All the Sanskrit literature is known as Kāvyā. Therefore, the field of the Sanskrit Kāvyā is very wide. The great epic Rāmāyana is the first classical Kāvyā. It flows from the heart of the greatest poet Vālmīki. Kāvyā is of two types Drśya and Sravya. The term Drśya Kāvyā is also called Rūpaka. Rūpaka means drama. Rasa is the soul of both types of Kāvyā Drśya and Sravya, without Rasa a Kāvyā will be imperfect. Among all the varieties of Kāvyā drama is very popular and excellent (Kāvyesu Nātakam rāmyam). Sravya Kāvyas like Raghuvamsam, Naisadhā caritameta are to be read and heard, but not to be seen. Drśya Kāvyas like as Śakuntala, Mālatimādhava these are to be enacted on the stage and seen by the audience. Hence it is very easy to ascertain the drama than Sravya Kāvyā for the audience. Some critic opined that there are eight rasas in a Rūpaka. (Aṣṭau nātye rasāh smṛtāh). But some other says that there are nine rasas which are applicable in a drama. According to some critic only Śṛṅgāra or vīra rasa can be predominant in a Rūpaka. But we have found in a drama like the Probodha- candrodaya Śanta rasa is depicted as principal one.
In the tradition of Sanskrit drama as a matter of fact there is no tragedy. However, in the field of dramatic literature we have seen a few dramas in which Karuna rasa is depicted as predominantly Śṛṅgāra and Karuna rasa have wide scope to please the audience. There are two books we have found one is ‘The treatment of pathos in Sanskrit drama’. In the treatment of pathos in Sanskrit drama we have seen that there discussion has been made on pathos. But it is not cleared whether Karuna rasa is reflected as predominantly or subordinately. Therefore we are prompted to undertake such a research work which will be devoted to investigate the Karuna rasa in the dramatic literature irrespective of it being predominant or not. Most of the Sanskrit drama ends happily, but a few end in sorrowfully. Dhavabhuti’s Uttararāmacarita is considered as a drama where Karuna rasa is predominant. There are some very tragic scenes depicted in the drama, yet it is neither a tragedy nor a Karuna pradhāna nātaka. When hero or heroine departed for ever then it will be called a Karuna pradhāna nātaka. But if there is a hope for their union then it will be Karuna vipralāmbha Śṛṅgāra. Therefore in the dramas like Uttararāmacarita, and the Kundamālā there grief of Śītā is depicted very sorrowfully, yet these two dramas are not accepted as Karuna pradhāna dramas. But in the
Candakausika, Urubhaṅga and Dutaqhatotkaca the death of hero has been displayed by the dramatists and therefore these three are accepted as Karuna pradhāna dramas. The Nāṭya-sāstra of Bharata is the earliest authentic dramaturgy which was written after Bhāsa. Therefore Bhāsa did not follow all the rules and regulations of Nāṭya-sāstra in his drama, as a result he displayed the death etc. in his work. Kṣemīśvara also wanted to establish a new tradition by making his Candakausika a nāṭaka ending in sorrowful state. Tragedy and Karuna pradhāna nāṭaka are not homonymous. In the tragedy there must be pity and fear and at the end of the drama it will have to come to the purgation. But sorrows of hero or heroine remains for ever. It is a common idea that Karuna rasa gives only sorrow. However, it can be said that Karuna is not a sentiment of sorrow, because it is able to give us pleasure. When spectators go to see the pathetic scene of Rāma and Sītā on the stage then they can forget their personal sorrows and sufferings for a moment. We can say all rasas are pleasurable because this state is called a 'Brahmā svāda and Brahmananda. Anandavardhana the author of Phvanvāloka said that any one rasa will be predominant which makes the drama very excellent. From that point of view Karuna rasa may be predominant in a drama.

In this thesis we want to establish our opinion in support of the predominance of Karuna rasa in a drama with
the help of textual evidences, we have collected data from original sources. And after proper analysis we have presented those in a systematic manner to constitute this dissertation. We do not know if any other scholar who would deal with same topic for a work of thesis dealing with Karuna rasa predominant or subordinate in dramas. Most of the author of Sanskrit literature did not tell about the actual date of their life and works. Therefore it is a very difficult to justify the actual date of the author and their works. We shall have to take decision regarding the date of a Sanskrit author depending upon the date of other authors. In this way the date of Bhasa might be fixed at 4th or 5th century B.C. His plays Karnabharam, Madhyamanavayogam, Pratimanataka, Svarnavasavadatta, Carudattam, Pratijayauugandharaya, Dutavakyam, Dutaghatotkacan, Urubhairam, are discussed here under. The date of Kālidāsa might be, thus, fixed as first or second century A.D. His dramas are the Malavikāgnimitram, the Vikramorvasiyam, and the Abhijnanashakuntalam. Visakhadatta composed his Mudrarakṣasa in 6th century. Sudraka also was a dramatist of 6th century A.D. We find his only drama, the Mrchakatika, Harṣa was a historical king of 7th century A.D., who composed three dramas. Two of them the Ratnavalī and the Nāgānanda have been discussed here. Bhattacharaya was a dramatist of 8th century
A.D. and he composed the Venīsamhāram, we have found three
dramas of Bhavabhūti, these are the Mālatimādhavavām, the
Mahāvīracaritām and the Uttararāmacaritām. His date may be
fixed at 8th century A.D. Mūrāri composed Anarbhārāghavām
in 9th century A.D. Saktibhadra wrote his drama
Aścaryacūdāmāni and Diṇṇāga wrote his Kundamāla in the
10th century A.D. Kṣemīśvara wrote his Candakauśikām at
the behest of Mahipāla, the king of Kāṇyakubja, he was a
patron of Rājaśekhara. Hence Kṣemīśvara may be contemporary
of Rājaśekhara in 10th century A.D. Śrīkrṣnamīśra's
Prabodhacandragadaya and Hanumānāṭakām by Hanumān also within
in the 11th century A.D. Subhata composed the drama
Dūtāngadām in the middle part of the 12th century A.D.
Jayadava's Prasannarāghavām was written in 13th century A.D.
In between 1229 and 1232 Yāsahpāla wrote Moharājaparājayaṃ
In the 13th or 14th century Venkatanātha wrote the
Sankalpasūryodayaṃ, And the Caitanyacandragadayaṃ was written
by Kavikārṇapūra in the 16th century. In the 1693
Gokulanātha wrote the Anmrdayaṃ. In the first half of the
18th century Ānandarāya Mākhiṇ wrote the Vidyāparīdayaṃ.

we have dealt our topic of the thesis in six
chapters along with this introduction and conclusion. In
the first chapter we have treated the preliminary discussion
on the Rūpaka and Rasa - The definition of Kāvyā, divisions
and sub-divisions of Kāvyā, Kāvyā and rasa.
In the second chapter, there are definition of rasa, rasa its varieties. The treatment of Karuna rasa, Karuna rasa and its presentation on the stage, predominance of Karuna rasa. All rasas are inherent in Karuna rasa. In the third chapter definition of Rupaka, origin and Development of Rupaka, divisions of Rupaka and exposition of rasa are discussed.

In the fourth chapter a characteristic feature of (a) social, (b) chayan and (c) symbolic drama and principal Rupakas of these types of drama and their rasas are discussed. Social drama Mrchakatika and Carudatta, symbolic drama prabodhacandradaya, Sankalpasuryadayaya, Vidyaaparinaya, Amrtodaya, Moharaja Parajaya, and Caitanyacandrodlaya, Chayanatka, Dutaangadka are specially discussed in this chapter.

In the sixth chapter we have dealt with Karuna rasa used as āṅgī in the following dramas Dūtaghāṭotkaca, Urubhaṅga, and Candakauśika. After these we come to the conclusion.

The work further contains usual Bibliography, hints to transliteration and preface etc.