CHAPTER IV

OTHER DRAMATICAL WORKS COMPOSED IN ASSAM IN CONTEMPORARY TIMES.

The Śāṅkhacūḍadvadha of Dīna Dvija, a Sanskrit drama of three Acts, was composed, as stated elsewhere, under the patronage of one Borphukan (bṛhat-phukkana) of Handiqui family, and its date of completion is said to be Śaka 1724 or 1802 A.D. It tallies with the Borphukanship of Gandhela Rājkhowa or Kaliyabhomora Barphukan, who was the viceroy at Guwahati during the reign of Kamaleswar Simha. Svargadew Kamaleswar Simha was one of the last kings of the Ahom royal house. This play is one of the three dramatical works included in the anthological work, called Rūpakatrayam, compiled and edited by Professor Satyendra Nath Sarmah and published by Asom Sahitya Sabha. The other two plays, included in the Rūpakatrayam, are Kāmakumāraharaṇa by Kavicandra Dvija and the Vighneśajanmodaya by Gaurikānta Dvija.

The learned editor in the Introduction of the Rūpakatrayam has mentions the names of two other

1. Detailed discussion in Part-1, Introduction, Section (ii)
dramatical compositions. These are *Dharmodya* by Dharmadeva Goswami and *Śrīkṛṣṇa-prayāṇa* by Vidyāpañcānana Shastri. The *Dharmodaya* of Dharmadeva Goswami is written during the reign of Lakṣmī Simha (1769-80) representing a picture of the contemporary Vaiṣṇava revolt against the Ahom regime. This play contains five Acts. It deals with the Mowāmiyā insurrection which took place during the reign of the said monarch. It is on the model of *Prabodhacandrodaya* of Śrīkṛṣṇa Misra, and the occasion is also similar.

The *Śrīkṛṣṇa-prayāṇa* of Vidyāpañcānana was written at the behest of Gadadhar Duwara Borphukan when Pramatta Simha was on the Ahom throne (A.D. 1744-51). The source of this play is the Udyogaparvan of the *Mahābhārata*. It treats the episode of Śrīkṛṣṇa trying to negotiate a truce between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas at the court of king Dhṛtarāśtra.

Two Assamese dramas were also written during this period under the inspiration of two of the last Ahom monarchs, viz, Kamaleswar Simha and Chandrakanta Simha (A.D. 1811-1818 & 1819-21). These were (i) The *Sambarāsura-
vadha by Bhavakānta Vipra Mahanta and (ii) the Kumāraharaṇa or Harihara-yuddha by Lakṣmikānta Dāsa.

The three Sanskrit plays included in the Rūpakatrayam bear some special characteristics which are not normally found in classical Sanskrit dramas. These characteristics are rather similar to the features of Assamese Brajāvalī dramas composed by Śrīmanta Śaṅkaradeva. Śrīmanta Śaṅkaradeva was the promulgator of the neo-Vaiṣnava faith in North East India during the fifth century A.D. For propagating his faith Śaṅkaradeva has composed quite a good number of literary works which are now become the storehouse of the Assamese literature.²

From the thirteenth century onwards, Assam has seen a continuous flow of literary products. Assamese has taken the place of Sanskrit as the medium of literary expression. The Vaiṣṇavite movement initiated by Śaṅkaradeva gave new impetus to the development of Assamese literature. Even Sanskrit scholars who could compose fluent Sanskrit

---

2. Śaṅkaradeva has composed the Kīrttana-ghoṣā, the Bhaktipradīpa, the Bhakti-ratnākara (Skt.), the Harichandra-upākhyāna (-kavya), Rukminī-haraṇa-kavya, Kurukṣetra(-kavya), besides rending into Assamese several skandhas and sections of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa and the Uttarākṛtāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa, and six Aṅkīya-ṇāṭas, viz., Patni-prasāda, Rukminī-harana, Pārījata-harana, Kāliya-damana, Keli-Gopāla and Rāma-vijaya.
verses, preferred to write in Assamese for the edification of the masses. The king Naranārāyaṇa of the Koch dynasty who, along with his brother Chilaray, studied Sanskrit at Vārāṇasī, reigned from 1540 to 1584 A.D. He was a great patron of Assamese literature, and thus his capital Koch Behar became the centre of Assamese literature and culture. But with the decline of the Koch power and the rise of the Ahom power in Eastern Assam, the centre of literary activity shifted from Koch Behar to Sivasagar. The Ahom power reached its zenith during the reign of Svargadew Rudrasimha, who was the elder son of Gadadhar Simha and Jaymati Konwari, and reigned from 1696 to 1714 A.D. Sivasimha, the worthy son of Rudrasimha patronised artists and scholars. Literary works of an erotic flavour, which

3. "It is pertinent to note here that since very early times, Assam (anciently known as Prāgjyotisa / Kamarūpa) was a famous centre of Sanskrit learning, where both kālā and vidyā were meticulously studied and this tradition continued without break. Śaṅkaradeva, Mādhavadeva, Ananta Kandali, Rama Sarasvati, Bhaṭṭadeva and the whole host of Vaiṣṇavite composers were renowned Sanskrit scholars who were quite capable of writing śāstras in Sanskrit like many of their counterpart in other parts of India. --------- As Ananta Kandali announces 'I am an adept in Sanskrit verses and can compose them as well; yet I write in this medium so that women and the illiterate may know the essence of the Śāstras and enjoy it by audience:

śloka sanskṛte āmi likhivāka bhāla jāni
tathāpi karībo pada bandha /
stri śūdra ādi yata jānoka paramatattva
śravanata milaya ānanda //
—Bhāgavata (Assamese, Book X. v. 16210.)

was not seen in the Vaiṣṇavite literature, received favour at the Ahom court of these two monarchs. The *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa* with its religious eroticism was rendered into Assamese part by part by the court poets. The court poets, however, cultivated Sanskrit also. Five dramas mentioned above are the result of Sanskrit culture prevailed in this part of India. The three plays included in the *Rūpakatrayam* bear the erotic flavour, —two of them having based on the stories culled from the Prakṛtīkhaṇḍa of the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*, — all these three plays are of similar in nature. So, we propose to hold a brief discussion on the other two plays, viz., the *Kāmakumāraharana*: and the *Vighneśajanmodaya* which are contemporary to our drama, the *Saṅkhacūḍavadha*.

1. **The Kāmakumāraharana**:  

   The *Kāmakumāraharana*, composed by Kavicandra Dvija, is a play of six Acts. He was the court poet of Svargadew Siva Simha. In the prologue of the drama, Kavicandra has highly acknowledged the patronage extended to him by king Siva Simha and his spouse Bar-Rājā Pramathesvari alīas Phuleswarī Konwari. The poet  

---

4. Queen Pramathešwari was known as Baratī, which means the chief ruler or the ruling King. King Sivasimha issued seals and coins in the joined names of the queen and his ownself.
eulogises the patrons with high regards. cf.

śrūtāho sāmājikājaṇāḥ avirata suravindavandita-haragaurī-
caraṇā-ravinda-makaranda-pānonmattamadhukarēṇa,
kundendu-dhavala kīrtirajīvirājita-dīdgīganta-reṇa-
dordaṇḍārpitakodanda-danēita-durvaravairivinivahena-
camatkāra-karaprabhapragbhāra-bhāsvara-vividha-
vidyāvidyotitavigrahaṇa-cāturyāsītāsēṣa- lokaṁyā-
līlakalitakalevara-surasundari virājamāna vrhadrājapada-
prakhyāta-prathitagunaṃgrāmarāmābhirāma-śrīpramathēṣvarī-
mahādevī-dayiten-śrīśavargadēva-śivasimha-mahāmahendrenēṇa-
kāmakumāraharaṇa-nāmanātakāmī-nātayiturī ādiṣṭomi, atah

idānnēṃ kṛtakṛtyena mayā tādevānūṣṭḥeyam //

The story of the Kāmakumāraharaṇa is culled from the
Bhāgavatapurāṇa and the Harivamśa-purāṇa. The author of
the play clearly mentions the sources from which the story
is taken. He says, thus, “śrībhāgavata-harivamśa-samudhrēta
kāmakumāraharaṇanātāke prathamoṅikaḥ.” etc. Thus, the
story of the Kāmakumāraharaṇa is an amalgamated one.

The story of the marriage of Uṣā and Aniruddha, and
the battle between Hari and Hara are well depicted here.
Uṣā was a princess and the daughter of Bāṇāsura, the king
of Śoṇitapura. Bāṇāsura was a devout devotee of Lord Śiva
and Pārvatī. Once Pārvatī granted a boon to Uṣā that she would meet a young man in her dream, and that young man would be her husband. Accordingly, Uṣā had a dream in which she sported with a young man. She became mad after that young man when she woke up.

To help Uṣā, her friend Citralekhā tried to find out the person whom she had met in her dream. Citralekhā was an expert in painting portraits of all creatures of the three worlds. Citralekhā painted all the young men of the three worlds, and from those portraits Uṣā found out her man. The young man was no other than the son of Pradyumna, and the grandson of Śrīkṛṣṇa of the Yādava clan. Citralekhā was not only an expert in painting portraits, but also knew some magic feats. At the request of Uṣā, she took a journey to Dvārakā. On the way she met the divine sage, Nārada, and conveyed to him her desired mission. Nārada, too, wished to help her. With the favour of the sage, Nārada, she learnt the Tāmasividyā whereby she could abduct Aniruddha unnoticed from Dvārakā. Bringing Aniruddha from Dvārakā to Śoṇitpura, she solemnised his marriage with Uṣā according to the Gāndharva rites.
The news of the marriage of Uṣā and Aniruddha reached the ears of Bāṇāsura. Bāṇāsura arrested Aniruddha and kept him confined. Nārada reported the captivity of Aniruddha to Śrīkṛṣṇa at Dvārakā. Kṛṣṇa marched to Śoṇitapura with his army to rescue Aniruddha. A fierce fight took place between a Śrīkṛṣṇa and Bāṇāsura, and also between Śrīkṛṣṇa and Śiva, who came to defend Bāṇāsura. Finally, Bāṇāsura was defeated and Uṣā was given to Aniruddha in marriage by Bāṇāsura. The play ends in a happy note of marriage songs sung by the women folk. Citralekha was also married to Sāmba.

Kavicandra, however, adds to his theme some elements which are not found in the original sources mentioned above. These are, (1) applying of magic tilaka on the forehead of Aniruddha to transform him into a bee, and (2) the comic incidents created by the hunchback women, Uṣā’s maid servant, besides a few minor incidents. He seems to have borrowed these elements from the Kumāraharaṇa, an Assamese kāvya, composed by Ananta Kandali, a contemporary and a follower of Śrīmanta Śaṅkaradeva.

Besides the above, the poet has given local colour to the theme wherever possible. Depiction of marriage
ceremony with nuptial songs sung by womenfolk bear instances of adding not only local colour but also reflecting the contemporary Assamese way of life and culture. The language of these nuptial songs is Assamese. One more song is composed in Assamese language on the top of which the metre is mentioned as Lechārī-Muktāvalī. The songs inserted here are set into classical rāga and tāla. Songs are marked by sweetness and resonance.

The technical aspects of the play are similar to the Śaṅkhacūḍavadha which are discussed in proper place.

2. THE VIGHNEŚAJANMODAYA:

The Vighneśajanmodaya of Gaurikānta Dvija is second in the list of the Rūpakatrayam. The play is consisted of three Acts. So far as the life and date of Gaurikānta Dvija is concerned, the poet presents a self introduction in the concluding verse of the play. The epithet Kavi-sūryya (lit. the sun of poets) is added before his name by a Brāhmaṇa. His father’s name was Govinda, a brahmin by caste, who was well-versed in Kāvya, Jyotiśa and other branches of learning. cf.

\[ \text{yo bhaktyāpara sadāśivamumānandaṁ sadāsāṁsthitaṁ-bhāsmādreh śikhare, sayoginikare kailāssailopame} / \]
The poet belonged to Bharadvaja gotra and like his father he was an ardent devotee of Śiva (Harapara). The work was completed on a certain Monday, when the sun was in the second house of the Zodiac (i.e., in the month of Jyaiṣṭha) in the Śaka year 1721 or 1799 A.D. as it is found at the closing verse of the play. Gaurīkānta Dvija wrote the play, Vighnesajanmodaya, during the reign of the Ahom king Kamalesvara Simha (1795-1811). The poet invokes blessings for the king of Kamarupa who conquered Anga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Magadha, Gava, Kuru, Bhoṭa, Kāsī, Kāśmira, Gauḍa, Karnāṭa and Lāṭa. The king of Kamarupa, referred to in the verse 45 of Act., III, is the Ahom king Kamalesvar Simha. Kamalesvar Simha’s date is suggested

---

5. cf. “prthvibhujācalasāṅkamite śakābde
yāte vrśam dinakare dvijarāja vāre/
jāte ca nājaka iha triyāṅkapūrṇe
mātsaryadoṣaraḥitā sudhiyo bhavantu //”
—Act III. 47

6. cf. “aṅgaṅa baṅgaṅa kaliṅgaṅa magadhagabakūrum bhōṭakarnāṭalāṭān-
kāśikāṃśirāgaudāṅ draviḍaṁmaṇīpuraṛu durdamānardamyaḥarmyān /
yo dorddamāṇḍaiḥ praçaṇḍaṁrbhavatu saksālī kāṃrūpādḥināṭa //”
as year 1795-1810 A.D.\textsuperscript{7} It is clear from the \textit{prastāvānā} of the play, the \textit{VJ}, that the source of the play is the \textit{Brahmavaivartapurāṇa}.\textsuperscript{8} The \textit{Bvp} is one of the eighteen Mahāpurāṇas and it contains the essential traits of the \textit{purāṇa}-type of literature, given in the \textit{Amarakośa}. Veda-vyāsa is the composer of all the eighteen Mahāpurāṇas.\textsuperscript{9} The \textit{Bvp} is divided into four \textit{khaṇḍas}. The first one, Brahmakhaṇḍa, deals with the creation of Brahman. The stories relating to the origin of gods and demons, men and animals, the origin of the three worlds, seven oceans, and different regions of the earth are narrated here. The second part is called Prakṛtikhaṇḍa. This part deals with Prakṛti, the original matter, which manifests in the forms of five goddesses, viz., Durgā, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Śāivitrī and Rādhā. Other important stories are of Vedavatī, Śitādevī, Tulasī, Śāivitrī etc. The origin of the earth is also described here. The third part of \textit{Bvp} is named Gaṇapatikhaṇḍa. Three major stories are depicted here. The main story describes the birth of Kārtikeya and Gaṇeśa as well as the incidents leading to the loss of Gaṇeśa’s human head and obtaining

\textsuperscript{7} Talukdar, Nirmal Chandra, \textit{Prathamik Bhārat Buraṉji}, p. 256
\textsuperscript{8} \textit{VJ}. I, 16.
\textsuperscript{9} sargaśca pratisargasca varīso manvantaraṁ ca / varīsānucaritaṁ cāpi purāṇam pañcalakṣaṇam //
of elephant's one. The second part deals with the fight between sage Jamadagni and the king Kārtavīryārjuna, and also the annihilation of the Kṣatriyas by Parasurāma. The third one is the story of Parasurāma's encounter with Gañeśa and the resultant loss of one of his teeth by Gañeśa. In this part of purāṇa, Gañeśa is depicted as an incarnation of Lord Kṛṣṇa. The last part is known as Kṛṣṇajanmakhaṇḍa. Though the name of this part implies all about the birth of story of Kṛṣṇa, but other adventures of Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa's life in Goloka, the details of Kṛṣṇa's parents, Daivakī and Vasudeva and of foster parents Nanda and Yaśodā are also narrated here. This part of the Bvp glorifies Lord Kṛṣṇa and his favourite consort, Rādhā.

Gaurīkānta Dvija has taken the story of the Gañapatikhaṇḍa for the theme of his play, Vighneśajanmodaya. The dramatist has summarised forty-six chapters of the Bvp to insert in his play, the VJ, which is consisted of only three Acts. The first eight chapters have been summed up in Act I, chapters nine to seventeen in Act II and chapters twenty-four to fourty-three in Act III.

The story of Vighneśajanmodaya is taken from the Gañapati-khaṇḍa of the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa. This chapter
of *Bvp* consists of forty-six chapters and describes the union of Śiva and Pārvatī, the birth of Kārttikeya and Gaṇeṣa, the reason of Gaṇeṣa’s getting an elephant’s head, the conflicts between Kārtavīrya and Jamadagni and Paraśurāma receiving favour from Śaṅkara, the fight between Rāma and Kārtavīrya and the latter’s death, Rāma’s Kṣatriya annihilation campaign, his visit to Kailāsa and conflict with Gaṇeṣa, the breaking of the tusk of Gaṇeṣa in the conflict, Pārvatī’s anger and its appeasement. All these incidents together with detailed accounts of various *kavacas*, *dhyānas* and *mantras* of different deities that constitute the Gaṇapati-khaṇḍa have been summarised and depicted in three acts of the play, the *Vighneśajanmodaya*.

The first Act of the *VJ*, begins with the celebration of birth day of Gaṇeṣa. Description of the erotic dalliances of Śiva and Pārvatī. The first Act also describes the birth story of Kārttikeya and Pārvatī’s penance for one year under the guidance of Sanatkumāra in order to beget another son.

The second Act begins with the celebration of the birth of Gaṇeṣa, The gods participated with various presents and offerings. Śanaiscara was the last to come. He paid his respects to the divine couple, but did not look at the boy.
Parvati was surprised at his behaviour. Sanaiscara justifies his conduct by telling her that due to the curse pronounced on him by his wife, his look would cause harm to the child. But Parvati insisted on his looking at the child. At last he casted a partial glance at the child and at once the head of the child fell down and merged in Nārāyaṇa. Hari, Who was also present in the celebration, flew off and took the head of an elephant, and by putting it on the child restored him into consciousness. This Act also gives a description of Kārttikeya being nourished by six Kṛttikās and subsequently being recovered by the followers of Śaṅkara by tracing the clues supplied by the gods and brought back to Kailāsa.

The third Act of the VJ, describes the arrival of Kārtavīryārjuna, the king of Māhīśmati in the hermitage of sage Jamadagni. In this Act we find that the poor sage Jamadagni received the king and his army with royal ovation and gives food with the help of his wish-yielding cow, Kapilā. Knowing the divine power of the cow, the king asked the sage for the cow which the sage refused. A conflict between the sage and the king ensued resulting in the death of the sage. After this, the dramatist gives the description
of Renuka's (the sage's wife) immolation in the funeral pyre of her husband. At the end of the drama, we see how Paraśurāma obtained from Śiva the Pāśupāta-astra as weapon and the Kṛṣṇa-kavaca as protection against enemies. Kārtavīryārjuna and all other kṣatriyas are destroyed by Paraśurāma, the son of Jamadagni and Renuka. Another fight also occurred when Paraśurāma comes to pay his homage to Śiva. It so happened when Gaṇeśa and Kartikeya blocked the way and did not permit Paraśurāma to meet Śiva, a scuffle arose between them. Gaṇeśa inflicted physical torture on Paraśurāma for his bad conduct. Paraśurāma, also, in a fit of fury, gave a heavy blow to Gaṇeśa with his axe, and one of the tasks of Gaṇeśa was broken. Pārvatī, out of anger, scolded Paraśurāma bitterly, but Nārāyaṇa, disguised as a Brahmaṇa, appeared in the scene and appeased her; and finally Paraśurāma was able to appease her.

3. The Śaṅkha-cūḍavadha:

The Śaṅkha-cūḍavadha is the third play included in the Rūpakatrayam. The Śv shares similar features with other two plays. In fact all these plays bear an amalgamated rules of dramaturgy, i.e., the classical Sanskrit dramaturgic rules as well as the dramaturgic rules of the Ankīya-nāṭa of the
Vaiṣṇava Saint of Assam. So, a brief note on the common characteristic features of these three plays, are proposed to be made in the following pages.

These three plays, i.e., the Kāmakumāraharaṇa, the Vignēśajanmodaya and Śaṅkhacūḍavadha bear some common characteristics. These are briefly as follows:

All the plays were composed under royal patronage. And as such, the patrons of the authors are eulogised in the manner of kings of the land-grants (śāsanas) in the region. The author of the Kāmakumāraharaṇa enjoyed the patronage of the Ahom king Svargadew Siva Simha (1714 A.D. to 1744 A.D.) and his ruling consorts Pramatheswari alias Phuleswari Knowarī and Ambika Devi. The author of the play highly acknowledges their patronage in several places of the play. As for instance, the following verse may be cited. cf.

śrisvargadevaśivasimhanarendraṇapati
vispaśṭanirnālayaśāḥ pramathesvariṣṭam /
yatnāt kumāraharaṇāṁ makaradhvajasya
nīrmāti nāṭakamīdām kavicandravipraḥ //
—Prologue of KH

In the Vignēśajanmodaya also, Kavisūrya Gaurīkānta Dwija eulogises his patron Kamaleswar Simha in the
following manner. cf.

\[ \text{āṅgāṃvangaṅkaṅ kalindaṅgam magadhagavakurūn bhoṭakarnaṅāṭātan,} \]
\[ \text{kāśikāśmīra-gauḍāṇḍra-viśāmanipuraṃ durddamāmramya-} \]
\[ \text{harmyān/} \]

\[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{sakusāli kāmarupādhiṅāthah //} \]

—Act III. 45

In a similar manner, Dīna Dvija also eulogises his patron Kaliyabhomora Barphukan in the prologue and the epilogue of his play. e.g.,

\[ \text{srimān sriśakravamśodbhavanapati ratikāntasanākrāntam-} \]
\[ \text{nānabhūpālasīrṣa pranatapadyugo mitrapakṣe kṛtāntaḥ/} \]
\[ \text{tatslaghyo mātyamukhyaḥ sakalabudhajana pritidhaḥ śubhakārītiḥ-} \]
\[ \text{sandikaivaṃśajanmā jayati vimaladhiḥ bṛhatphukkano' sau //} \]

—Act I. 3

Like other classical Sanskrit dramas, these plays open with Nāndi verses, prarocana etc., and close with the Bharatavākyas. Sūtradhāra plays an over bearing role, i.e., piloting the entire play from the prologue to the epilogue. He performs the preliminary rites and recitations, introduces the characters, maintains link between different incidents, gives explanatory comments wherever necessary, sing songs and recites the concluding verses (maṅgalavākyas).
Preponderance of lyrical elements consisting of prayers and songs marks all the three plays. Songs inserted into these plays are set into classical Rāga and Tāla. Assamese metres are employed along with the classical Sanskrit metres in the lyrical compositions.

Absence of Vidūṣaka is a noteworthy feature of these plays.

Dialogue of the characters are meagre compared to the volume of the Sūtradhāra’s narratives and explanatory notes.

The use of Bhaṭṭimā (Assamese, Bhaṭimā), is a common feature in all the three dramas.

The unity of time, place and action have not been carefully maintained. However, the overbearing role of the Sūtradhāra has helped the playwrights to do away with these difficulties. The plot construction is rather weak in these plays.

All the three plays bear local colour in idiomatic expressions. Even folk songs like Assamese nuptial songs (biyānām) are inserted to depict the marriage event of Uṣā and Aniruddha in the KH.

Although the diction and style of composition of these dramas are not very high, yet some passages of prose
composition show the talent of the concerned authors. These ornamental prose passages reflect the style of the authors of the local inscriptions of the time.

(a)
śṛṇutāho sāmāyikajanāh. aviratāsuravṛṇdavandita-haragauri-
caranaravindamakaranda-pānonmatta madhuka-reṇa,
kundendudhavalakīrtirājīvirājīta digdigantarena,
dorāvṛtipitakodanda daṇḍitadurvvāravairīvīranivahena,
camatkārakaraprabhāprāgbhārabhāsvaravividhāvidyāvidyotita-
vigrahaṇa, cāturyāśitasitāśalalāvāyaliśalakalitakalevara
surasundarīvirājamānabṛhadṛja padaprakhyāta -
prathitauṇagrāma rāmābhīrāma-śrīpramathaśvarīmahā-
devidayitena śrīsvargadevaśivasimhamahimahendrenā
kāmakumāra haraṇamānāmnāṭakaṁ nāṭayutumādiṣṭo’smi/
ataḥ idānim kṛtakṛtyena mayā tadevānuṣṭhēyam //

—KKH., Act I

(b)
anena mandamandarāndolitamugdhabugdhap āravāra
hīṅḍirapiṇḍapāndurayaśaścandraprakāśitādīmmanaḍalena,
apāra pāravāra -saṁsārasāra sakalalokapāla kula cuḍāmanī
maricīmañjarīnirājitacaranarānakamalayu galena, samasta
dikkarinikararīṇatālā spālaviśālavāta samapāta nartita
pratāpānalena.

—VJ., Act I
śrīmadamaranikaravarakīrītakotiktamaṇḍibhiracitracaraṇa
nalinena, haravirīṇcisaṃcitatatanuvābhavavabhāva-
nirṇyorjita-tanusahastreṇa, kalakaṇṭha kokilakaṇṭhīrava
-saṭāsaktāraktaṇocana mocanottuṇgamātaṅgariṅgamāna-
-surapurūryavasthādhi-śvarena, lakṣmīvilāsalāsitāntaḥ -
sphuraṇasaraṇena, śrīmatā hṛdayasarasīruhaśāyinā -
nārāyaṇena śāṅkhacūḍavadhākhya- nāṭakam-abhinetum-
ādiśṭo'smi / tadadyābhīnayāmi / sābhāsada tatpaśyata /

—Śv., Act I