Chapter-VI

Sandhyantararas.

Sgn. omits the theories of Anusandhi and Daśā, both of which are referred to and rejected by Ag.; but treats the Sandhyantararas in details. The GOS. edition of the NS. gives the names of twenty-one Sandhyantararas and the editor notes that some of the manuscripts enumerate them in the earlier part of the chapter. The KSS. edition enumerates them in the earlier part of the chapter (XXI. 49-51). Ag. gives only a short exposition on the nature and utility of the Sandhyantararas but neither the NS. nor Ag. makes any attempt to define and illustrate them. Dhanañjaya and Viśvanātha clearly avoid the topic. Bhoja does not define the Sandhyantararas but illustrates each of them. The ND. at the end of the first Viveka refers to these, as according to the view of some and enumerates them. The Bhā. pra. also simply gives a list of twenty-one Sandhyantararas. Chronologically speaking then, so far as the available texts are concerned; it is the NLRK, first that defines and illustrates each of them. The RS. with its close follower the NC. also, gives a detailed account of the Sandhyantararas with definitions and illustrations. Sañ. dā. also gives the names of the Sandhyantararas and there they are called the Pradeśas of the Sandhis, as in the NLRK.

1. NS. GOS. XIX. 107-109. p. 63. f.n. 3.
3. ND. p. 102.
6. Sañ. dā. p. 98; NLRK; 1. 923. Cf. NLRK (1. 994) where they are called Sandhyantarara-pradeśas.
Sgn. maintains that these twenty-one Pradeśas (situations, points) of the Sandhis occur in a play to serve some purpose, and for the proper delineation of the plot, as many of them as are required may be used within the Sandhis. Thus, there is no hard and fast rule regarding the use of the Sandhyantarās. Śiṅgabhūpāla also opines that unlike the Sandhyāṅgas any one of these twenty-one can be used anywhere within the Sandhis whenever necessary and without any restriction.

Sgn. says nothing definite regarding the utility of the Sandhyantarās. The NS. seems to indicate that the necessity of these twenty one lies in the role of their connecting the 'āṅgas' of the Sandhis. The RS. also maintains that they are to prevent the looseness in the use of the Sandhyāṅgas and the NC. repeats the same.

Ag. himself gives little importance to the Sandhyantarās. He refers to two views regarding the purpose served by them in a drama. He informs us that according to some the Sandhyantarās fill up the gaps between the Sandhyāṅgas and thus they are primarily related to the 'āṅgas'. Others, as stated by Ag., maintain that they are but varieties of the Sandhyāṅgas like Upakṣepa.

---

7. NLBK. 1.923. eteśāṁ eva saṁdhīnām ekaviṁśati-pradeśā arthavaśād bhavanti / 11. 930-931 prayojana vaśādyāvanta etc. pradeṣṭum śaṅkante tāvantaḥ saṁdhīṣu pradaṁṣayitavyāḥ /
9. NS. GOS. XIX. 106 eteśāmeva caṅgānāṁ sambaddhānyarthayuktitaḥ/sandhyantarāṇi etc./--
10. RS. III. 79. mukhādi-sandhiṣvāṅgānāṁ aśaṅthilyaṁ pratiyate/ NC.(p.34) reads...aṅgānāṁ aśaṅthiāya sarvataḥ/
11. NS. GOS. Vol.III. p.63. tena sandhyāṅga-cchidravartitvāt sandhyantarāṇi, ata eva caṅgānāṁ sambaddhiṇī /
etc., each of which may be of different varieties. A single 'āṅga' Upakṣepa has been shown as of different variety in different drama. It is 'krodhātmā' in the V. sam., 'bhyātmā' in the Rāmāhyudaya, 'svapnarūpa' in the Pratimāniruddha and 'hetvavadhāraṇātmā' in the Udāttrāghava. Thus the Sandhyantarās have according to this view, got no separate entity besides the Sandhyāṅgas, they are but to indicate the special marks of the latter group of sixty-four. Ag. himself understands them as nothing more than the Vibhava, Anubhava and Vyabhicāribhavā; they are the causes of brightness (ujjalatvahetu) of the Prayoga (dramatic performance). Ag. further says that the Sandhyantarās occur in all types of plays and as they can be easily discerned they need not be illustrated. Thus Ag. neither rejects the Sandhyantarās altogether nor attaches much importance to them. The DR. maintains that they may be covered by the Alankāras or Vyabhicāri-bhāvas and as such, require no separate treatment. Following the Abhi. bhā., the ND. also maintains that the Sandhyantarās require no elaborate treatment, as some of them (Sāma etc.) are identical with the Sandhyāṅgas, some (Mati etc.) are Vyabhicāri-bhāvas, some (Dūta, Lekha etc.) are but the very incidents of the plot of the play, while...

12. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 63.anye manyante ya evopakṣepādyāh sāmānyā uktāḥ teśāṁ evaitadvisēsā avāntarabhedāḥ / This view seems to be referred to in the RS. (III. 95) when the author says, †sandhyantarāḥ nam aṅgeṣu nāntarbhāvo mato mama/


14. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 64. ete ca vibhāvānubhāva-vyabhicāri-rūpā eva/

15. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 64.

16. DR. IV. 84. cf. also Avoloka on the verse.
others are but the varieties of Upakṣepa etc. Thus, excepting Sgn., Bhoja and Śiṅgabhūpāla, none of the authorities takes any interest in the definitions and illustrations of the Sandhyantarās.

There is a general agreement among the different lists of twenty-one Sandhyantarās found in different works excepting minor variations. Sgn. and Subhaṅkara read Dhi, Rujāḥ and Upadhi instead of Uṛi, Ujās and Lekha of the NS. The RS. also reads Dhi. The Bhā. prā. enumerates both Upadhi and Lekha and omits Dhi or Uṛi. It reads Hāsa instead of Sūhāsa of others.

Sgn. further states that into the Sandhis there may be introduced aerial voice uttered by a celestial person and the reading of letters, and in support of his statement quotes an anonymous authority. Again after discussing the four Patākāsthānas Sgn. states, - 'svapnodūtah nepathyākāśa - vacanaṁ likhitānyanantara-samdhiṣu kathyante' Svapna and Dūta have been...

17. ND. p. 102.
18. NL RK. 11, 994-996. samadhīnām antare cākāśa-puruṣa-vacanāni lekhyoktyā (ms. reads, - lekhyoktayā) vidhātavyāḥ/yadāha/ lekhyoktirākāśa-vacanam antaraṃ samdhīṣviti/ Subhaṅkara also records this view and probably from the NL RK. The Saṅ. dā (p. 99) reads "lekhoktirākāśa-vacanam-antarā sandhiṣu smṛ-tam". Dr. Raghavan (NL RK. Eng. Tra. p. 63) takes the 'ākāśa - puruṣa-vacanāni' as the definition of the 'lekhyokti' and prefers the reading 'lekhyoktayaḥ' (NL RK. Eng. Tra. p. 72). The reading 'lekhyoktayaḥ', however, seems to be the correct one but it may be taken to mean 'reading of letters'. Cf. RS. III. 91. In the list of twenty-one Sandhyantarās Sgn. omits 'Lekha' and here he seems to have included it.

19. NL RK. 1, 1039. The text reads 'svapnodbhūtam'. Dr. Raghavan (NL RK. Eng. Tra. p. 72) suggests 'svapnodūtah' and this seems to be a better reading. A further improvement may be suggested as '- duto'. In another place (1, 2280) Sgn. enjoins that the entrance of minor characters, having a little to perform on the stage, should be avoided with the help of the devices Akāśavāk, Nepathyokti and Lekha.
included by Sgn. in the list of the twenty-one. Dr. Raghavan points out that this line of the NLRK. seems to be a reference to the view of Mātrgupta, as quoted by RB. in the Arthadyotanikā. RB. says, - "ukto mātrguptācāryaiḥ-svapno dūtaśca lekhāśca nepathyoktistathaiva hi/ākāśa-vacanaṁ ceti jñeyā hyantara-sandhyayah". This gives us another important information that among the ancient authorities on the subject Mātrgupta also accepts the Sandhyantarās. Excepting Nepathyokti and Ākāśa-vacana, other names given in the above verse of Mātrgupta, occur also in the list of the NS. It is interesting to note that the number of the Sandhyantarās like that of the Sandhyāṇyas, also went on increasing and Sgn. takes into account at least twenty four of them including Lekhyokti, Nepathyā-vacana and Ākāśa-vacana from different sources. The Upadhi found in the list of the NLRK., Bhā. pra., and Saṁ. dā. is found neither in the NS. nor in any other text. The Dhi is found as a variant of the Hṛi in one manuscript. The first anonymous authority cited by Sgn. does not refer to Māg. whose view, however, has also been recorded in the NLRK. Māg. accepts Nepathyokti and Ākāśa-vacana as two separate Sandhyantarās, thus Sgn. had before him another authority excepting Māg. who counted Ākāśa-vacana as a Sandhyantarā.

From the treatment of the Sandhyantarās by most of the authorities, as discussed before, it appears that the theory was not given much importance to in the face of the more elaborate scheme of the Sandhyāṇgas. Śiṅgabhūpāla maintains that some Acārya approves of their utility; - "acāryā-ntara-saṅgatyā camatkāro vidhiyate". The ND. also expressly states that the Sandhyantarās are taken into account by some theorists only. These factors tend to support

22. NS. GDS. Vol. III. p.63, f.n. 5 'na'
23. RS. III. 80.
24. ND. p.102.
the assumption that the Sandhyantaras are Post-Bharatan, but neither Ag. nor any other authority gives any such hint. Ag. accepts them as Bharatan without any suspicion, as it appears from his commentary. The above statements of the ND. and RS. may simply mean that some theorists do not approve of any utility of the Sandhyantaras while some attach importance to them. It is also a fact that all the topics of the NS. are not equally treated by each and every later authority.

The NS. gives no definition of the Sandhyantaras and this also cannot be taken to be an indication of their post-Bharatan origin. Perhaps no necessity was felt to define these common features of plays, as maintained by Ag. Their definitions gradually took shape in the hands of later authorities.

Sgn. himself in most cases gives only the synonyms of the names of Sandhyantaras while explaining them and these are in no sense can be called as definitions. The Dāna has only been illustrated and a curious explanation has been given to Nāyā as fraud planned by the demon Maya to deceive the gods, while for illustration a situation is referred to from the Sugrīvānka, where false Hanumat has been used against Sugrīva. Sgn., however, cannot be credited as the first authority to explain and illustrate the Sandhyantaras, as he him-

25. NLRK, Eng. Tra. p.63. Dr. Raghavan on the basis of the statements of the ND. and DR. supposes that they are post-Bharatan. But the expression 'Post-Bharatan' itself requires elucidation in the face of the still unsettled problem relating to the identity of Bharata or Ādi-bharata. Moreover it is yet to be finally decided what portion of the present NS. is pre-Bharatan, what is Bharatan and what is post-Bharatan.

26. Cf. NLRK. 11.935 bhedāḥ Pṛthag-bhāvah; 940. damanaṁ dandah; 942. vadho vyāpādaḥ; 949. gotra-skhalitaṁ nāmāntara-grahānām; 957 bhāyam Lhitih; 965 krodhaṁ kopah; 977 bhṛāntir-bhrumaḥ; 983 dūtaḥ śandesā-haraḥ; 984 Upadhiśchala-nām.

self refers to other's view. He defines Rujā as physical pain caused by blow etc., and then says that others include even the sight of an evil omen causing mental anguish in Rujā. The definitions of Sandhyantaras given in the RS. on the other hand, are fuller and in most cases have got no apparent similarity with those found in the NLRK. Sgn.'s treatment of these twenty-one thus seems to represent an early stage in the development of their definitions which took a definite form by the time of Śiṅgabhūpāla, i.e., 14th century A.D.

It has been pointed out above that RB. quotes the view of Mg. to support that the Nepathyā-vacana is a Sandhyantara. But at least in ten cases the said commentator, while pointing out other Sandhyantaras, quotes their definitions from the RS. The quotation concerned from the text of Mg., as given above, only enumerates some Sandhyantaras but gives no definition. As Nepathyavacana and Ākāṣa-bhūṣita have not been taken into account as Sandhyantaras in the RS., RB. gives no definition to them. From this it may be supposed that Mg. himself also did not define the Sandhyantaras. Probably their definitions began to take shape after Mg. and did not reach to a final stage even upto the time of Sgn.

At present, however, there is nothing to prove conclusively that the Sandhyantaras were not included in the original NS. and that some other seer formulated them. If they were included in the NS. after Mg. we could have found the names of Ākāṣa-vacana and Nepathyokti in the list given there. It can thus be accepted unhesitatingly that the Sandhyantaras were there in the NS. at least before Mg. Mg. took up the Sandhyantaras from the NS. and increased their number at least by two, - Nepathyā-vacana and Ākāṣa-vacana. We, of course, know

29. NLRK. 11.967-970. As an illustration of Rujā, Sgn. quotes (11.971-972) a verse that seems to be apparently taken from the Mrchakatikam (Act. IX.II). The reading differs very much from that of the printed text of the drama.

nothing definite about Mg.'s opinion regarding the purpose served by the Sandhyantaras in a play.