodies, poetic embellishments, defects as well as a detailed description of the ten
varieties of drama. The Āhārya covers the arts of make-up, costumes, masques and scenic properties. The Sāttvika finds room for emotional acting, erotics, classes of Nāyakas, Nāyikās, etc. Thus between the four varieties of Abhinayas, the art of drama-Nātya in all its aspects is presented in this work. This is supplemented by directions about constructing different kinds of theatre-buildings in the second Adhāya. What the drama is expected to achieve for the audience is Rasa. This is treated in Adhāyas 6 and 7. The first, the third, the fifth and the thirty sixth Adhāyas give the legends about the origin of Nātya, its deterioration as well as ceremonials connected with it. Vocal and instrumental music is dealt with in Adhāyas 28 to 34. The fourth Adhāya of Tāndavālakaṇa deals with dance proper clearly distinguishing it from Abhinaya. Its place in drama is as a beautifying factor. There are references to other writers in Adhāya 37. Thus it will be seen that the NS covers practically all the varieties of literary and other arts. It says:

Na tajjñānam na tācchilpam na sā vidyā na sā kalā /
Nāsa u yogo na tatkarma nātyeṣṣmin yanna drṣyate  //1

1. There is no knowledge, no craft, no lore, no art, no technique and no activity that is not seen in Nātya.

While evaluating this work MM. Dr. P.V. Kane rightly observes, "This work is probably unique in the world's literature on dramaturgy. Hardly any work on dramaturgy

1. NS. 1. 116.
in any language has the comprehensiveness, the sweep and the literary and artistic flare of the NS.\(^2\)

The Nāṭya, according to the text, is a representation of human life as a whole and the world surrounding it. The NS which attempts to describe all these aspects becomes naturally a great source of cultural data. Nāṭyasāstra, in fact, is a valuable source of information for the research of Ancient Indian Culture. It supplies geographical, ethnological and linguistic data. As Nāṭya embraces all different activities of human life, it reflects a very interesting picture of ancient Indian society. The different tribes and peoples, their speeches and dialects, their costumes and colours, their modes of addressing and behaviour, their beliefs and practices, their ways of enjoyments and amusements, etc. are mirrored in the NS. It also gives ample information about the political conditions of the time. It describes the ideal qualities of a king with his important associates. It also prescribes rules for war. Various types of weapons are also described.

The economic conditions of the society is also reflected in it. It has a long list of persons of various professions and religious sects. Besides giving other information on the subject the NS gives detailed information about Ars amatoria. It has devoted one whole Adhyāya-23 for this topic. It prescribes rules for

---

2. H.S.P., pp. 39-40
various ways of wooing, for ways of winning over hearts of women, and for amorous unions. It supplies an interesting picture of various types of women in love.

The aesthetic theory of Rasa based on the psychology of mental states (Bhāvas) and their expression through speech, bodily gestures, make-up and costumes is a very important contribution to aesthetics in general. It also shows how ably the knowledge of mental states is utilised for dramatic production. It has classified heroes and heroines according to their psychological nature.

Before I proceed to gather cultural data from the NS, it would be appropriate to determine the region or regions and the age or ages to which this data can be related, because culture refers to the material and mental achievements of a people or peoples and that they must have lived somewhere and at some time.

When we attempt to study this work for drawing out cultural data, we are first faced with the problem of the text of the work because in the several published editions the texts differ to considerable extent. So I will discuss it first and see in what condition the text of the NS has come down to us. Then we will be in a position to discuss its age and authorship.
Chapter 2

TEXTUAL PROBLEMS

Various editions of the text of the NS:

This valuable work was first brought to the notice of the western scholars by Fitz Edward Hall, in 1865 A.D. while editing Daśarūpa. This American scholar was very keen to edit the text of the NS, but he could not do so on account of the corrupt nature of the available manuscripts of the said work. He was successful in editing only XVII-XX and XXXIV chapters of the NS which he added as an Appendix to his publication of the Daśarūpa. After this publication the attention of the scholars was drawn to the need of finding out more manuscripts of the NS in different manuscript collections. To some extent their efforts were successful.

A German scholar W. Heyman wrote an article in 1874 A.D. on the various topics discussed in the NS.

and created great interest in the scholars interested in this particular subject.

In 1880 A.D., a French scholar named Paul Regnaud critically edited chapter XVII of the NS. The same scholar edited a part of chapter XV and the whole of chapter XVI in 1884 A.D. He pursued his study of this work and edited chapters VI and VII in the same year.3

Another French scholar named Joanny Grosset, being attracted by this work done by his teacher Paul Regnaud, critically edited chapter XVIII of the NS with its translation in French in the year 1888. This work was favourably reviewed by the scholars. Being successful in his primary attempt, Joanny Grosset undertook to prepare a complete critical edition of the Nāṭyaśāstra. During this time two Indian scholars named Sivadatta and Kasinath Parab attempted to edit the complete text of the NS, which was published by the Nirṇayaśāgara Press in its Kāvyamālā series4 in the year 1894 A.D. After this publication, Joanny Grosset published his edition of the NS containing chapters I-XIV in 1898 A.D.5

3. Rhetorique Sanscrite, suivie des textes inédits du Bhāratiya-nāṭya-śāstra, publie pour la première fois et suivi d'une interpretation française, Paris 1884. (Quoted by Dr. Ghosh, ibid).
4. NS Kāvyamālā Series No.42, Bombay, 1894.
The Oriental Institute, Baroda, took up the work of publishing the text of the NS with the commentary of Abhinavagupta under the editorship of the late Shri M.R.Kavi. Under this scheme the first volume of the NS containing Adhyāyas 1-7 was published in the year 1926. The second volume containing Adhyāyas 8-18 was published after eight years in the year 1934.

During this period, in the year 1929, another edition of the NS edited by Shri Batuknāth Sharmā and Shri Baladeva Upādhyāya was published from Banaras, in the Kāśi Sanskrit Series, popularly known as Chowkhambā Series.

The second edition of the NS of the Kāvyamālā Series of the Nirnayasāgara Press, which utilised the material of the first volume of the G.O.S., Baroda and was edited by Pandit Kedaranāth Kavyabhusana was published in the year 1943.

The third volume of the NS of the G.O.S. containing Adhyāyas 19-27 was published in the year 1954.

8. NS Kāśi Sanskrit Series, Publication No. 60, Banāras, 1929.
The second revised edition of the NS, Vol. I. of the G.O.S., Baroda, edited by Shri K.S. Rāmaswāmī Sāstrī was published in the year 1956.11

The second volume of the text of the NS containing Adhyāyas XXVII-XXXVI edited by Dr. M.M. Ghosh was published in the year 1956.12

The fourth volume of the NS containing Adhyāyas 28-37 of the G.O.S., Baroda, edited by Shri J.S. Pade was published in the year 1964.13

The first volume of the text of the NS containing Adhyāyas I-XX VII edited by Dr. M.M. Ghosh was published in the year 1967.14

Recently the text of the NS containing Adhyāyas 1-7 (Vol. I) with 'Pradeepa' Hindi Commentary, edited by Prof. Bābu Lāla Sukla, Shāstrī, is published under the Kāśī Sanskrit Series, 1972.15

The account given above makes it clear that we have four editions which lay claim to present the complete text of the Nāṭyasāstra.

Traditions regarding the Gauntem and Adhyāyas:

Let us now consider the traditions regarding the quantum and Adhyāyas of the NS and see how far the published texts agree or disagree with them.

Abhinavagupta in his commentary says that he is explaining this "Bharatasūtra" consisting of consisting of 36 Adhyāyas. At other place he calls it 'Sattrinsād adhyāyi', i.e. a work consisting of 36 Adhyāyas or chapters. He refers to the volume of the text as Saṭsāhasrī, i.e. a work consisting of 6,000 Ślokas.

This means that the version of the NS that Abhinavagupta had before him consisted of 36 Adhyāyas and that its volume consisted of 6,000 Ślokas. It is not clear why Abhinavagupta calls the work 'Bharatasūtra', unless he had a work other than which consisted of Śutras. But as

17. Ibid.
18. A Śloka or a Grantha is a unit consisting of 32 syllables. With this unit of Grantha or Śloka the extant work is measured as consisting of certain Granthas or Ślokas.
nothing is known about Bharata-sūtra consisting of Sūtras, we have to presume that Abhinavagupta gives the name of Sūtra in order to put this work in the class of ancient hoary Sūtra works.

Abhinavagupta seems to understand the tradition as saying that the text of the NS was divided into 36 chapters and that it consisted of 6,000 Granthas. This same tradition is accepted by the author of the Daśārūpāvaloka. There is another tradition of 12,000 Granthas of the NS. Sāradātanaya says that originally the NS consisted of 12,000 Granthas, though the current text of the NS consisted of half this number, i.e. 6,000 Granthas. Bahurūpamīśra, another commentator on Daśārūpaka, while discussing Aukāvatāra refers to the author of the NS and calls him Dwā-dāśa-sahasrikārī, i.e. composer of 12,000 Ślokas. If Bahurūpamīśra has taken his reference from an actual text before him, it would go to show that there was a text of the NS consisting of 12,000 Granthas in his time. But this is very doubtfull. Not much is known about the Dwā-dāśa-sahasrikārī. Shri M.R.Kavi, the editor of the NS, Vol.I.

19. DR IV.2.
(Second revised Edn.), says, "The work is also known as Satsahasri, meaning 6000 (Granthas). This appears to be an epitome of an earlier work called 'Dvadasasahasri', which means 12,000 (Granthas). This larger work is now only in part available." But as this is nowhere published, I leave aside its consideration.

Coming to the traditional text of 36 Adhyayas and 6,000 Slokas let us see how far the four printed editions confirm or differ from it.

The commentary of AG as published in the G.O.S. Baroda in four volumes of the NS is on 37 Adhyayas. This seems to go against Abhinava's own tradition of 36 Adhyayas. The first and the second editions of the Kavyamala Series of Nirmayasaagara Press, Bombay, consisted of 37 and 36 Adhyayas respectively. The Chowkhambã edition published in the Kasi Sanskrit Series consists of 36 Adhyayas. So does Dr. M.M. Ghosh's editions. Let us try to explain this discrepancy.

As stated above, out of these four published editions of the NS, three have 36 Adhyayas. Only the G.O.S. edition has 37 Adhyayas. The first edition of the

23. Dr. S.K.De in his History of Sanskrit Poetics makes a reference to a manuscript of the NS containing 38 Adhyayas in the Deccan College Library, Poona. (HSP, P.18, fn.2.)
Kāvyamālā series had also 37 Adhyāyas. To explain this discrepancy Shri M.R. Kavi advances the theory of two recensions and states, "The present work consists of 37 chapters according to the Northern or later recension but only 36 according to the Southern or earlier texts. The difference lies in the numbering of chapters, as the Southern or older texts combined the 37th with 36th. Abhinava, the commentator, appears to be the author of this numerical extension of the text, though he himself states that work consists of 36 chapters. He actually comments on 37th chapter also." Shri Kavi considers the Vārtikakāra responsible for this type of interpolation. He says, "the commentator begins each chapter with a verse in praise of Śiva as incorporate of one of the 36 Tattvas of the Saiva Siddhānta in some order while the 37th chapter is headed with a verse indicating anuttarāha (nothing beyond) a doctrine in Kāshmirī Śaivism propounded by Utpaladeva, the commentator’s paramaguru (Teacher’s teacher). The reason for this extension of the text is not mere fanciful device for introducing his Śaiva Tattvas. Thus subject matter thus separated from the rest was probably composed by one of the Vārtikakāras, either Rāhubala, Śini, or Śrīharaśa. But he himself says in two places that Bharata’s work consists of 36 chapters and hence the 37th must be according to him an interpolation by one of the Vārtikakāras."

24. NS Vol. I., Preface, p.58
25. Ibid.
Let us now take a comparative account of the total number of verses in each of the four published editions of the NS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter No.</th>
<th>Total number of verses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that the number of slokas in chapters in the different editions of the NS plus the prose passages incorporated therein does not vary much from the traditional number of 6,000 slokas of the NS.
THE TWO RECENSIONS OF THE NĀTYASĀSTRA:

Now let us examine the question of the two recensions of the text of the NS. Shri M. Ramakrishna Kavi, the editor of the first three volumes of the NS, G.O.S., Baroda, classifies his 40 manuscripts in two groups, viz. A and B. According to him the B group is earlier and the A group is later. These two groups he looks upon as two recensions of the text. He is of the opinion that the A recension was closely followed by the Sphoṭa School of Kāśmir critics, to which Abhinavagupta and his preceptors Tota, Utpaladeva and Bhaṭṭendurāja belonged. The earlier B recension has been followed by the Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya Schools, to which belonged Saṅkuka and his predecessors Lollaṭa, Udhaṭa etc. While classifying the available manuscripts he states 'All the copies obtained in the Telugu, Tamil, Kanarese and Malayalam districts, with the exception of two in the last named country, represent the earlier recension, while the edition of Kāvyamālā (probably based on the two copies of the text in the Bhandarkar Institute) their original copy which is our manuscript obtained from Ujjain by the Baroda state, and the two copies in the Library of Mahārājā of Bikaner, represent A recension. One may call the earlier recension Southern and the later Northern. But we have obtained two copies from the Malabar of the A recension.
while the two copies in the Durbar Library of Nepal represent B recension. Our Almoura transcript stands midway between the two recensions1. Shri Kavi is of the opinion that in the 10th Century the text of the NS was available in the recensions. To show this he points out that Dhanañjaya (945-995 A.D.), the author of the Dasarūpa quoted from the shorter i.e. A recension of the NS, while his contemporary Bhoja quoted from the longer one i.e. B recension in his work Śrīgārāprakāśa. According to Mr. Kavi, B recension seems to be more ancient, but several portions therein are interpolated according to the different Schools of Nandin and Kohala. For reconstructing the text of the NS the learned editor Shri Kavi has followed 'A' recension. The Commentator Abhanavagupta also follows 'A' recension.

Shri Kavi advances the following chief tests in favour of his theory of two recensions:

(1) in A sets about 40 verses are omitted as mere interpolation at the end of the fifth chapter, while B sets give them.

(2) the Ninth Chapter in A sets is divided into two chapters (9th and 10th) in B, and thus the numbering differs thenceforth.

27. Ibid.
(3) The 14th and 15th Chapters in A dealing with prosody for the stage introduce later terminology of Piṅgala (as ra, ja, ta, bha, sa, etc.), while the B sets merely equate the measure of a line in short and in long syllables of Laghu and Guru.

(4) The definitions in the Sixteenth chapter are given in Upajāti metres and in a certain order in A, but they are given in Anuṣṭubh metre and in reverse order in the 17th Chapter of the B sets.

(5) The subject matter of the 26th Chapter in 'A' is found in the 35th chapter of B sets.

(6) The 36th Chapter in B sets is divided into two chapters 36 and 37 in A sets, or even as 38th in one of the copies of the same recension.

Dr. M. M. Ghosh also accepts the theory of two recensions and says 'In the matter of having two rather divergent recensions, the NS is quite a peer of important works like the Mirukta, the Brhaddevatā and the Sakuntalā.' 28 In support of this statement he

---

advances the argument, 'The Chapter XVII (K.M.XVI) dealing with Nāṭya-gūṇa and alaṅkāra has nearly forty ślokaś differently worded in the two recensions. These ślokaś in the longer recension i.e. B are written in the usual simple language of the NS, while in the shorter recension i.e. A the ślokaś betray a later polish. The metre of the five opening stanzas of chapter XVII (K.M.XVI)which in the shorter recension are in Upajāti points to their later origin. For, the bulk of the NS as has been pointed out before, are composed in the Anuṣṭubh metre and the first couplet of this chapter in the longer recension is also in the same metre.'29 Dr. Ghosh frankly admits that it is very difficult to solve the problem of relation between the two recensions. Without any reliable material we cannot opine that the shorter recension is earlier and the longer is later or vice versa. Dr. V. Raghavan also believes in the two recensions of the some of the text of the NS. According to him the portions pertaining to Lākṣaṇas, metres and gūnas in the NS are in two recensions. To support his view he quotes Abhinava and says, 'There is concrete evidence to prove that Abhinava knew the two chief recensions of the NS. In his Abhinavabhāratī itself, there are three places where Abhinava himself says that another recension exists.'30

29. Ibid. p.4.
This view of two distinct recensions of the text of the NS has been examined by Shri K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, who has revised the first edition of the first Volume of the NS published in the G.O.S., Baroda. In his preface to the volume he refuted the theory of two recensions. In support of his refutation he says, 'It is difficult to get convinced that there could be distinct recensions in the Sāstric works of all India importance such as Dharma Sāstra, the Artha Sāstras, the Kāma Sāstras, the Nātya Sāstras and other philosophical works and Bhāyas of Patañjali, Śābara, Śaṅkara and others. Bharata's work also, like these Sāstric and philosophical works, seems to have been preserved with a certain amount of uniformity in the northern and southern manuscripts.¹ In support to this statement he further states, 'it is quite possible for different recensions to exist in epic works which were recited in public by Sītas and Māgadhas, but there is no likelihood of such recension in the case of the works of Sāstric importance. No doubt, there are scribal errors, additions, and interpolations in different manuscripts but these can be easily detected and eliminated by critically checking and collecting the text with several original manuscripts from different parts of the country. Moreover, the NS which is also

known as Nātyaveda seems to have been preserved all over
India in one recension only in the same manner as all
other Vedas and Sastras have been preserved.\textsuperscript{32}

As to Kavi's classification of Northern and
Southern recension, I may say that he give up his case
by saying that even though the manuscripts obtained
in the Telugu, Tamil, Canaries and Malayalam districts
represent the B version yet he says that the two
manuscripts obtained in Malayalam Dist. represent 'A'
version. Similarly even though the majority of the
manuscripts obtained in the Northern India represent
A recension, yet the two copies in the Darbar Library
of Nepal represent B recension. He further weakens his
case by informing us that the transcript of the Almoura
manuscript stands midway between the two recensions.

A comparative study of the texts in different
editions goes to confirm the opinion of Mr. Shāstrī on
the whole. We have, however, to accept the opinion of
Dr. Raghavan that the portions of the NS dealing with
Laksana, Metres and Guna were current in two
recensions. Whether these portions having two recensions
are the remnants of the two recensions of the whole NS
is a moot point which cannot be resolved for want of
sufficient evidence.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
Chapter-3

IMPORTANT FEATURES OF THE TEXT OF THE NĀTYASĀSTRA

Some important features of the text of the NS and the problems they raise:

The text of the NS as it stands before us is mainly written in Sanskrit verse, mostly in Anuṣṭubh metre. There are some Āryās and Upajātis also. There are a few Sanskrit prose passages also. In the illustration of Prakrit Dhruvas, there are a great number of Prakrit verses and while describing the prakrit grammar, there are few prose passages in Prakrit also. The remarkable variations are as follows:

(1) The prose passages found in different Adhyāyas are as under: In Adhyāyā-5, after verse 24, there is a short passage printed in the first volume of the NS published in the G.O.Series and the second edition of the NS published by the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press. The said passage is omitted in the texts published in the Kāśi Sanskrit Series and by Dr. M.K.Ghosh. There are prose passages of some length in Adhyāyas 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 28, 33 and 35.

(2) There are about 15 Ślokas and 16 Āryās referred to as Anuvāṃśya (i.e. belonging to a certain family or school or tradition).
(3) There are couplets of Āryās introduced with the words 'Sūtrānubaddha Āryā Bhavatah'.

(4) About 100 verses are cited with the word 'Bhavanti ca atra ślokah' or 'Atra ślokah'.

These features of the text of the NS have raised several problems as to the original nature of the text of the NS. Whether it was a prose work consisting of Sūtras with one or more commentaries or whether it was originally a work in verse with one or more commentaries. Let us see whether there are any clues regarding this matter in the NS itself which would enable us to unravel this problem.

The sixth Adhyāya of the NS refers to Saṃgraha, Kārikā and Mirukta. It also explains the meaning of these types of compositions. Saṃgraha is described as a compact composition of topics discussed at length in Sūtra and Bhāṣya. The Sūtra is described as a brief statement. The Kārikā is explained as one explaining the meaning of the Sūtra. Mirukta is an exegesis explaining the words grammatically. Then the author says, "I will now speak at length about Saṃgraha mentioned briefly by me with Mirukta and Kārikā."¹ This suggests that the author of this portion looks upon the NS as consisting of Saṃgraha

¹. NS 6.15, Saṃgraho yo māyā' proktah samāsena dvijottamaḥ/
vistāram tasya vakṣyāmi saniruktam sakārikāṃ //
with Kārikās and exegesis; in other words, we should expect Sūtras, Kārikās, exegesis, etc. in the NS.

From the brief account given above of the features of the text of the NS, it becomes evident that we find all these different modes of composition in the text. It may, therefore, be said that the text—published in different editions, even though have considerable variations in the number of verses, etc. they, in a general way, answer the nature of the work described in the introductory verses of Adhyāya 6.

This raises a number of questions by itself, e.g. whether there was a work consisting of Sūtras only, whether there was a work consisting of Kārikās explaining the Sūtras, whether there was a Bhāṣya explaining the Sūtras and Kārikās and finally whether there was a Saṅgraha, an epitome of all these works, which is, so to say, expanded in the NS.

We have, however, to confess that there is no material to enable us to answer these questions. We know that Pāṇini mentions two Nāṭa Sūtras, viz. one of Kṛṣṇa and the other of Śilālin, that the students and the

2. Pāṇini IV. 3-129.
followers of these two Schools were known as Kṛṣāsvins and Sāñcales and that these terms were in current use in the time of Pāṇini and that he had to explain them grammatically. We may, from all this presume that there were two Sūtra works on Nāṭya.

There is another important reference in Pāṇini's Astādhyāyī which explains Nāṭya on the analogy of Chāndogya, Yājñikya, etc. as the 'Dharma'or 'Āmnāya' of Nāṭas. Thus, according to Pāṇini, Nāṭya means the particular activity of Nāṭas or the traditional lore of Nāṭas. This goes to show that the art of the Nāṭa and the traditional learning pertaining to it were recognised as worthy of notice requiring explanations.

Thus these two references in Pāṇini's grammar indicate that there were two Nāṭasūtra works and that there was recognition of Nāṭya as a particular activity of Nāṭas and traditional lore.

But as these two texts are not extant we can say nothing about their contents and we cannot say whether these Nāṭasūtras or the substance of them is incorporated in the present text of the NS. We can, however, say that as early as 600-400 B.C. the Nāṭya was already a recognised discipline. This means that

3. Pāṇini - Ibid.
our Nātyaśāstra had before it traditional lore about Nātya. It would not be a wild guess to think that all this material might have been more or less utilized in our NS.

As we have, however, no extant Kārikā works, Bhāṣya works and Saṃgraha works on Nātya, we cannot go further than this. The only thing that we can say is in the present text, an extensive presentation of the brief Saṃgraha.

Prof. A. B. Keith calls Nātyaśāstra a compilation. Compilation means 'collecting materials into a volume or making up a volume of such materials.' If the present NS is a compilation in this sense, it would raise questions about the source of these materials, whether these have come from authors of one School or those of several Schools, or the major part comes from the authors of one School and completed with material from other Schools. It appears from the study of the text of the NS that the materials have come mainly from one School, though through several generations. In course of these several generations new material might have been appropriated from the developments in the School itself as also from other sources. In this

4. HSF, p. 372.
sense we may call the NS a compilation. The question whether Bharata was the compiler of the NS or whether he was the founder or a prominent Ācārya of the School is difficult to answer. The possibility, however, is that he was a founder of the School represented in the present NS. It may be presumed that Bharata had at least before him the Schools of Kṛṣṇaśva and Silālin.

In the NS we find many technical terms which do not appear to be Sanskrit. Several scholars have regarded them as Prakrit and Desya words. This might raise a problem about the original language of the NS, whether it was Prakrit and Desya or whether Sanskrit. The fact that Nāṭya was originally an art of the masses including Śādras might lead us to believe that the original language of the work might have been a popular vernacular and later on in the heads of Brahmins was transformed into Sanskrit. An analogy is presented by the theory of Pargiter who thought that the Purāṇas were originally in Prakrit and later on transformed into Sanskrit.

However, in the present state of our knowledge no definite opinion can be advanced. We can only say that Sanskrit text of the NS has absorbed Prakrit and Desya words as they were current among the practitioners of the art.

5. DKA., Introduction, pp. x-xi.
Chapter 4

AUTHORSHIP

The whole text of the NS is in the form of a dialogue between Bharata and a number of sages led by Ātreya. To be more precise, the sages put him questions and he answers them. Thus the NS is a sort of collection of lessons of Bharatamuni. In fact the word Adhyāya means a lesson, a lecture, a chapter, etc.

The introductory verses of the first Adhyāya of the NS describe the occasion of the propounding of the NS by Bharata. Its substance is as under:

'Saluting the gods Pitāmaha (Brahman) and Mahēśvara (Śiva), I will now propound the NS as revealed by Brahman. On a holiday Bharata was sitting at leisure surrounded by his sons or disciples. The sages led by Ātreya ask Bharata as to how the Nātyaveda originated, for whose sake, what are its parts, what is its volume and how it is to be practised.'

Now the question here is who is to be understood by 'I'. Are we to understand that it is Bharata himself or is it some one else? This in short is the problem of the authorship of the NS. It seems that this problem troubled our old Sanskrit critics also. Abhinavagupta 1

1. NS I. 1-5.
himself raises this question in his commentary. He refers to the opinion of some, according to whom the first five verses are composed by some pupil of Bharata. The reason given for this opinion is that Bharatamuni refers to himself in the third person. Abhinavagupta rejects this objection on the ground that the mode of referring to oneself in the third person as a method of discussion involving Pūrvapakṣa and Uttarapakṣa in works of Śruti, Śruti, Vyākaraṇa, Tarṭaka etc. was a tradition of the ancients. We may add that this is exemplified in such works as the Kautiliya Arthasastra, Vātsyāyanīya Kāmasūtra, etc.

Abhinavagupta also refers to the opinion of one Nāstikadhuryopādhyāya. We do not know who was this upādhyāya. Presumably he must be a leading teacher of the Nāstikas i.e. Lokayatikas or Gārvākas, who must have been a student of the NS. According to him the NS is not composed by the Muni, but it is a sort of compilation made after a critical study of the ideas or of the teachings of Sadāśiva, Brahman and Bharata. This has been done to establish the validity of Brahmanata. Abhinavagupta rejects this opinion on the ground that it goes against the well-known tradition of the people, which has not been superceded or contradicted viz. that Bharatamuni is the author of the NS.3

Here we may note the tradition regarding the composition of the different parts of the NS given in the 37th Adhyāya. This has been accepted by Abhinavagupta as the last Adhyāya of the NS on which he has commented. It was Svayambhūr Brahman who first taught the Nāṭya whose validity is to be accepted on the authority of the Āpta. Then we are told 'Kohala will do the remaining by the later Tantra (Uttara-tantra)'. He will also compose productions (prayoga), the kārikās and Míruktas. Later on we are told that in addition to Kohala and others Vātasa, Sāṇḍilya and Dhūrtita will also make their contributions to the NS to suit the human conditions.

Thus the multiple authorship of the NS which was current in Abhinavagupta's time is indicated in the NS itself. In spite of this AG accepts the hoary tradition that the NS is a work of Bharatamuni.

Let us now consider the problem of the historicity of Bharata.

Let us first look into the text of the NS itself for any clue regarding this question. As we just now said it is Bharata himself who is supposed to

4. NS 37, 17-18.
5. NS 37-24 'Dhūrtita' - according to Chowkhambā (36-71) and Dr. M.M. Ghosha's (36-75) editions.
propound the NS. In other Adhyāyas also we find such references as 'Bharatauvāca' or 'Bharatasya vacassṛutva', 'Muninām Bharato muniḥ pratyuvāca punarvākyam', etc. etc. This shows that for the NS Bharatamuni is a proper noun of a sage, who is its supposed author. But we may also note that at some places in the text Bharata (Adhyāya 13, śloka 61 KM) in singular and Bharatas in plural (Adhyāya 35, śloka 20 KM) are referred to as common nouns meaning Naṭas in general. In Adhyāya 35, śloka 21 why Vidūṣaka and other actors are known as Bharatas is explained thus 'Bharatāsīyacca Bharatāḥ' i.e. Vidūṣaka and other actors are called Bharatas because they are dependent upon Bharata. This means that in the NS itself Bharata is a name for the sage as well as a common noun for any actor.

Before we proceed further we may note a somewhat different tradition about the origin of the NS and an explanation of the word Bharata. In the Bhāvaprakāśana of Sāradātanaya (1175 A.D. - 1250 A.D.) we are told that Manu, the first emperor of the human world, was tired by the burden of ruling this wide earth. So he approached his father, the Sun, and requested him to show some way of getting respite. The Sun God narrated to him the story as to how Brahma having created these worlds had become

---
7. NS 4.269 (KM).
8. NS 5-1 (KM).
9. NS 5-5 (KM).
similarly tired and how he approached Viṣṇu for relief. Viṣṇu directed Brahman to Sambhu. Brahman went to him and prayed to him to relieve him of the exertion. Sambhu asked Nandikesvāra to teach Brahman the Nāṭyaaveda that Nandikesvāra had learnt from him. Accordingly Nandikesvāra taught the whole theory and practice of Nāṭya to Brahman. Brahman after receiving this knowledge went home and meditated upon a producer of the Nāṭyaaveda. As soon as he did this, a certain Muni followed by five pupils stood before him, when Bharatī also was present. Brahman spoke to them, 'bharata', 'you hold', 'carry' (Nāṭyaaveda).

They studied the Nāṭyaaveda and its various productions. Then they, taking the former deeds of gods narrated in prabandhas, presented them in a manner taught in the Nāṭyaaveda and thus satisfied Brahman. Brahman being pleased gave them a boon - "because you hold or carry" - 'bharata' this Nāṭyaaveda which I have propounded, you will be known in three worlds by the name of Bharata and this Nāṭyaaveda will be famous after your name i.e. Bharata."

Brahman, thus, with the help of these Bharatas removed the exertion caused by the labour of protection of these worlds. So to remove this fatigue the Sun God

10. BP-x pp. 284-287, G.O.S., Baroda. 1930. Has this tradition any connection with Bharata - Son of Bhautya Manu mentioned in the Markandeya Purāṇa?
asks Manu to pray to Brahman for the knowledge of this art, which he did. Brahman at his request sent all the Bharatas to this earth. They came to Ayodhya and practised their art.

Then the Bharatas, at the request of Manu, prepared a Saṅgraha taking the substance from the Nāṭyaveda, so that it could easily be practised. They prepared two epitomes, one consisting of 12,000 ślokas and the other of 6,000 ślokas. After Bharatas these are known by the name of Bharata.\textsuperscript{11}

This tradition, though in a late work, would attribute the origin of Nāṭyaveda to Sambhu, who asked Nandikeśvara, his disciple in the subject, to teach it to Brahman. In this respect it differs from the tradition of the NS, according to which Nāṭyaveda originated with Brahman. Both traditions, however, agree that Bharata learned it from Brahman. We further learn from it that Bharatas prepared two epitomes.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
Another interesting point is that instead of one Bharata, the sage and all his five disciples are called by the generic name Bharatās.  

12. Who these other Bharatas are not mentioned in the tradition. On the authority of the Bhāvaprakāśaṇa of Saradātanaya, Shri M.R.Kavi speaks of five Bharatas. He says, "Five Bharatas along with their master are mentioned as to have received inspiration from Brahmā to spread Gāndharva, among whom Vṛddhāravinda wrote a work consisting of 12,000 Granthas, a part of which is now available, while the younger, known as Bharata or Muni, produced Nātyaśāstra in 6,000 ślokas, in which music proper is dealt with in 5 chapters, 28 to 34 excluding the 32nd and 33rd." He further states, "It is not known who the other three Bharatas are. Kohala, Dattila, and probably Kāśyapa may be suggested to form the number." (Literature on Music - M.R.Kavi. The Quarterly Journal of the ARS Vol. III, Part I July, 1923) The other problem of Ādi Bharata and Bharata is discussed at length by Dr. M.M.Ghosh (IH; Vol. III, 1930; 0-79), Shri P.R.Bhandarker (IA, Vol. xvi, June, 1912), Dr. S.K.De, in his Some problems of Sanskrit Poetics, p. 156), Shri P.K.Gode, (Bh; Vol. XIII, p. 92) and Prof. D.R.Mankad, (Bh, Vol. XII, 1931-32). Dr. P.V.Kane is of the opinion that the distinction between Bharata and Ādi Bharata is made by comparatively later writers. (History of Sanskrit Poetics, p. 26. 3rd revised Edn. Delhi, 1961).
Let us now take note of Bharata and Bharatas in Vedic and later Sanskrit literature. As Macdonell and Keith say 'Bharata is the name of a people of great importance in the Rgveda and the later literature. In the Rgveda they appear prominently in the third and seventh mandalas in connection with Sudas and Tītsus while in the sixth mandala they are associated with Divodāsa.'

In Vedic literature Agni is also called 'Bharata' because it is maintained or being maintained (१st first conjugation) by men. The Mīghantus, to explain which Yāska composed his Mīruktā, give Bharata as one of the eight names of Rtvija, sacrificial priests. The commentator of Mīruktā derives it also from १ (1st conjugation) thus 'bhriyante daksinābhiriti Bharatāh' (p.321). Thus the references in Vedic literature including Vedas, Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣadās, give us four meanings of Bharata viz. 1. the name of a tribe or a people,
2. the name of a particular Agni,
3. the name of a particular person referring to the son of Dusyanta and Sakuntalā and according to the Mīghantus,
4. a sacrificial priest.

In the epic literature, particularly in the Mahābhārata, the dynasty of the Bharatas to which both the Kauravas and Pāṇḍavas belonged is too well known to require mention.

Now let us see what the Sanskrit lexicographers have to say about the noun Bharata. Amarasiṃha (660 A.D.) in his Amarakośa gives only one meaning of the word Bharata, i.e., Nāta or actor. In the eight equivalents of Saivāli Haśyādha (10th Cent. A.D.) mentions Bharata as the seventh and Nāta as the eighth. All the later lexicographers agree in giving this meaning of Nāta to the word Bharata. The Vaijayanti of Yādavaprabhāsa (11th Cent. A.D.) gives two other meanings viz. 1. Fire in which the 'Brahmaudana' is boiled and 2. a priest. Thus Vaijayanti seems to carry forward the Vedic tradition. Mahesvara (1111 A.D.)

17. 'Brahmaudannī bharato yavistha savanāhutau' Svargakāṇḍa, Lokapālādhyāya, Sloka 26, p. 11.
18. "Yajaka bharata yajña līhāh kukha rtvijah yatasrūco devayavo vahato vṛkta bahisah, Adhvaryugatāḥ hotāro brahmaeceti mahārtvijah."
   - Bhumikākāṇḍa, Brāhmaṇādhyāya, Slōka 89, p. 89
in his *Viprapakṣa* omits the meanings of the sacrificial priest and a particular Vedic Agni and adds two proper nouns viz. the son of Duṣyanta and a younger brother of Rāma and two common nouns viz. a kind of musical instrument and (rarely) a weaver.  

19. Hemacandra (12th Cent. A.D.) in his *Anekarthasaṅgraha* omits the Vedic sacrificial priest and Agni and also the musical instrument, but gives the son of Duṣyanta and a younger brother of Rāma and also a weaver as its meanings. He adds another proper noun viz. Ḍharata, a son of Ṛṣabha, the first Jain Ṭīrthāṅkara. He also gives three other meanings viz. 1. Ṣabara - an aboriginal tribe, 2. Five regions of the name of Bharata, 3. a Śāstra.  

20. Medinīkāra (14th Cent. A.D.) in his *Mānārthaśabdakośa* gives three proper nouns as meanings viz. 1. younger brother of Rāma, 2. the son of Duṣyanta, 3. the sage of the NŚ. As to the derivation of the word ḍharata, Āryaṅkīmin says,

19. "........ bharataḥ sābāre nāti
kṣetre rāmānīje sāstre dausyantravṛṣahḥāṃaje.
(Anekarthasaṅgraha, Kānda 3 śloka 301) Edited by Ghanananda Pandeya and Janardana Joshi, Chowkhamba, 1929.

20. Ibid.

21. "... bharato nātyasaśṭra nāti (śloka 138/B)
"Rāmānīje ca dausyanṭaui.... ..." (śloka 139/A) 
Medinikosā, p.64 Edited by Jagannath Śāstrī, Hoshing, Chowkhambā S.S. 1940).
'Bharatasyāpatyam' 22- offspring of Bharata. Hemacandra in his commentary on his Abhidhanacintāmani also connects it with the sage Bharata, but derives the word Bharata from the root bhr (3rd conjugation) in all its different meanings. Thus in the sense of Nāṭa he says, "Tām tām bhūmikāṁ bibharti," 23 in the case of Rṣabha's son, "Bibharti saṭkhaṇḍam bharatkaśetram" 24 in the sense of the son of Dusyanta, "Bibhrati prāthvīm," 25 and in the sense of five regions, "Bibhrati dharmam bharatāṁ pañca". 26

Bhanuji Dīkṣita (1450 A.D.) a late commentator on Amarakośa explains Bharata thus: "Bharatasya muneḥ sīṣyāḥ or Yadvā bibharti svāgama." 27 i.e. the disciples of Bharatamuni or one who assumes a role.

Thus we find that Bharata is the proper name of four persons viz. the son of Dusyanta, a younger

---

22. Amarakośa with the commentary of Kṣiraswāmi, Edited by Hara Dutt Sharma and Dr. N. C. Sardesai, Oriental Book Agency, Poona, 1941, p.
23. AC Kāṇḍa 2, sloka 242, p. 135 Edited by Viśyanākaraṇavāsa.
24. AC. Kāṇḍa 3, sloka 356, p. 278.
27. Amarakośa (Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1929, p. 332) with the commentary of Bhanuji Dīkṣita.
brother of Rāma, a son of Raṣabha, and in the late
Medinikā, the sage of the NS. We may also note Bharata, a son of Bhautya Manu, mentioned in the Mārkanḍeyā Purāṇa. It is also the name of a specific sāstra viz. the Nāṭyaśāstra and in Vedic literature the name of a specific fire. We have four general names, the Nāṭa, or actor, a musical instrument, an aboriginal tribe and sometimes a weaver. In the Vedic literature and in Mahābhārata it is a name of a famous clan and also sacrificial priests. In the Vedic literature Bharata-Agni is derived from the root य-भ्र (1st conjugation) and in later literature य-भ्र (3rd conjugation). The word is also explained as an offspring of a disciple of Bharata. We leave aside the proper names excepting that of the sage Bharata of the NS. In earlier Vedic literature two general names are prominent viz. the clan of Bharatas and the sacrificial priests. In the later lexical literature the meaning of Nāṭa is prominent and universally accepted. We have now to consider whether this later meaning of Bharatas viz. Nāṭa is in any way connected with the tribe of Bharatas or with the sacrificial priests.

28. MKP. 97.32.
Prof. Adya Raṅgacārya (formerly R.V. Jagirdar) is of the opinion that Bharata of the NS is family name of the Vedic tribe. This family according to him must have been highly cultured intelligent and respectable but cursed by the other Vedic sages on account of their later lapse in morals. This theory of Adya Raṅgacārya is refuted by Dr. I. Shekhar. While refuting the theory of Shri Adya Raṅgacārya, Dr. I. Shekhar floats a new theory about Bharata as one belonging to a non-Āryan tribe. The arguments of this scholar are more imaginative than historical.

The only possible connection of Bharatas - warriors with Bharatas - actors can be imagined as the latter being followers of the former on the analogy of other similar instance.  

31. Ibid.  
32. Such a connection is very often found amongst artisan Classes bearing the name of their patrons e.g. Amongst the tailors there are some who called themselves Parmārs, some Chaahāns; amongst the Nāgars the Nāgars there are some Chāreikhāns, some Saiyads etc; amongst Harijans also we have similar class names of the Kṣatriyas. The actors are also sometimes known after their patrons both in our country and in England.
The second possibility that the Bharatas may be a class of sacrificial priests - Ṛtvijas whose main work might have been music, dance and dramatic performances in the sacrificial sessions. The theory of the religious of drama can best be explained in this way. Kālidāsa's reference to the sages as looking upon the Nāṭya as the visual charming sacrifice for the gods can also get to support this view. The famous grammarian Pāṇini's reference to Nāṭya as ānāya also can be quoted to support this view. The high position given to NS as one of the Vedas and the high respect given to the mythical sage Bharata might have been due to this connection.

We have, however, to confess that there is no direct reference to Bharatas playing this role in Vedic literature; though in Kālidāsa and other writers Bharata is referred to as a sage in heaven directing plays for the pleasure of gods.

What we can say with certainty is that the term Bharata was used for Naṭa in Sanskrit literature, and that the word Bharata was derived by all authorities from the root bhr " (1st or 3rd Cent. A.D.).

33. Mālavikāgnimitram, Act V - v.
34. Pāṇini - 4.3. 129.
35. Vikramorvaḍīyam, Act II v. 18.
Bharatamuni may be regarded as an embodiment of Nātya, just as Vyāsa in the opinion of Sir R.G. Bhandarkar was a similar appellation. Another explanation that may be given is that Bharata may be a patronym. He might have been a historical ancestor of Bharatas, either of a class of Rtvijas performing music, dance and dramatic performances or merely an ancestor of the artisan class of actors, just as artisans see in Visvakarman their first progenitor. Beyond this it is not possible to say much about the historicity of Bharata, and so we cannot say anything about his time or place. We have, however, the text of the NS before us and we can discuss its time.

Most scholars, who have studied the texts of the NS published in different editions, are of the opinion that the NS is a compilation rather than a work of a single author. We have suggested above that the text of the NS probably represents the work of generations of teachers belonging to the school of Bharata. If this view is correct it would follow that the work cannot be ascribed to one particular period.

A perusal of the contents of the NS given after this chapter will show that it is an encyclopaedic work dealing with a great number of subjects which might have something to do with dance, drama and theatre as such. It also contains many references to geography, tribes, manners, customs, languages, dialects, etc. Scholars have used this material to find out the probable age or ages of the NS.
Chapter 6

THE AGE OF THE NĀTYAŚĀSTRA

If we are not in a position to establish anything definite about the identity, time and place of its author, it is very difficult for us to fix the date of the text as it is before us. We know that the text, as it has come down to us, is not the work of a single author, and is not only pertaining to Nāṭya, but with the other allied subjects connected with Nāṭya in one way or the other.

For want of sufficient data, the question of the different strata of the NS and the stages through which it might have passed is difficult to answer. Though the text contains valuable materials for reconstructing the cultural history of India, the problem of its date is troublesome. Various scholars have suggested different dates varying from 500 B.C. to 800 A.D.

It was the French Sanskritist Paul Regnaud, who, in the year 1897, after a critical study of the rhetorics and metrics of the text of the NS, declared that it might go back to 100 B.C.1

On the examples of Prakrit given in Chapter 32 of the NS Pischel assigns 6th or 7th Cent. A.D. as the probable date of the work.

Dr. Arthur A. Macdonell in his history of Sanskrit literature puts the work in 6th cent. A.D.

Prof. Sylvain Lévi, relying upon the use of such words as Swāši, Kumāra, and Bhadramukha in the text of the NS, tried to suggest that the text was composed at the time of Indo Scythian Ksatrapas i.e. in the first half of the 2nd century A.D.

Dr. Haraprasad Shastri, on the strength of the use of the word Pahlava in the NS, thinks that the word Pahlava was derived from the Pārthava, and this change took place when NS was written. On this ground he assigns 200 B.C. as the probable date of the NS.

Rao Saheb P.R. Bhandarkar in his article "Contribution to the study of Ancient Hindu Music" explains that it will be futile to attempt to determine the age of the author of the NS since it is a remodelled

2. Grammatik der Prakrit - Sprachen, p. 32
3. History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 434.
4. IA Vol. XXXIII, pp. 163-168
6. IA. Vol. XII-1912.
work. He is of the opinion that the chapter on music incorporated in the text of the NS can never be earlier than the 4th Cent. A.D.

H. Jacobi on the basis of the Prakrit passages incorporated in Chapter XXXII of the NS places the text of the NS in the 3rd Cent. A.D.

Sten Konow puts NS before Bhasa i.e., 2nd Cent. A.D. but he is not in favour of giving the earlier date to the present work.

Dr. P.V. Kane believes that 'The upper limit of the NS cannot be fixed with any certainty... the lower limit can be indicated with more assurance'. This scholar suggests 'NS is not much older than the beginning of the Christian Era.'

Dr. S.K. De is of the opinion that 'The lower limit of the date of Bharata's work, can be provisionally shifted back to the fourth or fifth Cent. A.D., while it is almost certain that it existed in its present shape in the 8th cent. A.D. This scholar asserts that 'the upper limit of the NS cannot be put too early because...'

7. Introduction: Bhavisottakaha, p.84
8. Das indische Drama, p.2.
9. HSP, p. 41.
10. JSP, p. 31.
of the mention of Sakas, Yavanas, Pahlavas and other tribes, and probably does not go beyond the commencement of the Christian Era.

Dr. P.D. Gune\(^{11}\) in his introduction to the Bhavisayattakaha\(^{12}\) says 'Bharata is the earliest writer on Sanskrit dramaturgy belonging to the 2nd or 3rd century A.D.

Prof. A.B. Keith\(^{13}\) is of the opinion that the Prakrits recognised by the NS are clearly later than those of Asvaghosa and more akin to those found in Bhasa. He further states 'Moreover Bhasa expressly alludes to NS and it is most probable that both he and Kālidāsa had knowledge of the prototype of the present a text!'.\(^{14}\)

This scholar assigns 450 A.C. as the probable date of the NS.

Dr. Manomohan Ghosh\(^{15}\) in his scholarly article on 'The date of the Bharata Nāṭyasāstra,' keeping in view the various data pertaining to poetics, metrics, mythology, Geography, Erotics, Music, Ethnology, Linguistics and inscriptions suggested the lower and upper limit as under:

---

11. Ibid.
13. SD. P.292
14. Ibid.
Lower limit according to data mentioned against them:

- 550 A.C. according to data of poetics
- 400 A.C. according to mathematical data
- 400 A.C. according to mythological data
- 400 A.C. according to geographical data
- 400 A.C. according to data of ars amatoria
- 400 A.C. according to data of music
- 300 A.C. according to data of ethnology
- 300 A.C. according to data of arthasastra
- 300 A.C. according to linguistic data
- 250 A.C. according to data of inscriptions.

On a review of these lower limits according to different data he infers that the work surely existed in the 4th cent. A.C. while its existence in the 3rd cent. A.C. is almost sure.

As for the upper limit of the NS too he makes a review of the testimony of all the different data as under:

- 200 B.C. according to data of poetics
- 50 B.C. according to ethnological data
- 001 A.C. according to inscriptive data
- 100 A.C. according to geographical data
- 100 A.C. according to data of the Arthasastra
- 200 A.C. according to linguistic data

Sanskrit Prakrit
200 A.C. according to metrical data
200 A.C. according to mythological data
200 A.C. according to data of music.

From all these dates he infers that the upper limit to the date of the NS extends to 200 A.C. though it is likely that the work has absorbed the contents of some earlier work and may, to some extent, have preserved its language and hence goes back to 100 B.C.

Later on, Dr. Ghosh while preparing the critical edition of the volume II of the NS (XXVIII-XXXVI) pursued the question of the age and revised his views on the date and suggested 200 B.C. as the probable date of the NS. Again the said scholar while editing the text of the NS Vol. I and revising the English translation Vol.I changed his views on the basis of later researches in the various branches of this art. In his introduction to the revised second edition of the English Translation of the NS Vol. I he wrote: "The translator is not ashamed to admit that his idea of the date of the work again underwent a change after he had revised the critical edition of the Vol.I of the text (I-XXVII) and had separated in the process the original work from what should be considered later additions, he then finally came to believe that the antiquity of the work could still be pushed upwards, and it was most probably written in the 5th century B.C."¹⁶

The arguments advanced by Dr. Ghosh for this revised view can be summarised as under:

(1) From a very close study of the Sanskrit of the work we find that its vocabulary points to a period between 500 B.C. to 300 B.C. Quite a large number of words used in it became totally forgotten, but some of these are found only in very old works. The peculiar position of Prakrit and the use of its seven dialects such as Vāhlika (Bāhlika) and Dāksinātyā most of which have vanished altogether, also point to a similar antiquity.

(2) The metres used in the NS lack in many cases sandhi and even allow hiatus in places of internal yati seems to show that it carried the Vedic tradition in its metres. This speaks indeed for its great antiquity, and on this ground alone it may be placed as early as 500 B.C.

(3) The figures of speech treated in the NS shows that it is earlier than Asvaghoṣa (100 A.C.). For the poet uses Utpreksā which was not treated in this work. The same was the case with Bhāsa, and the chronological implication of this is quite clear. The Prakrit Dhruvās though they
have mostly changed their orthography, may be said to have retained the tradition recorded in the NS about the use of figures of speech.

(4) On comparison of the mythological element in the NS with that of Ramayana and Mahabharata it can be assumed that NS was written about 400 B.C.

(5) The author of the NS thrice mentioned an Arthasastra though with him the authority on the subject was Brhaspati and not Kautilya, as was the case with the kamasutra of Vatsyayana, the upper limit to whose date is the 5th Cent. B.C. The next important fact in this regard is that the NS refers to functionaries like dvastha (XXXI V. 73), and kumaradhikrta (XXXI V, 95-97) which correspond respectively to dauvārika and Kumārādhya kṣa of a Kautilya. From this it appears that the NS followed the terminology of a different Acarya, probably Brhaspati whom he accepted as authority, and Kautilya probably, with a view to simplify the terms for his readers, have changed them. Hence it may not be wrong to assume that the author of the NS was either a predecessor or a contemporary of the famous chancellor of Chandragupta Maurya.
(6) The author of the NS refers to quite a number of geographical names which relate to different parts of India. India known to the author of the NS was a vast region stretching from the Himalayas in the north to the Ocean in the south, and from Sindhu, Sauvīra and Saurāstra in the west to Aṅga, Vaṅga and Prājyotisa in the east, and included besides, Vāhika (Vāhika) and Nepāla. Now, is this area to be identified with a kingdom or an empire? Though it is not quite easy to answer this question, it is a fact that only kings like Chandragupta and Asoka were in the past, masters of such an extensive territory. Will this not permit us to assume that the work was written during the rule of the Mauryas? The mention of a name like Tōsala (the same as Asoka's Tōsali) which vanished altogether from the later history may be said to lend support to such an assumption.

(7) As to the Prakrit of the NS and that of the plays of Bhāsa, it can be said that the Prakrit of Bhāsa was not much different from that of Sanskrit. Bhāsa had a knowledge of the NS. Bhāsa's date as suggested by Dr. Pusalkar is 350 B.C. and hence the most probable date for the NS is 500 B.C.
In conclusion Dr. Ghosh states, "Hence there can be no objection to assuming that the popular art of Indian nāṭya spread as far as the distant Vāhlika (Bahlīka) and Nepalā in the pre-Mauryan times; it may, therefore, be concluded that the work was written in 500 B.C. As the NS mentions the Śākya Śramaṇas, it cannot be assigned to a date much prior to the maha-pari-nirvāṇa of Buddha."

The arguments advanced by Dr. Ghosh cannot be applied for the whole text of the NS. It may be just possible from the geographical data of the NS to date back the work, but it is highly risky to arrive at fixed conclusions of 500 B.C. from other data such as linguistics, metrics, ars-amatoria, music, etc.

From the conditions as reflected in the NS in its various Adhyāyas we can say that it gives a picture of India at the beginning of the Christian Era.

Accepting the date suggested by Dr. P.V. Kane and Dr. S.K. De, we may say that the NS represents culture of India from the early Christian centuries to 6th or 7th cent. A.D. This however, does not mean that the NS as it has come down to us might not have preserved earlier cultural traditions.

17. Ibid.
Whoever might have been the author of the NS and whatever connection might Bharata and or his school had with it, we, however have before us the work as preserved in several families of manuscripts, which present to the eyes of scholars at least two recensions. The text has been published in several editions in India and abroad. As noted above, it consists of 36 or 37 Adhyāyas. As I have followed for my work the edition of the G.O.S., Baroda, the contents from the same are given here in brief.

The first Adhyāya deals with Nātyotpatti - the mythical origin of drama. The sages headed by Atreya put five questions to Bharata: (i) as to how this Veda was created, (ii) for whose sake, (iii) what are its parts, (iv) its volume and (v) how to practise it. The answers to these questions form the subject matter of the whole text of the NS.

The occasion for the creation of drama and dramaturgy is supposed to be the moral deterioration of the world. This makes Indra and other gods to approach Brahman to give them a Krīḍaniyaka - a plaything which would appeal to eye and ear both. Brahman agrees to oblige them and goes into meditation and brings forth
the Nāṭyaveda based upon the four Vedas. As the gods were not competent to practise this new Veda, Brahman asks Bharata along with his 100 sons to learn and practise it. For the representation of the Kāśi style Bharata requests Brahman to create Apsarasas. This Adhyāya gives a list of hundred sons or disciples of Bharata as well as twenty three Apsarasas who were to play feminine roles.

With all these paraphernalia Bharata produces the first production at the time of Indra's flag festival. The gods are pleased and they give various things to Bharata which would be useful to him as theatre property. In this performance the gods were shown as victorious, so the demons who witnessed the same were angry. By their magic power they obstructed the speech, the action and the memory of actions. The story of Jarājarśis narrated here. With the request of gods, Brahman explains the importance of Nāṭya to the demons. In about 20 verses Brahman gives an excellent exposition of Nāṭya.

The second Adhyāya is called 'Maṇḍapavidhāna'. It describes three types of theatre buildings viz. Vikṛṣṭa - Oblong, Caturasra-square and Tryasra - triangular. These three are again classified into other three varieties viz. Jyeṣṭha, Madhyama and Avara. All the details, right from finding the land to the construction and decoration of these buildings and
rituals connected with them are described at length in this Adhyāya. Here it is mentioned that the theatre should have two separate portions i.e. stage proper and auditorium, and should appear like a mountain cave. Seats for the spectators should be made of bricks or wood. It must possess good acoustic properties.

The third Adhyāya deals with 'Rāṅgadaivatapūjana.' It gives us a list of gods and goddesses to be worshipped for the success of a play. The worship of all musical instruments and Jarajara is also emphasized. The Pūjā connected with the stage should be arranged in auspicious asterism such as Ārdra, Maṅgha, Yāmya, Pūrvaphālguni, Pūrvaśādhā, Āslesā or Mūlā. Before offering Pūjā to the gods and goddesses, the stage should be first illuminated. After this the gods and goddesses in their proper form and colour should be installed in their proper places with regular ceremony. The Mantras to be chanted for different deities are also given. Offerings of various types to be offered to the different deities are also described. In the last portion of this Adhyāya good consequences of the consecration of the stage and evil of non-consecration are mentioned.

The fourth Adhyāya is called 'Tāṇḍavalakṣaṇa.' Bharata after performing the worship of the theatre asks Brahman as to what play is to be performed. Brahman asks him to produce a Samavakāra named Amṛtamanyana composed
by him. The gods and demons were pleased to see the representation of their ideas and actions. Sometime after this performance Brahman asks Bharata to show the art of Nāṭya to the three-eyed God viz. Śiva. First they show him the Samavakāra - Amrātamaṇṭhana and then they perform a Dima called Tripuradāha. Mahādeva with all His Gaṇas was very much pleased and congratulated Brahman on the creation of this excellent art of Nāṭya. He asks Brahman to utilise His dance in the ceremonial of Pūrvarāṅga, which was a simple one. Tandu teaches this art of dance to Bharata. He teaches him 108 Karaṇas, 32 Āṅgahāras and 4 Pīṇḍibandhas. All these are explained in detail in this Adhyāya. In the last portion of this Adhyāya rules for the use of vocal and instrumental music are also stated.

The fifth Adhyāya deals with 'Pūrvarāṅgavidhī'. In the beginning Bharata explains the meaning of the word Pūrvarāṅga and then describes its different parts to be performed in due order with the help of drums and stringed instruments. The various ceremonies relating to Hāṅga inside are described in detail. Some of Dhruvaṣ are also described here. In the end of this Adhyāya good results of performing rituals and bad results of not performing the same are mentioned.

The sixth Adhyāya is named 'Rasavikalpa'. But before Bharata comes to this main topic he refers to the
three types of Sastric compositions, viz. Samgraha, Kārikā and Mīrūkta. Then he refers to the main topics of the NS. There are eight Rasas, eight Sthāyībhāvas, thirty three Vyabhīchārībhāvas, eight Sattvikabhāvas, four kinds of Abhinaya, two types of Dharmīs, four Vṛttis, four Praṇāmnīs, seven tones of vocal as well as instrumental music, four types of musical instruments, five kinds of Gāṇa and three types of theatre buildings. This is followed by the Enunciation of the Rasasūtra and its elaborate interpretation. This is followed by the description of eight Rasas, their colours and presiding deities.

The seventh Adhyāya is called 'Bhāvavāyānjaka' which deals with different Bhāvas, Vibhāvas, Sthāyībhāvas and Vyabhīchārībhāvas. In the beginning as usual Bharata explains the meaning of the words Bhāva, Vibhāva and Anubhāva and then gives more details of these psychological states. He is of the opinion that a play should depict an ensemble of many Rasas, Bhāvas, Vṛttis, etc. He considers the knowledge of Bhāvas and Rasas essential for the best success in the production of Nātya.

The eighth Adhyāya is named 'Uttamāṅgābhinnaya' i.e. Abhinaya of the highest part of the body viz. the portion on above the trunk. After the preliminary discussion about the various kinds of Āṅgikābhinnaya, Bharata explains the thirteen movements of head, thirty
six kinds of Drstis, nine movements of eyeballs, ten glances, nine movements of eyelids, seven movements of eyebrows, six movements of nose, six movements of lower lip, six movements of chin, six movements of mouth, four types of Mukharāga, nine kinds of movements of neck. The description of the movements is accompanied by the mention of the ideas that three Abhinayas express.

The ninth Adhyāya is named 'Angābhinaya'. It first mentions the major limbs of the body whose Abhinayas are to be discussed. These are Hasta (hands), Uras (ear breast), Pārśva (sides), Jaṭhara (belléy), Kati (waist), Jaṅghās (thighs), Uru (shank) and Pāda (feet). The Abhinayas of the head with minor limbs were described in Adhyāya 8th. In this Adhyāya Sixty-four gestures of hands - both single and combined are given in detail. It also gives description of five kinds of breast movement, five kinds of the movement of sides, three kinds of belly movement, five types of waist movement, five conditions of thigh, five kinds of shank movement and five movements of the feet.

The tenth Adhyāya is called Ārī is defined here as 'ekapāda pracāra', a movement of a foot. It deals with the varieties of foot-work. In the beginning, as usual, Bharata defines the terms Ārī, Karāṇa, Khanda, and Maṇḍala and then speaks about their various forms
and uses. He describes two types of Cāris viz. Bhaumiki, the earthly one, and Ākāsiki, the aerial one. He describes sixteen varieties of each of this type. In this connection he also describes various Sthānas—standing postures. Their uses are also shown. At the end of the Adhyāya Bharata emphasizes the necessity of exercise and nourishment for maintaining sound health.

The eleventh Adhyāya is on 'Mandalavikalpana' which describes various combinations of footwork. It is stated that Mandalas are created out of a combination of Cāris. Like Cāris, Mandalas are also of two types viz. earthly and aerial. There are ten varieties of each of this type. These Mandalas are used in graceful steps and personal combat. They should be performed with sportiveness and graceful movements of limbs and should be accompanied by suitable instrumental music.

The twelfth Adhyāya is on 'Gatipracāra' which deals with different gaits of various characters according to the different types of Rasa and Bhāva. In this Adhyāya the sitting postures of the various characters according to their social status are described. This is followed by the occasions regarding the application of three kinds of tempo viz. slow, medium and quick. Over and above these various types of gaits of different characters in special conditions, their sentiments are
described in detail. At the end of the Adhyāya, Bharata says that whatever is not narrated here should be devised according to the need of the circumstances.

The thirteenth Adhyāya is named 'Kāksyāpravṛttidharmīvyāñjaka' which deals with the zonal divisions of the stage. In this Adhyāya instructions regarding space for musical instruments, space for representation of houses, gardens, forests, land, water etc. are given. Movements of the gods and men in Bhāratavarga are also stated in this Adhyāya. Rules regarding the timings of each Act in a play are also prescribed in this Adhyāya. This is followed by the description of four Pravṛttis and their uses in the play. Two types of production i.e. Sukumāra and Āviddha are also described in detail. At the end, Bharata speaks about the two Dharmīs - i.e. Lokadharma and Nātyadharma, with their characteristics.

The fourteenth Adhyāya is on Chandovidhāna which deals with metrical patterns. Bharata informs us that there are two types of Paṭhya - recitation in Nāṭya, viz. Sanskrit and Prakrit. He gives a brief outline of Sanskrit grammar. He then informs us that speech compositions should be made either in 'Nibaddha' fixed forms of Ćūrṇa - loose forms. In the rest of the Adhyāya, twenty six varieties of metres on the basis of the number
of syllables in each line from one to twenty six are described. He also mentions metres which consist of even lines, half even lines and completely uneven lines. These three types of metres are called the body of Sabda or speech. According to Bharata the combination of vers and prose illumines a play. This is followed by the description of Gaṇas and the metres based on them. The three types of Svaras - Tāra, Mandra and Madhya are also described.

The fifteenth Adhyāya is called Chandoviciti i.e. collection of metres. This Adhyāya is more practical than the last one, because it describes the metres usually employed in Nātya. These metres are Tanu Madhyā, Makarakaśīrṣā, Mālinī, Mālatī, Uddhata, Bhramara-mālākā, Śīṃhalīlā, Mattaceṣṭita, Vidyullekha, Cittavilasita, Madhukari, Kuvalayamālā, Mayūrasāriṇī, Doḍhaka, Moṭaka, Indravajrā, etc. etc. It may be noted that the order of the long and short syllables is described merely by saying that there is a certain number of short syllables and a certain number of long, instead of describing them with the scheme of Trikas or Gaṇas. But in the additional verses put into rectangular brackets metres are described by the method of Gaṇas. This is an important point in the history of metrical development. Bharata ends this Adhyāya by saying that even and uneven metres in Kāvyas - poetic compositions such as Nātya and other
varieties should be used. Then he cautions that there are other metres but they are without beauty and therefore should be avoided in Nāṭya. However, the metres prohibited here for recitation can be used in songs and they will be described while discussing the Dhruvās.

The sixteenth Adhyāya deals with Kavyalākṣāṇa. In this Adhyāya thirty six Lākṣāṇas, four Alāmākāras, ten Doṣas and Ten Guṇas of poetic compositions are described in detail. He also describes the application of Alāmākāras, Guṇas, and Doṣas in connection with various sentiments in play. At the end of the Adhyāya, he describes the use of metres in the representation of various sentiments e.g. in the erotic sentiment the composition of metres should be gentle, in heroic sentiment, metres like Jagatī, Atijagatī and Saṁkṛti should be used, etc. etc. In this Adhyāya Bharata has given many useful suggestions to a playwright and a director for the success of a play.

The seventeenth Adhyāya is named 'Kākusvaravyānjana' which deals with the various speech aspects of drama. The word Kāku means a peculiar tone or change of the voice resulting from distress or fear or anger or grief etc. In fact this Adhyāya consists of two sections. The first section deals with the Prakritā, different modes of address and other miscellaneous matter
concerned with speech in drama. The second section deals with Kāku proper. The first twenty five verses are devoted to a discussion of the changes that take place in vowel and consonants in Prakrits. Then follows a section which specify as to what language is to be used by the different characters. It also describes seven main speeches such as Māgadhī, Āvantī, Prācyā, Saurasenī Ardhamāgadhī, Bāhlikā, and Dākṣiṇātīyā. As different from this, there are seven Vībhāṣas - minor speeches - Sakārī, Abhīrī, Cāndalī, Sābārī, Dāmrī, Āndhārī and Vānecarī. This is followed by the description of some characteristics of the speeches of different regions. It also prescribes rules for naming the characters of a play. After this Bharata describes qualities of recitation. This consists of seven Svaras, three Stānas, four Varnas, two types of Kāku, six Alamkāras and six Aṅgas. At the end of this Adhyāya, Bharata lays stress on correct and proper recitation in a play.

The eighteenth Adhyāya in on 'Daśarūpavidhāna' which deals with the ten varieties of drama. It treats this subject in a very methodical way by naming them, showing their functions and ways of productions. The ten Rūpakas discussed in this Adhyāya are: Nāṭaka, Prakarana, Anka, Vyāyoga, Bhāna, Samavakāra, Vīthī, Prabasana, Dīma
and Ihamrga. Their relations with four types of Vṛttis are also described.

The nineteenth Adhyāya is on 'Sandhnirūpaṇa.' It deals with the Sandhis and other ancillary matter in drama. The plot of a drama is called its body. This plot-body is divided into five Sandhis. The plot is of two types: Adhikārika and Prāsaṅgika. The five Avasthās of the operation of action are: Prārāmbha, Prayatna, Prāptisambhava, Miśācbaṇḍita and Phalaprāpti. This discussion is followed by the five Arthapraksitīs: Hīja, Bindu, Patāka, Prakāri and Kārīya. Then comes the description of five Sandhis viz. Mukha, Pratimukha, Garbha, Vimarśa and Mīrvahāṇ. The five Arthopakṣepakas are Viṣkambhaka, Gūlikā, Pravesāka, Ankāvatāra, and Ankāmukha. The ten Lasyangas viz. Geyapada, Sthitaprāṭhīya, Āśīna, Puṣpaganḍīka, Pracchedaka, Trimūḍha, Saṁdhava, Dvimūḍha, Uttamottama and Uktapratyukti. Then we have general instructions about the composition of a good Nāṭaka.

The twentieth Adhyāya is on 'Vṛttivikalpana' which deals with styles in drama. In this Adhyāya, the origin and characteristics of the four Vṛttis are described in detail. In the beginning of the Adhyāya myth regarding the origin of Vṛttis is given. The four Vṛttis described in this Adhyāya are Bhārati,
Kaśyāki, Ārabhaṭī and Sāttvati. We are informed that all these Vṛttis are created from the Vedas. Their characteristics are described in detail. At the end we are informed about the relationship of these Vṛttis with different sentiments.

The twenty-first Adhyāya is named 'Āhāryābhīnaya'. In the beginning of this Adhyāya, Bharata informs us that the entire production of a drama is based on Āhāryābhīnaya. It deals with costume and make-up.

The four types of costumes and make-up described in this Adhyāya are: Pusta, Aleśkāra, Aṅgaracanā and Saṅjīva. Details of ornaments for man and women are also given. Rules for painting various limbs of men and women are also prescribed. The four original colours for painting the limbs are: Śita, Mila, Pīta and Rakta. These are primary colours. There are derivative colours also. These are: Karandava, Pāndu, Padma, Harita, Kāśāya, and Gaura. After this Bharata gives an account of living and non-living objects. The first includes gods, demons, Gandharvas, Yakṣas, Rākṣasas, and Pannagas while the second includes hills, palaces, mechanical contrivances, shields, armours, banner-staff and various weapons. Rules for the painting of limbs of various characters are also described. The three types of costume
viz. Sūdha, Vicitra and Malina are also described. Rules for the use of various weapons are also prescribed in this Adhyāya. This is followed by the description of rules for making masques. Then comes the description of the various Upakaraṇas. Bharata informs us that all the crafts that are executed in this world of moving and immobile objects are to be known as Upakaraṇas. These Upakaraṇas are to be obtained by going to the country where they are found. This is followed by the description of realistic and conventional objects. At the end of this Adhyāya Bharata informs us that what is omitted here is to be gathered from the people world.

The twenty-second Adhyāya is called 'Sāmānyābhinnaya.' Sāmānyābhinnaya comes out of Vāk, Aṅga and Sattva. In this Adhyāya graces of women-physical, natural and involuntary are described in detail. This is followed by the description of eight aspects of Sattva of males. Then Sārīrābhinnaya is described. This is sixfold: Vākya, Sūcā, Aṅkura, Sākha, Nātyāyita and Nivṛttyaṅkura. Then comes the description of twelve types of verbal representation. This is followed by the description of representation of objects and senses. Then comes the description of various types of women. Rules regarding etiquette are also prescribed in this Adhyāya. This is followed by the description of eight types of Nayikās. The various stages for amorous union and rules thereof are also described in this Adhyāya.
The twenty-third Adhyāya is on 'Vaisṣika'.

In this Adhyāya, Bharata prescribes rules for the treatment of courtesans in a dramatic production. The thirty-three qualities of an expert gallant are described. The three types of nature viz. superior, middling and inferior are also stated. Here we are informed that the nature of courtesans are appropriate to their own class. The four stages of women's youth are also described. After this Bharata describes five types of males with regard to the practice of love viz. Catura, Uttama, Madhya, Mīca and Pravṛttaka. Various modes of approaching a woman are also described. Rules for the treatment of men by the courtesans are prescribed in detail at the end of this Adhyāya.

The twenty-fourth Adhyāya named 'Punīstryapacāra' continues the discussion pertaining to the minor things of Sāttvikābhinaya. In the beginning of this Adhyāya we are informed that the male and female characters, in general, are of three types: Uttama, Adhama and Madhyama. Qualities of these types of are described. Then Bharata takes the characters of mixed nature such as Sakara, Viṭa and others like them. Four types of heroes viz. Dhīroddhata, Dhīralalita, Dhīrodātta and Dhīraprasānta are described. This is followed by the description of four classes of Jesters and heroines in a play. Two kinds of employment viz. Bāhya and Ābhyantara of the
characters in a play are also described. It also describes classes and functions of the female inmates of the harem. Similarly associates of the king are also described.

The twenty-fifth Adhyāya is called 'Gitrābhīnaya - conspicuous representation or representation of special objects which do not fall within the objects mentioned before. It deals with the rules of expression for indicating morning, sunset etc., seasons, emotions, determinants and consequents. It also prescribes rules for the expression of various Bhāvas by males and females. How to represent intoxicated conditions of men and women are also stated. Rules for the representation of birds and animals are also prescribed. Then come rules of greeting visible and invisible persons, for indicating great crowd, friends, Viṣas, crooks, mountains and tall trees. Rules in indicating Ākāśavacana, Ātmagata, Apavāritaka, and Janāntika are also described. Then come the rules for representing various kinds of speeches of different characters in different conditions of life. How to represent various types of death on the stage is also shown in this Adhyāya. At the end of this Adhyāya the triple basis of Nātya is also explained.

The twenty-sixth Adhyāya is called 'Vikrtivikalpa'. The colophon of Abhinavagupta's commentary
calls this Adhyāya 'Prakṛtivikalpādhyāya'. It deals with the casting of characters in various ways. We are informed that the casting of the character is of three types viz. Aṇurūpa, Virūpa and Būpānurūpa. It also describes two types of production viz. Sukumāra type and Uddhata type. Qualities of a teacher and a pupil are also described in this Adhyāya. Instructions are also given for preparing roles of characters.

The twenty-seventh Adhyāya is called 'Siddhivyāṇjaka'. It deals with Siddhis - accomplishments of a drama. It describes two types of Siddhis viz. Daivī i.e. divine and Mānūṣi i.e. human. The human fulfilment or accomplishment has ten parts and the divine has two. This is followed by the description of manners in which human and divine fulfilment is to be achieved. It also describes four types of 'thaṭā' which injure the Siddhis. In this Adhyāya qualities of the spectators and judges are also described. Bharata informs us that men and women are of different behaviour and hence according to their nature, young and old, can be classified as superior, middling and inferior type. Various types of judges specialised in their fields are also described. Probable time for the dramatic production is also stated. In the last verses of this Adhyāya a short account of the three Guṇas or qualities essential for staging a play are given.
The twenty-eighth Adhyāya is on 'Jātivikāpāla'. It deals with varieties of Jātis. 'Jāti' is a mode of singing, which in later times was replaced by the word Rāga. In the beginning of this Adhyāya four types of Ātodya viz. Taśa, Avanaddha, Ghana and Suśira are described. The characteristics and types of Gandharva are also described. Bharata informs that the Svaras (notes) have two sources: Vīna and human throat. Two types of Pada viz. Nibaddha and Anibaddha are described. Then comes the description of twenty aspects of Tala. The characteristics of sevens Svaras with their types are also described. Then comes the description of Grāmas, Mūrcchanās and Tānas. The ten characteristics of Jātis are also described in this Adhyāya.

The twenty-ninth Adhyāya is on 'Tatātodyavidhāna.' It deals with the rules pertaining to stringed instruments. In the beginning of this Adhyāya, Bharata describes the application of Jātis to the various sentiments. This is followed by the description of Varṇas and Alamkāras. The Alamkāras are classified into four types, viz. monotonic, mixed, ascending and descending. The characteristics of the Alamkāras dependent on the Varṇas are given in detail. The Alamkāras dependent on Gitis are also described. Then comes the description of four types of Dhātus. The three types of music from Vīna viz. Tattva, Anugata and Ogha is also described. In the concluding portion of this
Adhyāya, Bahir-gītas with their characteristics are described.

The thirtieth Adhyāya is on 'Suṣrātodyalakṣaṇa'. It deals with the rules of hollow instruments. We are informed that the rules regarding their Svaras (notes) and the Grāmas are the same as those of Viṇa. There are rules regarding the production of Svaras from the flute. At the end of this Adhyāya, Bharata informs us that a union of the human throat, the Viṇa and the flute is appreciated.

The thirty-first Adhyāya is called Tālādhyāya. It deals with Tāla proper. It deals with various units of time. Laya is explained as resulting from the time of a Kāla i.e. it depends upon the time unit of the Kāla unit. It is of three types: Druta, Madhya and Vilāṁbita. The tāla described in this Adhyāya is of two types: Caṅcatpūṭaḥ, known as Caurasra and Cāpaṇḍu, known as Tryasra. The syllables of these Tālas are also described. This is followed by the movements of hands and fingers in relation to these Tālas. The characteristics of Āsārita, Layāntarita and Vardhamāna are described. Rules for the application of Vastus of songs are also described. The seven types of songs viz. Madraka, Ullopyaka, Aparāntaka, Prakari, Ovedaka, Rovindaka and Uttara are also described with
their characteristics and measurements of Tāla. Then comes description of Catuspada song. This is performed by women. It is of two types: Trāyarsa and Caturarsa. The twenty-eight varieties of these songs are stated by Bharata. At the end of this Adhyāya, Bharata describes Lāṣya with its parts-āṅgas.

The thirty-second Adhyāya is on 'Dhruvāvidhāna'. It deals with the composition and use of various Dhruvās in dance and drama. In this Adhyāya, various Dhruvās are classified and named. The major part of this Adhyāya is devoted to the definition and illustration of a great number of metres useful in Dhruvās. All these varieties of metres of different Dhruvās are illustrated with beautiful verses. At the end of this section we are informed that the Dhruvās have sixty-four primary classes some of which are made up of equal number of syllables and some of which are made up of unequal number of syllables. Dhruvās having even number of syllables in their metrical feet are two hundred and eighty five in number and those having partially even number are one hundred and ten and similar is the number of Dhruvās which are having uneven number of syllables in their feet. After describing varieties of Dhruvās, Bharata describes five aspects of Dhruvās: Jāti, Sthāna, Prakāra, Pramāṇa, and Nāma. This is followed by the description
of the application of Dhruvas in different sentiments, characters, various occasions. At the end of this Adhyāya importance of songs in a dramatic production is stated.

The thirty-third Adhyāya is on 'Gunadoṣavicāra' of singers and instrument-players. In this Adhyāya the qualities of a male and a female singer are described. The qualities of instrumental players are also described. It also describes the six qualities of an Ācārya, a teacher. This is followed by the description of the six qualities of the voice. At the end of this Adhyāya the defects of the singers are also described.

The thirty-fourth Adhyāya is on 'Puṣkaravādyya'. It deals with varieties of Avanaddha - xx covered instruments. In the beginning of this Adhyāya, a myth about the origin of Puṣkara is described. This is followed by the description of instruments to be used on various occasions. Then comes the characteristics of the Avanaddha instruments: Mrīḍāṅga, Paṇava and Dardara. Rules for playing these Puṣkaravādyas are also prescribed. The playing of drums in various Dhruvas and dances is also described. The various Lepanas to be applied to the Puṣkara are also described. Instructions are also given in regard to the playing of drums in different conditions of the characters. The qualities and faults of a drum -
player are also described. The ceremonies pertaining to the installation of drums are also described. Bharata informs us that the dramatic performance in which the songs and the instruments are properly used, does not come to grief.

The thirty-fifth Adhyāya is on 'Bhūmikāvikalpana'. It deals with the distribution of roles of various characters in a play. In the beginning of this Adhyāya, Bharata gives the essential qualities of an actor. Rules for the selection of actors and actresses for various roles are prescribed. Physical features and qualifications taking various roles of dramatic characters are also described. It also supplies details of the members of Bharata's troupe. Their characteristics and functions are stated in detail. The other artists and craftsmen associated with dramatic troupe are also mentioned.

The thirty-sixth Adhyāya is on 'Nātyasāpa'. It deals with the curse on actors. The sages initiated into Nātyasastra ṭ put some queries to Bharata. They are very keen to know about (i) the deeds of gods to be adorned in the Purvaranga, (ii) reason for performing the Sāuca-repuration ceremony, (iii) descent of Nātya from heaven to the earth and (iv) how his race received the name of Nāta. Bharata answers these questions one by one. While explaining the cause of the coming down of Nātya from heaven to the earth, Bharata narrates the
curse. The remaining questions are answered in Adhyāya thirty-seven.

The thirty-seventh Adhyāya is called the ‘Guhyatattvakathana’ i.e., revealing the secrets. It deals with the descent of drama on the earth. We are informed that Nahuṣa invites the sons of Bharata to the earth. The subject of the origin of the family of Bharata is also touched. The greatness of this Nātyaveda and benefits thereof are also described in this Adhyāya.

From the above brief description of contents of the NS, it will be seen that it has covered practically all the branches of arts, crafts, and sciences connected with Nāṭya in one way or the other. It speaks about the sources of aesthetic pleasure that one gets from seeing a dramatic production. It treats with the origin and decline of the dramatic art. It deals with the various types of dramas and styles. In addition to music and dance and other allied topics like semantics, morphology, dialects and their phonology, prosody, play-writing, etc., are dealt with. Above all these, as MM. Dr. P.V. Kane says, "it insists on a high and noble purpose for the drama, forbids indecent behaviour, scenes or language and holds forth before the actors a high spiritual ideal by saying that if the actors dedicate themselves to their work in a spirit of a devotion to their art and attain perfection therein, they will be doing a great service to society and will acquire merit for themselves." ¹

¹. HSP., p.39.