Chapter-VIII

Divisions of a play for representation

A. Āṅka (Act)

Avasthas, Artha-prakṛtis and Sandhi-Sandhyāṇga-Sandhyantararas, we have seen, serve to analyse the plot of a well-knit play. The readers and critics are mainly interested in them. The playwright himself should possess a thorough knowledge of these divisions while constructing the plot. For the sake of an artistic representation on the stage, the body of the play is divided into several sections and these sections, according to their nature and purpose are called Āṅka, Viśkambhaka, Praveśaka etc., as the case may be. This division entirely depends upon the consideration that how a play can be best represented on the stage maintaining an abiding interest of the audience.

Āṅka, says Sgn., is the ‘Paricchedayita’ of the ‘ākhyaṅgrantha’ i.e., it divides the sections of the play. Each of these sections, enjoins the NLRK, should contain various acts (prayaḥ) and should be pervaded (upagañcha) with different types of Bhavas and Rasas. This is said as an exposition to ‘nānā-vidhāna-yukto bhāvai rasaiśca guḍho bhavet,’ evidently taken from the NS, where the whole verse is read as:

āṅka iti rūḍhi-sābdo bhāvaiśca rasiśca rohayatyarthān /

nānā-vidhāna-yukto yasmāt tasmād bhavedāṅkaḥ //

1. NLRK. I. 237.
2. NLRK. II. 242-244.
3. NLRK. I. 241.
4. NS. GOS. XVIII. 14. Two mas. read ‘guḍha-sābdo’ and ‘cihmayyatarthān’ for ‘rūḍhi-sābdo’ and ‘rohayatyarthān’ respectively. It is interesting to note here that NB, attributes this verse in his Arthadyotanika (Abhi.śaku, p.54) to Ādi-bhārata along with two other verses (NS. GOS. XVIII. 16,17) of the same context.
The first half of Sgn.'s quotation occurs as the third foot of the verse from the NS., but the reading of the second half is not exactly the same as that of the second foot in NS. Here Ag. informs us that some theorists headed by Lollāṭa accept the reading 'guḍha'. The Abhi-bhā. here reads, "āṅka iti rūḍhi-sabda iti/ bhāvaḥ rasaiśca guḍhaschannaḥ vyāpto 'r tho' ńka-sābdena yāḍrchi-kenocye ati bhāṭa-lollatādyāḥ guḍha iti pāṭhān vyācakṣire/ anye rohayatya-rthāniti paṭhānti". Thus the reading of the second foot of the above verse from the NS., according to Lollāṭa seems to be "bhāvaḥ rasaiśca guḍho bhavet", exactly similar to that of the second half of the hemistich quoted by Sgn., as given above. Thus the reading of the first foot of the same verse according to Lollāṭa, as appears from the above text of Abhi. bhā. is: "āṅka iti rūḍhi-sabdo" i.e., "āṅka" is a "yāḍrchiṅka-sābda" as Ag. puts it. According to this interpretation 'āṅka' is a "sā njā-sābda"; i.e., 'āṅka', as used in dramatic literature is simply a name having no derivative meaning and is applied in its particular sense through traditional sanction. The reading, "rohayatya-rthān," implies that Āṅka is so called as it nourishes the theme as if on its lap. This is undoubtedly an instance of folk-etymology but authorities like Dhanīka, Śiṅgabhūpāla and Śdt. adopt it. Ag. maintains that the word 'āṅka'
5. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 415.
6. Mm. P.V. Kane (HSP. p. 50) and Dr. Raghavan (MLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 61) maintain that the reading of the hemistieh according to Lollata is: āṅka iti guḍha-sabdo bhāvaḥ rasaiśca rohayatyarthān." But Ag. distinctly says "anye rohayatyarthān iti paṭhānti," as quoted above. Moreover according to Lollāṭa, as informed by Ag., 'āṅka' is a 'yāḍrchiṅkaśābda' which meaning comes from 'rūḍhi-sabda'.
8. Dr. p. 70. utsaṅga āṅkaḥ; RS. III. 197. p. 283; bhā. pra. p. 235. 1.11.
here in this context is purely a 'rūḍhī-śāhda', but in another place he says that the section of a play is so named as it is marked by various Rasas.

The poet, according to Sgn., is to take into consideration the entire action while constructing the Āṅkas of a play. He is to consider the Sandhyāngas, Avasthās and the expansion of the Bindu etc., in dividing a play into Āṅkas. The Bindu, we know, serves to maintain a connecting link and thereby a continuity in the development of the plot. This implies that every succeeding Act should naturally follow the preceding one as a direct continuation of the plot.

Indian theorists in general, maintain that the number of Āṅkas in a full-fledged Nāṭaka or Prakaraṇa may be from the minimum five to the maximum ten. Ag. opines that the Āṅkas should correlate to the Avasthās, an Āṅka should be closed with the end of an Avasthā. The Bindu, that acts like a linking thread, should at the close of each Āṅka, be so placed as to connect it with the following Āṅka. Thus there should be at least five Āṅkas corresponding to five Avasthās in a Nāṭaka, and the Bindu at the end of each Āṅka is to give a fresh impetus to the further development of the plot. Ag. further

9. NŚ. GOS. Vol. II p.415, p.418. aneka-rasaṅkita-tvād api āṅka iti nāmetyarthaḥ/

10. NLRK. 11.230-239. sa ca sandhyāṅgavaśād asyaiva nāṭakasyāvasthām prasaṃikṣya bindvādinām vistarād vā kartavyāḥ/ This is based on NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 13.

11. NLRK. 11.239-240; NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 29. prakarana-nāṭakaviśaye pañ-cādyā dusāperā bhavantyāṅkāḥ/

12. NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. p.415. itivṛttasya bindu-sūtra-syūtasya prārambhādyavasthā-pancaka-cārīno yadā prārambhāvasthā pūrṇatvam eti tadāṅkocchedo bindudvārāṇusandhiyamāna-dvītyāṅkābhidheyarūpo vidheyaḥ/evam prayatnādyavasthācaturuṣṭaye/ pi vācyam iti pañca tāvad āṅkā iti mukhyāḥ kalpaḥ/ Kohula also, as informs Śdt. (Bhā. pra. P.236, 1.18) enjoins the use of Bindu at the close of an Āṅka.
maintains that if the first Avasthā demands a larger space it can take two Ankas and in this way due to the exigencies of other Avasthās the number of 13 Ankas may be increased from six to ten but not more. Ag. holds, as has been shown before, that the five Sandhis rest on the five successive Avasthās. Now, it appears that according to Ag. there should be at least five Ankas, depicting five Sandhis and Avasthās in a Pūrna-sandhi-rūpaka; i.e., Nāṭaka or Prakaraṇa. An Avasthā and its corresponding Sandhi may cover two Ankas and thus there may be up to ten Ankas in a Nāṭaka. So, according to Ag. no Avasthā or Sandhi can either be ended before the close of an Anka or started from within an Anka. A Sandhi or Avasthā should be started at the beginning of an Anka and should also be concluded at the end of an Anka. From the above, it can also be inferred that no Sandhi and its corresponding Avasthā can occupy more than two Ankas according to Ag. But this rigid theory of Ag., as can be made out from the defective text, has found little recognition to the theorists and commentators. Visvanātha allots the entire portion from the beginning of the Act IV up to the situation prior to the recognition of Sakuntalā in the Act VII of the Abhi. Śāku to Vimarśa-sandhi. The Acts III, IV and V of the Venī-saṃhāra comprise the Garbha-sandhi according to the ND. Dhundhi points 13. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p.415. yadā prārambhāvadhipradhānam bhavatītī taddā tasyā evopakramopasāṃhāravasthādvayāpekṣayā dvāvaṅkau, anyāsām ekaikāṅkateti yuvat sarvāsām avasthādvayayogena sampūdanaṁ iti śādāṅkatvat prabhṛti saptāja-tapraptau (?) daśāṅkatvam / 14. NS'. GOS. Vol. II. p.416. Prārambhādvasthālakṣaṇo' rtho yatra samā-pyate so'ākaḥ/Cf. also pp. 421-422 sandhyavasthānapariṇāpoṇibaddha evaṅka etc. 15. SD. below VI. 80. p. 359. 16. ND. pp. 32, 49.
out that the Act I of the Mu. rā contains first two Sandhis and the last three Acts of the same Nāṭaka have been allotted to the Nirvahāṇa Sandhi by the same commentator. According to Rāghava-bhaṭṭa the Mukha-sandhi in the Abhiśaku ends within the Act II, wherefrom the Pratimukha-sandhi begins; similarly the Garbha-sandhi closes within the Act V and from there the Vimarśa-sandhi begins. The ND., a work of a dramatist, follows Abhi. bhā mainly but in this respect it clearly states that a single Avasthā, if required, can be delineated throughout even three Acts and gives an illustration from the V. sam. as noted above. It further informs us that according to the traditional view (vrddhasampradāya) an Avasthā should be ended with the end of an Act but there are some who maintain that it can be concluded even before the end of the Act concerned, i.e., within the Act. The authors, however, appear to have supported both the views. Here by 'vrddhasampradāya' the ND. refers to the view upheld by Ag.

The NS. nowhere clearly states that there exists any correlation between the Ankas and Avasthā-sandhis of a drama. The poet is given a free hand to exercise. Sgn. also keeps silent about the problems, as where an Avasthā is to be concluded and how many Ankas can be occupied by a single Avasthā or Sandhi.

19. ND. p. 32.
20. ND. I.19. p.31 asamāptāyāṁ apyavasthāyāṁ kāryaṁ eva yo vā chedaṁ khaṇḍanam so'ṅkah/ But again (pp.31-32) it says, 'amunā vrddhasampradāyāṁ tenāṅkalakṣaṇena vakṣyamāna-nītyā aṅka-samkhyaṁ-parimāṇam upapadyate/ ye tu vrddha-sampradāyāṁ avadhūyāṅkamadhye' pyavasthāṁ samāpayanti etc.
It should be noted here that Sgn. accepts no parallelism between Avasthas and Sandhis and the matter has been fully discussed before. No hard and fast rule can be formulated regarding the relation between an Avastha and an Anka and this seems to be the implication of Sgn.'s silence here in this respect.

Regarding the general rule about the number of Acts in a Nāṭaka A.b. Keith rightly observes, "the rule is generally obeyed, but late dramas styling themselves Nāṭakas are known of one (Ravidāsa's Mithyājñānavidambana), two (Vedāntavāgīśa's Bhojacarita) three or four acts, and one comparatively early work exists in one version of fourteen acts, the Mahānāṭaka; the Adbhutarṇava of a Kavibhūṣaṇa has twelve acts." Some of Bhūṣa-dramas may be included in this list, but most of the works named above may not be styled Nāṭaka proper. Prof. Sivaprasād Bhaṭṭāchāryya maintains that the Mahānāṭaka is a hand book of the Kathakas who recite and explain the epics and the Purāṇas.

For further exposition of the Anka, Sgn. quotes from the NS:-

Yatārthasya samāptiryatra ca bijasya bhavati saṃbhārah / 22a
Kimcidavalagna-binduh so'ṅka iti sadavagantavyah //

21. The Skt. Dr. p. 345. Keith here in the foot note (2) points out "Ghanasyāma's Navagrahacarita has three acts; Madhusūdana's Jānakīparinaya has four". The Bombay recension of the Mahānāṭaka has fourteen Ankas. Viśvanātha (SD. VI 223-224) maintains that a Mahānāṭaka should contain ten Ankas.


22a. NLāK. 1,245-246; NS. GOS. XVIII. 16. The verse is also quoted in the Bhūpra. p.235. 11. 12-13. Narahari in his commentary on the Abhisākū (p.310) quotes from the Kavi-kapṭha-hūra : Prakṛtarthasya nirvāhaḥ tathā bijasya samyataḥ / kimcit saṃpāgnabinduh syād yatra so'ṅka iti smṛtaḥ // This is very similar to the above verse from the NS.
This verse according to Sgn.'s gloss enjoins that in an Āṅka a particular incident (arthasyānusāṅgikasya) is to be fully delineated and a partial development of the main theme is to be depicted (pradhānarthasyāṁśataḥ saṁharaṇam) while the Bindu is to maintain the link. Ag. interpretes the verse according to the traditional view to mean that a certain Avastha and its corresponding Sandhi should be completed in an Āṅka but himself admits that this has already been said in the verse, 'asyāvasthopetam' etc. So, he opines, that the verse speaks of three types of Āṅkas and quotes the view of Kohala (and others?) that enumerates and defines those, viz., Cūḍāṅka (Cūlikāṅka), Avatārāṅka and Aṅkamukha. This view of Kohala will be taken up in our discussion on the Arathopakṣeṇakas. At present it is to be noted that this view of Kohala finds no mention in any of the works like the NLRK., DR., Bhū. pra. etc.

Following the NS., the NLRK. enjoins that there should be only four or five Nāyakas in a Nāṭaka and in Āṅkas their actions are to be depicted along with different circumstances (nūnā-dasā-yukto'ṅkaḥ); but these actions should not be protracted leaving the main issue which is made to be served by them. Sgn. takes the word 'nāyaka' to signify in this context both the chief hero and other leading characters like the heroine, the secondary hero, the enemy of the

24. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p.416. Prārambhādyavasthā-lakṣāṇo'ṛtho yatra samāpyate so'ṅkaḥ /.....evam āṅka-svarūpam anena nirūpitam iti cirantanāḥ / taccaitat punaruktam, "asyāvasthopetāṁ kāryam." (VIII.13) ityanena hi kiya- mnoktam yadanena lakṣāṇanābhidhiyate /
26. NLRK. 11. 249-250 (taken from the NS. GOS. XVIII.17),251-254,SD.VI.11.
hero even who is to be killed. The NS says: "sannihitanāyako'ṅkaḥ kartavyo
nāṭake prakaraṇe vā." Sgn. in his gloss on this hemistich says that in
every Anka any one of the above Nayakas must be present. The examples of this
principle are given from the V.sam; and the two Ankas Nāyādālāsā and Nā-
gūnanda are cited as having the principal hero in every Anka. To furnish an
Anka with different Rasas, not only the actions of the leading characters but
those of others like queens, their retinues, priests, ministers and merchants
are to be presented.

27. NLRK. 11.271-272. Ag. (NS. GOS. Vol.II. p.418) also in the same context
takes the word 'nāyaka' to signify both the main hero and leading characters.
Viśvanātha(SD.VI.11 p.322) uses the word 'kāryavyāppṛta-puruṣāḥ' to mean the
leading characters as distinguished from the Nāyaka, the main hero.

28. NS. GOS. XVIII. 28. The NLRK. (11.269-270) shortens the hemistich as:
Sannihitanāyako'ṅkaśca kāryah.

29. NLRK. 11.273-278. The names of the Ankas of the V.sam. are given
here as: Pratijñābhīma (Act I), Lhānumati (Act II), Āsvathāṁśa (Act.III),
Sundara (Act.IV), Dhṛtarāṣṭra (Act.V) and Samhāra (Act.VI).

30. NLRK. 11.254-256. nāyaka-devi-parijana-purohitāmātya-sārthavāhānāṁ
naika-rasāntara-vihitaścarita-sambhoga 'pyāṅkaḥ sa veditavyah/ This is almost
the same as NS. GOS. XVIII.18. The first half of the Āryā ends with 'sārtha-
vaḥānāṁ' and the portion 'arita-sambhoga' from the second half is to be de-
leted. Sdt. (Bhā. pra. p.235 ll.7-8) also quotes this verse with a minor di-
ference in reading in the second half. Ag. (NS. GOS. Vol.II. p.418) takes
'sārthavāha' of the verse to mean both commander and merchant.
II

What is and what is not permissible
to be visibly represented in an Act.

Sgn. quotes the NŚ. to show what is permissible to be visibly represented in an Act and what is not, but to be referred to or to be summarily treated in Pravesāka etc. The NŚ. enjoins:

(1) Krodha-prasāda-sokāḥ sāpotsarga’thā (NLRK, Ādi) vidravodvāha //
adbhuta-sambhava (NLRK. sampśraya) darśanām ānke pratyakṣajāni syuh. //

(2) Yuddhāṃ rājyabhramo maranām nagaroparodhānām caiva //
Pratyakṣāni tu ānke Pravesākaiḥ sa vidheyāni // The NLRK.

reads the third foot as : na Pratyakṣāni santi.

According to Ag., Lhoja and Sgn. the first verse enumerates some items which are allowed to be visibly represented in an Act. They, however, differ regarding the meaning of 'sāpotsarga'. Sgn. takes it to mean pronouncing of a curse, while Ag. interprets the word as the end of the mishap brought about by the influence of a curse. Thus Ag. is not in favour of permitting the utterance of a curse to be visibly represented in an Act, while Sgn. has no objection to it. Both, however, are in favour of the visible representation of feats of anger, favour, grief, a state of confusion, marriage and spectacles of miraculous

31. NLRK. 11. 279-280, 285-286; NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 20, 38. one ms. (Pa) reads the first verse as : soka-prasāda-vidravaśaипotsarga-prasādbhana-krodhāḥ/utsāho'

32. NLRK. 1. 282. sāpotsargaḥ sūpapradānam /

33. NŚ. GOS. Vol. II 419. sāpotsargaḥ sāpakṛtsanyānarthasya nāsaḥ / It may be noted here that Durvāsas in the Abhi-s'aku does not enter the stage but pronounces his curse from behind the screen and that also happens in a Viśkambhaka. The NŚ. (P.31) also follows abhi-bhā.
events as enumerated in the above verse, Ag. seems to maintain that these are specially attractive items that can be visibly represented on the stage and as such, they have been enumerated in the NS. separately. The ND. does not enumerate the above items but seems to follow the line of Abhi. when it says:

"संप्रवासिना-विवृत्तिवादयो' पि राणजकत्वः साक्षत-कौयः". Sgn. is of opinion that the show of incidents like battle, the loss of kingdom, death and the seize of a town, has been totally prohibited on the stage in the second verse as quoted above; these are only to be reported (and not shown) in a Pravesaka, or the like.

This list of forbidden items seems to be drawn up from a practical viewpoint. Excepting death, a full scale stage-representation, as demanded in an Anka of Indian theorists, of above incidents is a very difficult affair even on a modern stage.

Dr. M.M. Ghosh maintains that both the above verses of the NS. enumerate items which are not permissible to be visibly represented on the stage. He

34. NS. Gos. Vol. II. pp. 418-419. na kevalam caritasumbhogaideva Pratyaksam kintvanyadapi yatra raṇjanātīgyo' stīti darsāyaannāha krodhaprasāda-śoka iti /

35. ND. p. 31.

36. NLRK. 1. 287. yuddhādikām mānke pratyakṣaṁ kartavyam / Pravesakaireva vaktavyam / After this Sgn. (NLRK. 11. 288-290) refers to the Kumūhānka where fighting with the seize of a town, Pravṛddānka where death, and a hitherto unknown play Nalavijaya where the loss of kingdom, have been reported in Pravesakas. Kumūhānka is the Act V of the Udāttarāgāva (cf. notes of Dr. Raghavan. NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 61). The SD. refers to this Act once below VI. 200 which occurs in the NLRK. (1. 1807) in the same context as an illustration of Udāyana, a Nāṭyaūlāṅkāra. There are two more citations from the Pravṛddānka in the NLRK. (11. 3046-3052).

The play Nalavijaya has been referred to only in the NLRK. once.

accepts the reading, "अंका प्रत्याक्षाजानी" (अंके अप्रत्याक्षाजानी) instead of "अंके प्रत्याक्षा"... in the verse "क्रोधाप्रसादा" etc. This is the reading of the KSS. 38 edition of the NS. Dr. M. M. Ghosh, the KSS and KU. editions of the NS read the verse, "युद्धाम रूज्या" etc., immediately after the verse "क्रोधाप्रसादा" etc. But Sgn., Bhoja and Ag. do not support this reading and interpretation. They maintain that the NS permits the visible representation of feats of anger, favour, grief etc., in an अंका. This view seems to be practical. Apparently, from common sense it may be said, there is no difficulty in representing feats of anger etc., on the stage without hampering the development of Rasa. It may be added here that in practice also, Indian dramatists do not hesitate to depict 'क्रोधा' etc., in अंकास. In the V. sam. the feats of anger may be said to be a regular feature in almost all the Acts. 'प्रसाद' and 'सोका' are not rare in our dramas. शापोत्सार्ग, in the sense in which it is taken by Ag., is present in the Abhi. शाकु. Vidrava is itself a सांध्यांग and a scene of marriage is there in the विद्धशालाबहुंजिका of हाज़ेष्करारा. Marriage is also the theme of the पुर्वतपरिणया.

The introduction of death scenes in Sanskrit drama is a much discussed problem. Scholars both foreign and Indian mostly are of opinion that ancient Indian dramatic convention did not permit the introduction of death scenes on the---------------------------------~-------------------------------------------------
38. NS. KSS, XX, 20, cf. also NS. GOS. Vol. II. p.419. ms. reading 5 (bhā.).
39. NS. KS. XX, 20,21; KU. XVIII 20,21. Rucipati (anरा. p.53) also supports this reading and interpretation.
40. Vidrava is an 'अंगा' of the Garbhasandhi. Cf. the definition of the Vidrava in the NLRK. II. 283, 766. Ag. (NS. GOS. Vol. III. p.52) gives the same definition of Vidrava and illustrates it.
stage. In the light of this opinion the much debated Lhūsa problem has also been judged. Lhūsa in depicting death scenes freely in the Anūkas has either been alleged of breaking the rules of the NŚ., or has been placed before Bhārata. So, the matter deserves special attention.

Regarding the prohibition of the visible representation of death on the stage, later theorists are of one mind. They do not permit death scenes on the stage. Death is simply to be reported or described in a summary way in the Pravēṣaka or the like. Death of the main hero or heroine, however, should not even be so described and if described or visibly represented for the sake of the plot he (or she) should be restored to life, as is the case in the Nāţūnanda and the Mṛcchakaṭīka. Jīmūtauḥana and Vasantasena are both visibly restored to life on the stage.

Regarding the main hero the NŚ. also enjoins that in an Anūka or Pravēṣaka of a Nāṭaka or Prakaraṇa there should be no death of the Īyaka; his flight, treaty or capture may, however, be depicted. This is quite in consonance with the happy ending of Sanskrit drama. Sanskrit drama, as a rule, ends with the achievement of the desired object by the main hero. NŚ. also asserts that the death of the main hero should neither be represented visibly in an Anūka nor even be reported.


41a. The deaths of Daśaratha (Pratīmā), Vālin (Abhīṣeka), Arīṣṭa, Cānura, Mūṣṭika and Kamsa (Bālacarita) are all depicted in Acts for visible representation.

42. DR. III. 34, 36; Avaloka p. 71; Bhāṣa pra. pp. 236. 11.7-13, 217. 11.10-11; ND. pp. 33, 131; SD. VI. 16, 63.

43. NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 39-40.
ted in Pravesaka etc. Ag. informs us that according to some even the Patākānāyaka etc., also are to enjoy this privilege; and some others prohibits the visible representation of even the striking of the main hero by some one. Sgn. too maintains that in an Aṅka, as a rule, neither the actual death of the main hero who is to prosper at the end nor even that of the villain should be depicted but their flight, peace or capture only may be shown. This injunction, adds Sgn., is not absolute as the hero's enemies like Kāraṇa, Duryodhana and Kaṃsa etc., in Nāṭakas are to be killed eventually. But that killing should not be visibly represented i.e., if necessary, may be reported in a Pravesaka or the like. In a Prakarana, however, the poet is free in the matter of the plot and there the hero may be represented as making peace with the enemy, if the occasion so deserves; as for example Ārudatta establishes peace with Śakāra in the Mṛcchakatikā. Thus Sgn. is not in favour of presenting death scenes on the stage, where the death is unavoidable for the proper delineation of the plot, it should be reported in an Arthopokṣepaka, but should never be visibly represented.

44. NS. Gos. Vol. II. p. 427.
45. NS. Gos. Vol. II. p. 427. anye tu khyātam nāyakaṁ patākānāyakādiṁ icchānti / .... yastu nāyakastasya khyātasya na ghātanādi pradarśanīyam /
46. ALRK. 11.290-291. This is based on the NS. Gos. XVIII 39-40.
47. ALRK. 11. 291. etatto nāṭake nātyantikam/yato rūvaṇa-duryodhana-kāmāśadīnāṁ vadha eva sa tu na sākṣātkartavya ityarthāḥ/ Prakāraṇe punah kuveḥ śātantryāḥ sandhyāṅciḥ sakhīdviṣayaḥ/yathā ārudatta (...dattasya) rāṣṭriyena saha sandhīreva darsīṭaḥ /

The NS' (Gos. XVIII.82) while describing the Iḥāmya also says:
yatra tu vadheṣitaṁ vadha hyudagro bhaveddhī puruṣāṁ∥ kiṁcit vyājaṁ kṛtvā
tesāṁ yuddham śūnayitavyam //
Ag. himself forbids death scenes on the stage, but he refers to and criticises views which permit such scenes. One such view draws a distinction between two types of deaths, one caused by others' activity, as the chopping up of the head of the demon with the disc (by Narâyana evidently); another happening independent of any such activity by diseases and hurts. The view advocates that the second may be shown on the stage while the first one is prohibited.

The reason seems to be the practical difficulty of representation and the intention of avoiding gruesome scenes. Ag. finds no reason behind the distinction drawn between deaths. Moreover, from a practical standpoint, as he seems to argue, death scenes cannot be allowed on the stage, because the dead character neither can exit from nor can remain on the stage and thus creates many difficulties to the presentation itself and obstructs the development of kâsa. Ag. further adds that the 'anubhava maraṇa' may be represented in cases where the dead revives, as the case of Jîmûtavâhana. Thus, according to Ag. visible representation of any sort of death without revival is totally forbidden on the stage. This is the opinion of all the later theorists, as shown before, but at the conclusion of the topic Ag. refers to another view that permits the visible representation of death on the stage in cases where death is due to the disease or hurts and where there is no necessity of revival or exit. This view, in the face of Ag.'s argu-

48. NS. Gos. Vol. II. p. 426, iha kecidahu maranam dvividham, kiṅcidanyasaṃbandhinyā kriyāa sampādyaṃ yathā ca krenā daityaśya śiraschedam, kiṃcidanyasaṃbandhikriyā-nairapekṣyaṇaiva vyūdhāḥ highātūdi-prabham, tatṛādyasyāiva niśedhaḥ kriyate/

49. NS. Gos. Vol. II. p. 426, idām maranam prayojyam idamprayojyam iti na tāvadatra vīṣaya-vibhāge nidānām utpāsyarāh/matasya katham niṣkrīmam katham vīvasthānam, tato nātyopayogi....prakriyāviloṣaḥ śanājikānām virasatā-pratipāttiriti tu sarvatra maraṇam samānām tathaḥ range maraṇam aprayojyam eta/...p. 427, kiṃca yatra pratyrpaṭtiśiṇyāṃ maraṇām tat prakriyāviloṣakaṭvānā prarjyam/yutto kvacit pratyrpaṭtiphiḥ yathā jīmūtavāhanasya tadeva,...maranānubhavā-manṣa-tukṣa-karanaṣya viṣayaḥ/....anye uṣūh-yaudhijan akhītājan ca maraṇām range prarjyam, apunarjani-niṣkṛanti-rahitapra-krītir vidheyeti/
ments, seems to suggest that death can be represented visibly either at the close of a play or an Act where there is a scope of covering the deads with the curtain. It may be noted here that this principle appears to be generally followed in the plays ascribed to Bhāsa. The deaths of Daśaratha (Pratimā, Act.II), Vālin (Abhiṣeka, Act.II) and Ariṣṭa (Bālācarita, Act.III) are depicted almost at the close of the Acts concerned, while that of Duryodhana (Urbhaṅga) is shown at the close of the play itself, as we have it. Deaths of Cāṇūra, Muṣṭika and Kaṃsa (Bālācarita) are depicted in the last Act and after that the play itself continues for a short while. It thus becomes certain that there were theorists and dramatists alike in ancient India who allowed death scenes on the stage.

The NS., as has already been shown, totally prohibits the death of the main hero and general death scenes in an Aṅka. About death scenes it says: 50 "pratyakṣāṇi tu nānke praveśakaiḥ samvidheyaṇī". From this Dr. M.K. Ghosh seems to conclude that the NS. allows visible representation of death in an Arthopakṣepaka, like the Praveśaka etc. Accepting this view it may be said that the NS. prohibits a detailed representation of death scenes, as an Aṅka demands, but not their representation in a summary way in the Praveśaka or Viṣkambhaka. The standpoint of the NS. requires further elucidation. It draws up different lists of items prohibited on the stage. While describing various activities of women of superior and middling types it says :-

50. NS. GOS. XVIII. 38, Sgn. (NLRK, 1.287) takes 'samvidheyaṇī' to mean 'to be reported' (vaktavyam) but the word may also be taken to mean 'to be performed'.

Again in the same chapter the NS. gives another list:

na kāryaṁ sāyanaṁ range nātyadharmaṁ viṣṭātā /

................................................

yadva śayitārthaśaśād ekākī sahito 'pi vā /
cumbanālīnganāṁ caiva tathā guhyam ca yad bhavet //
danta-chchedyam nakha-chchedyam nīvī-bhrājanām eva ca /
stanāntara-vimardāṁ ca raṅga-madhye na kārayet //
bhojanam salila-krīḍā tathā lajjā-karam ca yat /
evaṁ vidhāṁ thaved yad yat tat tat range na kārayet //
pitā-putra-snuṣā-śvaśṛu-dṛṣṭyam yasmēt tu nātakam /
tasmād etāṁ sarvāṇi varjanīyāṁ yatnataḥ //

A perusal of the above lists shows the high moral standard of the age and a keen practical sense of the sage. Through these injunctions it transpires that there was an idealistic atmosphere in ancient Indian stage; decency and decorum were highly valued. Anything shameful or indecent was not allowed on the stage. Presentation of grim realism was also not the aim of Sanskrit drama. In fact grim realism has not been favoured in any form of ancient Indian art or li-

52. NS. Gos. XXII. 240-241. The KSs. (XXIV. 232) and the KM. (XII. 232) editions read the first foot of the first verse as: "nasvara-grahaṁ range" and this may be taken to mean the prohibition of croaking or indistinct voice. The Gos. reading, however, gives a better sense.

53. NS. Gos. XXII. 295-299.
terature. The above list is certainly not comprehensive. So, it is said in this connection that anything like these (evam vīdhāṁ bhaved yad yat) and which are considered to be shameful (lajjākaram ca yat) should be avoided on the stage. The taste of the people has been honoured as the best judge; the playwright and the Nāṭyācārya are to consider this fact in writing and producing a play. This seems to be the implication of the above injunctions. The NS, also puts before us a very practical reason behind these injunctions in "pitāputra-snuśā" etc., (quoted above) and no better one can be conceived of even in modern age. A dramatic performance should avoid such representations as cannot be witnessed by a son with his father, mother and wife without any sense of shame due to some immodest acts on the stage. In practice also we can point out that Bhavabhūti in the Act I of his Uttara-rāmacarita represents Sītā as sleeping and Rāma as supporting and affectionately caressing her. But none can allege that here the limit of modesty has been transgressed. The wife of Cārāyaṇa in the Viddhasālhabhaṅjikā sleeps on the stage, of course, alone.

The first list of injunctions in the chapter XIII (GCS), as quoted above, concerns with the acts of women of superior and mediocre types. Some activities by these types of women are not to be represented on the stage so that their grace and dignity may be fully maintained; and this is the implication of this list. It may be mentioned here that Kālidāsa allows Śakuntalā to be dressed and toileted at the eve of her journey to Hastināpurā, by her friends in a serene and religious atmosphere prevailing on the stage. There is an important dramatic utility of this dressing and toileting of Śakuntalā which are to be witnessed by the audience for a proper comprehension of the repudiation

54. The same criterion seems to be taken up in describing the Āśilatvadoṣa by rhetoricians also. Cf. SD. p. 472. āśilatvam vṛdajucusmaṇahlavayāṅjakatvāt trividham.
scene in the next Act. Kālidāsa takes all possible cares to veil the beauty and identity of the heroine as known to the hero and to save the latter from censure for which the curse of Durvāsas also has been introduced. Some may take objection to the wearing of the 'kṣaumayugala' by Śakuntalā on the stage. But there are several means to obstruct the sight of the spectators on the stage. Moreover she can easily be dressed up with the silk-cloths on the stages over her original bark-garment. In any case, it is the business of the director (Sūtradhāra) who is expected to be fully conversant with the taste and feeling of the audience, to look after how far and what is to be represented on the stage.

From what little has been said above, it is clear that the above two lists of prohibitions in the chapter लाल (GOS) of the NS, are purported to avoid in any type of 'rūpaka' the visible representation of such acts which may wound the feeling of the audience and may cause any obstruction to the intended atmosphere on the stage as well as the development of proper hāsa. Such injunctions in the field of art depend upon socio-cultural inhibitions and none can give a comprehensive list of such inhibitions, as the taste and culture of the people differ from age to age even in the same country. The NS, also gives no comprehensive list. Here it's injunctions appear to be words of caution addressed to the Sūtradhāra and the playwright concerning all types of plays (rūpaka-kus).

In the light of the above, the prohibitive verse in the chapter लाल (quoted before) seems to refer only such acts, a full-scale visible representation of which is forbidden in the ānka of a full-fledged drama, as the context shows. Regarding the visible representation of fighting, it may be pointed out, that the NS, gives directions as to how the fighting is to be acted
on the stage. Similarly the NS. elaborately discusses how death should be visibly represented on the stage and describes various symptoms to be imitated by characters representing deaths due to different causes like disease, hurt by weapons, snake-bites etc. Ag. also refers to a school of thought that supports the visible representation of death on the stage, as shown before. Thus neither the imitation of fighting nor that of death on the stage can be said to be totally forbidden in the NS. The Anka is to represent scenes vividly and elaborately. The NS seems to prohibit an elaborate and vivid representations of scenes depicting fighting, death, loss of kingdom and seize of a city. The context also shows that visible representations of such incidents as death etc., is forbidden mainly in Pūrna-sandhi-rūpakas wherein also the Pravēsākas may visibly represent

55. NS. GOS. X. 86-88.
56. NS. GOS. VII. 86-88 and prose portions (pp. 372-373); IV. V. 100-110.
The concluding line says: evam hi nātyadharme marānāni tudhaiḥ prayojyāni /
57. NS. GOS. XVIII. 38 (quoted before). Sgn. while illustrating Vidrava due to 'puroparodha' says: "myochakatiṣṭikāyām āryakānusaraṇe puroparodhah" (NLRK. 11. 2015-2016). This may refer to the commotion indicated from 'nepathya' in the Act IV when Sarvilaka is leaving the house of Vasantasena with Madanika, or more suitably the situation depicted in the Act VI beginning from the entrance of Āryaka. But even the second one cannot be taken as a visible representation of actual 'nagaroparodha'. The whole effect of a serious commotion, of course very successfully, has been produced by mainly two characters (Viraka and Candanaka) on the stage with other two (Vardhamānaka and Āryaka), playing here minor roles and others remaining behind the screen.
fighting etc., in a summary way, but Sgn. is of opinion that such representation is totally forbidden, only the incidents are to be reported in the Praveśakas, as has been stated before. Regarding death scenes it may be pointed out here that excepting the works of Lhāsa, as noted before, not a single Sanskrit drama is known to us as depicting such a scene. In the act II of the U.śa., Rāma enters with his sword drawn and actually imitates striking Sambuka who is not on the stage, as the direction shows. But immediately Sambuka appears as a 'diṣṭya-puruṣa'. Here even the visible representation of a fatal blow on the victim has been avoided. In practice, then, visible representation of death scenes may be said to be avoided by Sanskrit dramatists.

Later theorists mostly, seem to have confused these different lists of injunctions and in their works we get a single list. In Aṅkas and Arthopakṣepakas alike, they totally prohibit the visible representation of all the scenes coming under the above injunctions of the Nāṇḍarghaṇidaṇī, given in different chapters and in different contexts. The SD. include even 'vivāha' and 'ṣāpotsarga', in this list of prohibited items. All these according to them are to be reported, if required, in an Arthopakṣepaka. The narrow outlook of the later works when compared with the Nāṇḍarghaṇidaṇī becomes evident. The variety of acts and incidents to be visibly represented on the stage came to be curtailed more and more.

58. DR. III. 34-35. dūrāchvānāṁ vadhām yuddham rājya-deśādibiplavam// samrodham bhojanam snānam suratam cānulepanam / aṃtara-grahaṇādīni pratyak-ṣāṇī na nirdiśet // The Avoloka here says: Praveśaṅkādiḥireva sūcayet / bhā. pra. p. 236. 11.7-9 quotes the DR verbatim.

59. SD. VI. 36-38.
III

Duration of time covered by an Āṅka.

Regarding the duration of time that can be represented in an Act, the NLRK gives as many as three views; the first one is taken from the न्यायसंहिता. It says:

"eka-divasa-pravṛttah kāryo 'āṅkaḥ sa prayogam adhikṛtya." Sgn.'s gloss on it means to say that the entire plot should be so treated that an Āṅka can represent the matter of one day. Ag. also maintains that an Āṅka is to depict incidents that can take place in course of one day. This is the generally accepted view regarding the maximum duration of time that can be represented in an Āṅka. But the incidents are to be so arranged that they may not create any hindrance to the routine duties like 'sandhyā-vandana'. This is mainly to serve the didactic purpose of dramatic performances. The suitable time is indicated through picturesque description of the morning, the noon and the evening and in every Sanskrit drama we come across one or more of such descriptions.

Sgn. refers to two other views. Some opine that incidents covering half of a day can be represented in an Āṅka, others maintain that an Āṅka can treat what may occur in a day and a night. The Bhāṣā. pra. also refers to the first of

60. NLRK. 1. 296. The text reads: .."āṅke samprayo....". Dr. Raghavan's emendation (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 72) is accepted above. न्यायसंहिता (GOS. XVIII. 21) reads ekadivasa-pravṛttam kāryastvaṁko 'ṛtha-bījam adhikṛtya.

61. NLRK. 1. 297.

62. न्यायसंहिता (GOS. Vol. II. p. 420) ekadivasa-saṁpāditamupayogi ceśṭitaṁmaṅke badhniyāt/


64. न्यायसंहिता (GOS. XVIII. 21-22; SD. VI. 14; Bhāṣā. pra. p. 233. 1.11.

65. NLRK. 11. 298-299.
these two views. Śiṅgabhūpāla maintains that the duration of the entire day or its half is to be represented in an Anka. The ND. offers a maximum and a minimum limit of the duration of time suitable to be represented in an Anka, as four Yāmas and one Uuhūrta respectively.

The problem, as to how the passing of a long time in plays, generally based on the stories of the RāmaṆya and the Mahābhārata is to be distributed in Acts, has not been elaborately treated in the NLRK. Sgn. simply says that if the nature of the action involves a long passage of time in an Act, it should be reported in a Praveśaka following that Act. But in this way the maximum period of a year should be treated and not more. Here Sgn. quotes in his support from the NS. "varṣād ūrdham na kadācit." In conclusion he says that this simply, implies that events stretching over a very long period should not be represented in an Act. It appears that Sgn. does not give much stress on the maximum period of a year. His opinion is simply that a long passage of time should not be represented in an Act.

66. Bhā, pra. p.237. 1.16. anka syad vāsārādhenā......
67. RS. III. 205, p.234. dinārdha-dinayor yogyam anke vastu pravartayet /
68. ND. p.31. mūhūrtād ārabhyā yāma-catuṣṭayaṃ yāvat / yāma or Praharā is one-eighth part of a day i.e., a period of three hours. Uuhūrta corresponds to a period of about 45 minutes. This view of the ND. is also found in the NS. (GOS. XIII.25) kṣaṇo mūhūrtō yāmo vū divasō vāpi nātāke / ekānke samvīdūt-avyo Lījasyāṛtha-vaśūnuyad // This verse, however, has not been taken into account by Ag.
70. Cf. SD. VI. 15. nāneka-dina-nivarta-kathaya saŋgrayojitah/
The above problem has been elaborately discussed by Ag. According to Ag., from the long life of an epic hero a few years are to be selected for representation in a drama. Rāma though passed fourteen years in exile yet there were only three or four such years as full of incidents. Now the NS. enjoins that in an Ānka incidents occurring in a single day can be represented and if these incidents are such as cannot be accommodated in the Ānke then the less important ones are to be summarily treated in a Praveśaka following that Ānka. In the same way incidents occurring in course of a month or year can be represented in an Ānka, followed by a Praveśaka or the like, but more than a year should not be treated in this way in a single Ānka. An Ānka then, in such cases, is to represent the most prominent incidents of the year as occurring in a single day of that year and the rest is to be dealt with in a short compass by the help of an Arthopakṣepaka. Thus the incidents of fourteen years of Rāma's exile or the like, should be so selected as to occur in, say three or four years and can easily be represented in three or four Ānkas in the above method. So, in a drama consisting of five Ānkas, there should be represented only five days having incidents (kāryadināni).

Similarly in a drama of ten Ānkas, ten such days can be represented. Thus theore-

---

72. NS. GOS. XVIII. 21, 26. Ag. (NS. GOS. Vol. II pp. 421, 422) points out rightly, that here Praveśaka means any one of the five Arthopakṣepakas. Cf. SD. VI. 53.
73. NS. GOS. XVIII. 31. ankacchedam kṛtvā māsa-kṛtam varṣasamcitam vāpi/tat sarvān kartavyam varṣād ūrdham na tu kadācit // The SD. (VI. 51-52) quotes this verse below VI. 52, but reads: "ankacchede kāryam" as the first foot.
74. Abhi. bhā. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 423, tena pañcāṅke nāṭake pañca kārya- dinānīti sankṣepaḥ dasāṅke tu daśeti vistaraḥ /
tically an Anka in a Sanskrit drama consists of a day's incidents which are required and at the same time permissible to be visually represented. This principle has also been followed by the dramatists of ancient India. An act in a Sanskrit play never covers a duration of time exceeding a day. But it should be noted that there is no injunction against the representation of events of one day in more than an act.

IV
Other regulations.

Sgn. concludes the topic with the remark that neither one should enter in nor exit from the stage during the Anka without any purpose. This may be taken to be a general principle for any play of any age. The entrance and exit of characters in either Anka or Pravesāka etc. should always be in connection with something relevant. Sgn. as has been shown, prohibits also the introduction of characters on the stage with an insignificant part to play which purpose may very well be served by such devices as aerial voice, voice from behind the screen and 'lekha'.

75. Bhavabhūti in his U. ca. depicts the incidents of a single day in the Acts II and III; each Act having a Viṣkambhaka prefixed to it.

76. NLRK. 11. 203-204. nāhetukāḥ praveśo 'ṇke kasyūpi jāyate tvapi/nīś-krāntirapi tataḥ syād vyālamvārttham prasaṃgām ca // 'The verse seems to be Sgn.' s own as there is no introductory expression like 'yaducyate' etc. before it.

77. NLRK. 11. 2279-2280.
While describing the Viṣkambhāka, Sgn. quotes from the NŚ:

na mahājana-parivāram kartavyam nāṭakam prakaranam vā/
ye tatra kārya-puṣṭaḥscatvārah pāṇca vā te syuh //

It appears that Sgn. takes this verse, as containing a general injunction applicable to Nāṭaka and Prakarana. The import of his gloss on the verse is that all the prominent associates of the hero and his enemy should not be presented on the stage with minor roles to play, only four or five from them should be made to involve directly in the main action and others are simply to be mentioned outside the main action. What exactly Sgn. here drives at is not clear. If he means to assert that only four or five amongst the associates of the hero or his enemy are to be presented on the stage then we can point out that in very few cases the principle has been followed. On the other hand, if it is meant that a small number of characters should be made to involve directly in the main action and others indirectly, then it should be pointed out that the expression "bahireva" etc., is not a happy one. Viṣvanātha, however, enjoins that there should be only four or five leading characters directly related to the action. According to Ag, the implication of the above verse of the NŚ, is that a crowd should not be allowed on the stage and undertakings...

78. NLRK. ll. 374-375; NŚ. Gos. lVIII. 41.

79. NLRK. ll. 376-379. nāyakasya tadvipakṣasya ca ye ye mahājanāh pradhanabhitah/nate sarve nāṭaka-prakaranayoḥ paricārakatvena vyāpāra-yitavyāḥ/teṣāṁ madhye kāryāvalambinaḥscatvārah pāṇca vā kartavyāḥ/ apare bahir eva kāryataḥ kīrtanīyāḥ/anke 'pyeka e[v nirvahayita etc.

80. Not to speak of works like the Mu. rā or the Erccha, even U.Ca. and Abhiśāku also present a greater number of characters on the stage.

81. SD. VI. 11.
which require many persons to be performed, should not be visibly represented. Ag. maintains that at best there can be eight to ten characters present on the stage at a time. If the number exceeds much, then the scene will be no better then a crowd assembled to witness the 'yātrā' of a deity and the four kinds of 'abhināya' will not be clearly perceptible. Thus, the verse according to Ag. refers to an Act and the above principle upheld by him has also found a general approval. Like the presence of many characters on the stage at a time the representation of many incidents in a single Act has been normally prohibited for fear of shadowing the main topic. If for the sake of the plot many events are to be represented in a single Act, they should be so treated as not to hamper the necessary routine duties.

In describing the characteristics of Anka,Syn. has missed a very important point which has been insisted upon by all other theorists of Indian dramatics and invariably followed by dramatists. As a rule, all characters should exit

82. NS. Gōs. Vol. II, p. 426, etad uktaṃ bhavati tahutara-puruṣāsādhyaṃ yat kimcit tadyatha samudre setubandhanam ityādi, tat sarvam pratyakṣena na pradaṛśaniyam /...yadi prakārṣastadā daśāṣṭau va raṅge praviṣṭā bhavanti/tato 'dhi-keṣu tvabhinayacatuṣṭayaṃ samyag avilāvaniyam syat delayātāra-paridṛṣṭyāmatāna-jana-samājavit/ Ag. by twisting the language of the verse also makes out another meaning that all the indecent activities and those offending the feeling of the audience are to be strictly avoided on the stage. But the NS. includes this injunction in other places, as has been shown.

83. DR. III. 37; Bhā. pra. p. 236. 1.16; NS. p. 32. The NS. undoubtedly clarifies the matter best, of course, following the Abhi. Bhā.

84. NS. Gōs. XVIII. 22, 24; DR. III. 36, Avaloka p. 71.
from the stage at the end of an Act. During the Act according to Indian convention, the stage should never be left vacant and the exit of all characters and a temporary vacancy thus created on the stage, should mark the close of an Act. Now, the problem is what was the device employed in ancient India to represent this exit of characters. Ag. says that at the close of an Act the exit of all characters is to be shown by covering them with the 'yavanikā' and the same is the opinion of Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra. The existence of a screen in ancient Indian theatre is an undeniable fact but opinions vary as to the position of its setting. If the front curtain is meant here in this connection, the exit through the 'yavanikā' means covering the stage with the front curtain. If on the other hand the back curtain is meant, then according to the above convention the actors and actresses at the end of an Act, are to walk away of the stage behind the back screen. In any case, a temporary vacancy on the stage created by the exit of all characters marks the close of an Act in a Sanskrit play. This convention is accepted both in theory and practice without any protest or violation.

IV.

Division of plays into several Acts is a very ancient practice in India as the evidences of the NS. and the plays of Asvaghoṣa, Bhaṣa, Śūdraka and Kālidāsa show. It may be surmised that this practice evolved in India before the

85. NS. GOS. XVIII. 23; DR. III. 37; ND. I. 20; Bhā. pra. p. 236. 1.17; SD. VI. 19.
86. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 420, tat parisamāptau yavanikayā tirodhānarūpāṁ niśkramanāṁ darsāniyam / ND. p. 30, niśkramo yavanikayā tirodhānam /
87. The NS. (GOS. V. 11-22) divides the features of the Pūrvarāṅga into two sets; one is to be done behind the screen and the other, - viṣṇuḥya vai yavanikāṁ nṛtta-pāṭhyā-kṛtāṁ tu/. This along with the above remarks of the Abhi. bhā. and the ND. go to prove the existence of the front screen in ancient Indian stage. Dr. C.B. Gupta (Ind. thea. chap. IV.A) strongly argues in favour of the front screen.
Europeans could divide their plays into Acts. Early Greek plays, we know, are not divided into Acts. But an Act in a Sanskrit drama is not further subdivided into scenes. It in itself though forms an unity, is not also a well marked scene in the modern sense of the term. On the other hand an Act in most of our renowned dramas consists of a number of scenes, loosely connected but cannot be separated from one another due to its peculiar technique of construction and representation. In the Act III of the Abhiśaku, the king enters and proceeds towards the bower on the bank of the Kālinī where he reaches after going a few steps only. Almost all the Acts of the Myṛchakāṭīka consist of a number of scenes. This salient feature of Sanskrit drama can be noticed by any casual reader. A peculiar technique of representation also evolved in India. The stage was taken to be divided into several kakṣyās and with the help of the proper arrangement of miniature models (pusta), illusion of adjoining spots could be created and the characters were made to move from one spot to another according to necessity during acting. Moreover, the peculiar construction of a Sanskrit drama, teeming with poetic descriptions of time and place and their reactions on the minds of characters together with the skilled performances of four types of 'abhinaya' also contributed very much in the creation of dramatic illusion. The passage of time and the shifting of scenes in an Act are simply described in Sanskrit plays.

Indian dramatic convention shows no trace of the three unities so strictly maintained in Greek plays. Sanskrit drama as a whole, maintains no unity of time, place or action, but adheres to uniformity. Even in an Act the

88. NS. GOS. XIII. The word is also spelt as 'Kakṣā'

89. NS. GOS. XXI.
unity of place is ignored in most cases, as has been stated above. But an Act being an unit in itself should maintain some sort of unity. It is also an accepted fact that individual Acts were also played and which could not have been possible had there been no unity in an Act. It has been shown before that the NS., as interpreted by Sgn. and Ag., enjoins that a particular incident requires to be fully delineated in an Act. This principle has been emphasised again in the NLRK., where Sgn. enjoins that in an Act, the behaviour of a particular leading character should be visibly represented. From this it appears that a sort of unity of action is prescribed to be maintained. Several views have been discussed regarding the duration of time to be represented in an Act and it has been shown that all the theorists are of opinion that a certain unit of time, generally a day, is to be covered by an Act. Generally speaking then, according to Indian theorists, an Act is to represent fully a particular incident forming an important part of the whole plot and occurring in a particular unit of time. There should not be any appreciable break within the Act, as the convention of the close of an Act through the exit of all characters shows. The DR. nicely puts this in a short compass, "ekāmacaritaikārtham".

90. See infra 'naming of an Āṅka.'
91. Cf. supra p. 315
92. NLRK. II. 379-382. āñeke 'apyeka eva nirvāhayitā kartavyah / tasyaikasya krodha-sokādayaḥ pratyakṣabhuvō darsāityavāḥ / For illustration Sgn. cites the Āśvathāmāṅka.
93. DR. III. 36. The RS also says the same (p. 284) in,"āṅkacchedaśca kartavyah kālāvasthānurodhataḥ"/
The untenability of the theory of the dependance of Acts on the Avastha-sandhi, as advocated by Ag. and others, has also been shown. It has been shown above that an Anka maintains an unity of time and action. But no such unity is essential in an Avastha. The first Avasthā of the Abhi-śaku, according to Lt., as shown before, represents incidents occurring in different days. No unity of action or time is traceable in the Acts IV, V, VI and part of VII of the Abhi-śaku, though they have been taken to be included in the Visārṣa Sandhi by Viśva-nātha. It is useless to multiply instances. It should be pointed out here that the plot of a full fledged drama can be analysed and divided for different purposes and from different standpoints but a simplification of which into a clear-cut mould is practically impossible. Acts and Avasthās serve quite different purposes and are determined according to different standpoints. The point has already been discussed. One may correspond to the other, but not necessarily. If Avasthās and Acts are so correlated, as taken by Ag., then it is difficult to find out the reason behind the two sets of terminology while the ancient theorists are famous for their love of brevity in expressions. It is interesting to note here that in Europe also there was a time when the principle of the five-fold 'natural divisions of a dramatic plot' based on the normal division of a Greek Tragedy, influenced playweights so much that they divided their plays into five Acts. But this wooden structure could not be maintained for a long time.

94. SD. below VI. 80, p. 358.

The purpose served by the Praveśaka in a Sanskrit drama has been indicated in our foregoing discussion on the Aṅka. Praveśaka is to epitomize the portions of the story which are not possible or permissible to be elaborately and visibly represented in an Act, but at the same time should be conveyed to the audience for proper comprehension of the action. Drama is always a representation of selections. The entire history of a hero covering a long time cannot be fully represented in a drama. An Act also, according to Indian convention can cover only a day, as shown before. So, the important and impressive events of a long period are so selected as occurring on some particular days, and are visibly represented in Acts. But to maintain the link of the whole story, the scattered portions, omitted in acts, are drawn together and briefly dealt with in the Praveśaka. This is the opinion of the NS., as understood by Sgn. and Ag. Later theorists also generally accept this view. But the above function of the Praveśaka is thought to be commonly shared by all the Arthopakṣepakas, specially by the Viṣkambha. Ag., therefore, takes the word Praveśaka of the NS. in the above context to stand for all the Arthopakṣepakas.

In the form of a popular etymology, Sgn. gives his opinion regarding the function of the Praveśaka. He says that the Pravesaka is so called because it introduces characters on the stage, "praveśayati pātrāni reṇgaṇi iti praveśa-

He further states that the entrance of the immediately following character should be mentioned in the Pravesāka and to justify this statement he quotes from an anonymous authority: "asūcitasya pātrasya pravesō naiva vidyate," i.e., no character should enter the stage without being indicated. The entire verse with slight difference in reading is found in the Saṅ. dā, in Raṅganātha's commentary on the Vik. u and also in the commentary on An. rā. by Rucipati who in two cases attributes the verse to Bharata and in another to the Saṅcitakalpataru. Raṅganātha ascribes the verse to the commentary on the Daśarūpaka by Devapūrī and says that the view is also sanctioned by the Sāhasāṅkīya-ṭīkā. The above half of the verse given by Sgn., is found in the commentary of Narahari on the Abhiṣāku and also in the Arthadyotanīka of MB, with a different reading and

3. NLRK. 1.307. Ag (NS. GOS. Vol. II. p.421) also says: "adṛṣṭam apyar-tham hṛdi praveṣayantīti praveṣakāḥ." Here the word 'Pravesāka' is used to denote all the Arthopakṣapakas. Cf. also ND (p.35): apratyakṣanarthṁ sāmījikahrdaye praveṣayatīti praveṣakāḥ /


5. Saṅ. dā. p.72. asūcitasya pātrasya praveṣō naiva drṣyate / atah Pra-dhīna-pātrīṇāṁ sūcakah syāt praveṣakah // Rucipati quotes (An. rā. pp 21, 106)" asūcitasya pātrasya praveṣō naiva yujyate" and attributes it to Bharata. The full verse is quoted in p.70; the second half is: "tato viṣkaṁbha-kṣeṣyasya sūcanāṁ recayed budah", here it is ascribed to the Saṅcitakalpataru.

6. Vik. u. with the com. of Raṅganātha, p.31. tathā ca devapūrīviviracita-dāsārūpaka-ṭīkāyāṁ sāhasāṅkīya-ṭīkā-sammatirapi, - nā sūcitasya pātrasya praveṣāḥ kvacid iṣyate/Praveṣam sūcayet tasmād amukhyānke praveṣakāṭ/ he know nothing about these two sources of Raṅganātha.
under different contexts.

Neither the NS. nor Ṇg. directly prohibits the entrance of a character without being indicated. Standard works like the DL., Ṭhā. prc., KŚ and SD. also do not refer to this view. But dramatists generally follow this principle and some renowned commentators and a late work like the Bāṇ. dā., as noted above, honour it. The NLRK., so far as the extant works are concerned, is the earliest one to refer to this view. Ṇg. seems to have taken the line from some ancient source, probably the work of Ṇg. whom he honours so much. RB. does not connect the view with the function of the Praveśāka, but haṅga- nātha, Rucipati, Narahari and Subhānkara refer to the view in connection with the Praveśāka or Viśkambhaka. They strongly assert that the main function of the Praveśāka (or Viśkambhaka) is to give prior indication to the entrance of a leading character. It thus appears that this principle got a wide recognition and among the theorists Ṇg. is first to cite it as an ancient view.

7. Abhi. sāku. with the com. of Narahari, p. 329; Abhi. sāku. with the com. of RB. pp. 123, 192. naśucitasya pātrasya praveśo niryaṅga 'pica. RB. cites the view to explain the 'apaṭṭikṣepeno Praveśa' of Anasuyā (Act. IV) and that of Kaṅcukin (Act. VI).

8. NLRK. l. 330. yadāha - asūcitasya etc.

9. Raṅganātha in Vik. U. Com. (P. 31) says: adhāmapātraṇa pāṭṛabhyaṁ vā prākṛta-bhāṣibhyāṁ sūcetyivṛttasūcanāṁ pravesakāḥ. View of Rucipati has been quoted in f.n. 5 supra.

10. Narahari in his com. on the Abhi. sāku (p. 318) says: aṅkoṣu pradānā-pātra-praveśaṁ sūcayannadhama-pātra-praveśaḥ praveśakah
To show other uses of the Pravesaka Sgn. quotes from the NS:

kālottthāna-gati-rasa-vyudāsārambha-kārya-viṣayāṇāṃ /
arthābhidhānabhūtah pravesakah syād anēkārthāh //

According to the gloss of Sgn., this verse means that the Pravesaka serves many purposes; it communicates the reckoning of time of a distant journey and causes the change of Rasa and thus provides variety in the performance. ng. maintains that the above verse mentions five uses of the Pravesaka of which he gives examples and adds that there are other uses also.

11. NS. II. 336-337. We find no reason to amend the reading 'Vyudāsa' into 'Vyatyāsa', as done by Dillon. Sgn's. gloss on 'rasa-vyudāsārambha' (1.341) is quite clear. The expression means the cessation, end (vyu­dāsa) of one Rasa and the beginning (ārambha) of the other i.e., a change of Rasa (rasānām anyathākaraṇa), the NS. (GC. VIII.35) reads the verse:- kālottthāna-gati-rasa-vyākhya-saṃrāmbha-kārya-viṣayāṇāṃ/
arthābhidhānayuktah etc. // Some mss. however read 'vyatyāsa'. Cf. ms. readings 6 (bha) and 7 (na). The Bhū. pra. (P. 216. 1.11) reads the first half of the verse as: kālottthāna-nagara-vyatyāsārambha-
kāma-viṣayāṇāṃ/ Sr. pra. (vol. II. p. 462) reads:......rama-vatyāsāram-
bhakāma-viṣayāṇāṃ/

12. NLRK. II. 340-342.

13. NS. GGS. Vol. II. pp. 424-425. Five uses are:- (1) Kālodhayasūcana, (2) Vyākhyārthābhidhāna, (3) saṃrāmbhārthābhidhāna, (4) kāryārthā-
bhidhāna (5) and Viṣayārthābhidhāna. ng. concludes with the comment: "anyānyapi pravesākasya prayojanāni santi".
Regarding the characters to take part in a Pravesaka and the language to be used by them, Sgn. quotes from the NS:

nottama-madhyama-puruṣaśācarīto nāpyudātta-vacana-kṛtyah

prakṛta-bhūṣācāraḥ prayogam āśādyā kartavyah

Thus in a Pravesaka (a) no superior or middling character but only low ones are to take part, (b) there should be no 'udāttavacana', and (c) only Prakṛta is to be used. Sgn. gives no meaning of the word 'udāttavacana' but for illustration refers to the Saktyaṅka where two monkeys take part in a Pravesaka, and then remarks: "tadeva nodattava-canaṁ tadeva prakṛta-bhūṣācāram". It is evident that 'udāttavacana' has not been taken by Sgn. to mean Sanskrit language. But Ag. distinctly says: "udāttam sanskrta-vacanaṁ tasya niṣedhāḥ". So, according to Ag. only 'nīca-pātras' should take part in a Pravesaka and not Sanskrit but only Prakṛta should be their language. Dhamanţiya also seems to prohibit the use of Sanskrit in the Pravesaka when he uses 'anudattakṛtya' in its definition which has simply been copied by Viśvanātha. The ND. and NS. also allow only 'nīca-pātra' in a Pravesaka and as such, Sanskrit becomes prohibited. Bhoja also main-

14. NLRK, 11. 334-335; NS. GCS. XVIII. 34; Bhā. pra. p.216. 11.3-6; Śr. pra (Vol.II) p.462.
15. NLRK. 11.330-339. Saktyaṅka is an "Act of a Rāma play which may be Kṛtyā-rāvana", so suggests Dr. Laghavan (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p.62) Sgn. refers to this Act in three other places, 11.338, 967, 1749. Dr. Raghavan (SOLK p.101) notes "A fuller citation comprising two verses of Rāma's lament in this situation is given by Allarāja in his Rasaratnapradīpikā (p.32)", and also quotes these two verses. The Act, as its name suggests, is related to the battle of Lanka, in which Lāṅkaṇa is hit down by Rāvana's Saktī weapon.
17. DR. I. 60; SD. VI. 57.
18. ND. I. 25; RS. III. 194.
tains that Saurascni etc., should be the language in a Pravesāka.

Sgn. maintains quite a different view. From the NS. he quotes:

"parijanakathānubaddhā praveśako nāma vijñeyaḥ," i.e., a Pravesāka consists of dialogues of servants or retinue. In his gloss Sgn. includes in the term 'parijana' such lower and middling characters as male and female slaves, chamberlains and the like. Thus the Kaṇcukin (chamberlain), a Sanskrit-speaking "madhyama-pātra," has been included among the characters to take part in a Pravesāka. Ag., however, interprets the above hemistich of the NS. to refer all the Arthopakṣeṇakas and maintains that the Kaṇcukin may appear in a Viṣ-kambhaka; i.e., the Kaṇcukin or any 'madhyama-pātra' has been excluded from the Pravesāka.

In support of his above theory Sgn. quotes the view of Ag. that permits parasites, (Vitas) ascetics, Brahmins, sages and chamberlains etc., to take part in a Pravesāka. These are all Sanskrit-speaking characters. Again at the conclusion of his gloss on the verse "kālotthānaguti" etc., of the NS. (quoted before), Sgn. means to state that the only additional characteristic is to be added to the view of the NS. is the use of Sanskrit when ascetics etc., take

19. Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 477, praveśakassa vijñeyaḥ sāurasenādīnaḥsaṣayā //
20. NLRK. 1. 310; NS. GOS. XVIII. 20, reads 'Kathānubandhaḥ'.
21. NLRK. 1. 311-313. parijanaḥ dāsī-dāsa-kaṇcuki-prabhṛtayāḥ.........//
      ......ye nīca-madhyamāste praveśakāḥ kartāyāḥ //
22. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 421.
23. NLRK. 1. 314-316. māṭṛguptaḥ - viṭa-tāpasa-viprādyair-munikaṇcukibhiḥ/iti praveśakaṁ varṇayati /
part in a Praveśaka. Illustrations of Praveśakas with Sanskrit-speaking characters have been cited from third Acts of the Raivatīparināya, Saśikāmadattī and the Abhi-śāku. But the interlude at the beginning of the Act III of the Abhi-śāku, is noted as a Viśkambhaka and not Praveśaka in printed texts and that is also the opinion of RL. It is a Viśkambhaka in the opinion of all the theorists who do not follow the above principle of U.ś., as here the disciple of the sage Kaṇva performs the interlude in Sanskrit language. The encyclopaedic bhā. pra. records the above view of U.ś., though his name has not been mentioned; and here we get the full verse, half of which is found in the NLRK. Among the commentators, two from Mithila, Śaṅkara and Narahari note the entire verse in their commentaries on the Abhi-śāku and the readings there correspond exactly with that adopted by Sgn. It is all the more interesting to note here that Śaṅkara attributes the verse to one 'mahārāja'. Śaṅkara, perhaps we-

24. NLRK. 11.342-343. yādā ca tāpāśādayah praveśakāh santi tatra samśkrita- 
pāṭha eva viśeśaḥ / 
25. NLRK. 11. 318-319. raivatīparināye tṛṭīye 'nke tāpasaḥ / abhijāne 
tṛṭīye virahā/ saśikāmadatte tṛṭīye viṭāḥ/ of the first and the third dramas we 
known nothing and in the NLRK. also they are referred to only here in this con- 
text. 
when he designates this scene as a Praveśaka (Abhi. śāku, p. 318). 
27. Bhā. pra. p.216. 11. 9-10. viṭā-tāpasa-vṛddhādyair-muni-Kaṃcuki- 
bhistathā/praveśakam acīchanti santaḥ samškritabhūṣilhīh/. Cf. also 11.7-8, 
containing the same idea. Šdt. reads 'vṛddha' in place of NLRK's 'vipra'. 
lieved that Nāṭṛgupta of Kalhana's Rājataraṅgini, who was a king and poet, was also the author of a treatise on dramaturgy. After all, it is evident that there was a theory according to which middling characters like parasites, ascetics, chamberlains etc., all speaking Sanskrit, could take part in the Pravesāka. Perhaps Nāg. was the propounder of this theory, at least his name as the earliest supporter of the theory is recorded by Sgn.

Sgn. quotes the view of another anonymous authority according to which the Pravesāka should be subservient to what follows, and as an illustration of this characteristic, cites the Pravesāka in the Act III of the V. sam. The dialogues there between a 'rākṣasa' couple though in Prākṛta, has been mentioned as 'udātta-vacana' by Sgn. It has been shown before that following the NS., Sgn. prohibits 'udātta-vacana' in a Pravesāka and also does not take it to mean Sanskrit language, as done by Ag. But here, while recording the view of another authority, he permits 'udātta-vacana', though maintains silence regarding the implication of the word. Ag refers to a view that understands 'udātta-vacana' as: "svatma-kārya-visranta-vacana". Thus, according to this view, in a Pravesāka such speeches as refer to the affairs of those who take part in

29. Cf. RT. chap. III. It is not unlikely that Saṅkara means to attribute the view to Nānyadeva, the founder of the Karṇāṭaka dynasty in Mithilā, the homeland of Saṅkara. Nānyadeva is known to be the author of a work called Lha-rata-bhāṣya. In the colophon of the ms. of the work (for details see ISP. by Nm. P.V.Kane pp.61-64) Nānyadeva is styled Mahā-sāmantādhipati and not Mahārāja.

30. NLRK. 11. 316-317. anyastu/prakramādhiṇah pravesāko nāma/
31. NLRK. 11. 320-323. prakramādhiṇastu aśvatthāmānke yuddha-Prastāvam adhikṛtya.....rākṣasau/tayor udāttam api vacanam/
32. Supra p. 243.
it, are prohibited; i.e., in a Pravesaka, the dialogues, of course in Prakṛta, should be related to the affairs of the main characters, the hero, heroine etc.

In the above illustration of Pravesaka from the V. saṃ, Sgn. cites the speech of the 'rākṣasa' "out of his wrath against the son of Drupadu, he (Aśvatthāman) may kill us also" as 'udātta-vacana'. The speech here gives a sequel of the main story (Prakrama) by its reference to the wrath of Aśvatthāman who enters immediately with an unsheathed sword in his hand; and also is related to the safety of the characters present here. Thus it appears that Sgn. also takes 'udātta-vacana' to mean speeches related to the affairs of characters themselves.

The Pravesaka, maintains Sgn., is to be used in between two Acts and there too at the beginning of an Act and never in the middle or end. It thus


34. NLRK, II, 321-323.

35. Dr. Raghavan (NLRK, Eng. Tra., pp. 61-62) takes 'udātta-vacana' to mean elevated speech and observes, "If the Pravesaka is of the kind that gives in brief the sequel of the main story (prakrama), it has naturally to be elevated, if, however, it were to present the inferior characters in their own reaction to certain happenings, then the tone could not be elevated," but the speech cited by Sgn., as 'udātta-vacana' goes to support the above interpretation referred to as according to the opinion of others by Ag.

36. NLRK, II, 332-333. sa caṅkāntara-saṃdiśu kartavyah/tatrūṅkasyādau na tu madhyāntayorityarthāḥ/This is evidently based on: 'aṅkāntara-saṃdiśu ca praveśakasteṣu tāvantaḥ', of the NS (GOS, XVIII, 29).
follows that a Pravesāka should not occur at the beginning of the Act I of a play. Dhananjaya, Viśvanātha and Śīngabhūpāla state this convention more explicitly. But the ND. maintains that this is the opinion of some theorists, some do not allow a Pravesāka at the beginning of the first Act. Ād. also says that generally the Pravesāka is prohibited at the beginning of the first Act. Ag. also maintains that the Pravesāka is to be used in between two Acts. From the standpoint of Sgn. it may be argued that as the Pravesāka is to introduce the 'pātra' of the following Act, it should be used at the beginning of that Act, and because in the Act I of a drama the 'pātra' is introduced by the Śūtrudhāra (or Sthāpaka) in the Prastāvanā, the Pravesāka is of no use there.

As a brief résumé of the entire discussion the following may be stated:

(1) Indian theorists agree that the Pravesāka is to epitomize the scattered portions of the story which are not possible or permissible to be elaborately represented in Ankas.

(2) The NŚ., as we have it, prohibits 'udātta-vacana' and higher characters in the Pravesāka and prescribes only Prākṛta language there.

This is also the generally accepted view.

37. DR. I. 61; Avaloka p. 32. anka-dvayasyānte iti prathamāṇke Pratiśedha iti/SD. p. 348; RS. III. 194. p. 203.

38. ND. p. 35. kecit pravesākaṁ prathamāṇkasvaśe daśe śekantanti/


40. NŚ. GŚŚ. Vol. II. p. 423. anākāntarānu-sārīti anka- (pankayor?) madhye Lhavatīti yāvat/anākāntaram pūrvāṅkāntaram anusarati..
(3) Uga. admits Sanskrit language and such characters as Vītū, Tāpasa, Vipra, Kaścukin etc., in a Pravesāku. Sgn., Sv. and two commentators from Mithila accept this view.

(4) All the theorists agree that the Pravesāku should not be used at the beginning of the first Act, but from the evidences of the IS. and Bhā-pra, it appears that there were some who had no objection against the use of Pravesāku at the beginning of the first Act.

(5) According to some, as recorded in the ALLK, even 'udātta-vacana' is permissible in a Pravesāku where it is 'prakramūčina'. Sgn. takes the word in a sense which has been referred to by Sgn., as according to the opinion of some.

(6) No character should enter the stage without prior indication. This is a generally accepted theory in Practice, though not expressed by any one excepting Sgn., Subhaṅkara and some commentators who also maintain that the Pravesāku serves to give the prior indication of the entrance of a leading character in the immediately following Act.

In conclusion it may be pointed out that neither any one of the 'niśedhas' nor the 'vidhi', of the AS. regarding the Pravesāku as enumerated (in 2) above, is thought to be absolute by all the theorists. It may be added here that according to the Viṣṇu-dharmottara-purāṇa, two characters are to take part in a Pravesāku. This purāṇic injunction is but a general statement of facts, as Pravesākus are generally found to be performed by two characters, though instances of Pravesākus with only one character are not wanting; the one at the beginning of the Act II of the Svapna-vāsavadattā may be cited here, as an example.

VDP. XII, 13 (p. 314) Pātra-dvayena kārtavyaṃ tathā nityaṃ praveśakam.
All the editions of the NS. describe the Viṣṇambha twice each. The GOS. edition of the NS. in the chap XVIII, while describing the Prakaraṇa says:

(1) madhyama-puruṣairnityaṁ yojyo viṣṇambhako 'tra tattvaṁaṁih/ sanskrta-vacananugataḥ samkṣeparthaḥ pravesakavat//

(2) suddhah samkīrṇo ṛdvirdhoh viṣṇambhako  'i kartavyaḥ/madhyama-pūtraḥ suddhah samkīrṇo nīca-madhyama-kṛtah//The KŚ. and K. editions here read another verse:

(3) ankāntare mukhe vā prakaraṇam āśritya nātaka vāpi/viṣṇambhakastu niyatah kartavya madhyamairadhamaiḥ//

Again in the chapter XIX of the GOS. edition, we get a similar description of the Viṣṇambha.

(1) madhyama-puruṣa-niyoyo nātaka-mukhasandhi-nātra-saṅcāraḥ/viṣṇambha-kastu kāryaḥ purohitāmataya-kācucckibhiḥ//

(2) suddhah samkīrṇo vā dvividho viṣṇambhakastu vijnēyaḥ/madhyama-pūtraḥ suddhah samkīrṇo nīca-madhyama-kṛtah//

The commentary of Ag. on these two verses of the chapter XIX is not available. On the otherhand, the first one of these two verses is attributed to Kohala by Ag. and the second one is a copy of the second verse quoted above from the

1. NS. GOS. XVIII. 54-55; KŚ. XX. 37-38; K. XVIII. 89-90.
2. NS. KŚ. XX. 39; K. XVIII. 91.
4. NS. GOS. Vol. II p.434. nanu kohalena mukhaṁkasya cāyaṁ antarāntare vihitah/ "madhyama" etc. The reading of the second half is given here: "viṣ-kambhako hi kāryo nātakayoge praveśakavat"
chapter XVIII. Thus, these two verses appear to be interpolations, as stated by the editor. The verse, attributed to Kohala by Ag., is also not very unlike the first verse quoted above from the chapter XVIII. Thus the authenticity of almost the entire definition of the विष्कम्बंका becomes questionable. However, according to the NS., as it stands now:

(a) विष्कम्बंका serves the same purpose as the प्रवेशाका. Like प्रवेशाका, it is also used to convey to the audience in a summary way those events of the plot which are not represented in Act. विष्कम्बंका is "साम्प्रेष्पर्था" like the प्रवेशाका (प्रवेशाकावव).

(b) A विष्कम्बंहाका may be either 'सुध्दा' or 'साम्यार्था'. In a सुध्दा-विष्कम्बंका, only Sanskrit is to be used by a 'मध्याम' character or characters; while in a साम्यार्था-विष्कम्बंका, there should be both Sanskrit and प्रकृत-speaking characters (निका-मध्यामा-पात्रा).

Thus the use of Sanskrit is the only mark that distinguishes a विष्कम्बंका from a प्रवेशाका where only प्रकृत is to be used. It is also clear from the above that the NS. recognises प्रवेशाका along with the अघा, as the main device of representation and विष्कम्बंका is considered as nothing but प्रवेशाका with the use of Sanskrit. Ag. also takes the word प्रवेशाका of the NS. in several places as shown before, to stand for the five अर्थोपक्षेपकास and also for

5. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p.64. The problem will be discussed in our "General review of the अर्थोपक्षेपकास," pp. 273-279.

5a. It is curious that the interlude at the beginning of the Act IV of अभिषाकु has been taken to be a सुध्दा विष्कम्बंका by RB., who says: (अभिषाकु. p.121) यामपि सुध्दा-विष्कम्बंकाः केवलम् प्रकृतीनः क्रत्यत्/Anasūya and Priyamvadā, both speaking प्रकृत, take part in this scene. RB. perhaps understands सुध्दा-विष्कम्बंका as one where only one language, either Sanskrit or प्रकृत, is used. The two female characters here cannot be, according to RB., designated as 'निका-पात्रा.' Narahari (p.329) and Abhirāma (p.152) take this scene as a प्रवेशाका.
Viṣkambhaka. But in other later works, excepting the NLRK. and Sr. pra., Viṣkambhaka is found to be defined first and the definition of the Pravesāka comes as an 'atidesa'. These later authorities, however, follow the NS. closely, so far as the nature and function of the Viṣkambhaka and Pravesāka are concerned.

Following the NS. Sgn. also admits that the Viṣkambhaka does not differ materially from the Pravesāka; it is 'pravesākasthāniya', and is of two kinds 'suddha' and 'saṃkīrṇa'. Only Sanskrit is to be used in the Sudhaviṣkambhaka; if an inferior character, speaking Prākrit is also involved, it is Saṃkīrṇa-viṣkambhaka. But it has been shown that Sgn; following Mg.

7. Sr. Pra (Vol.II pp. 462-463) simply quotes from the NS.
9. NLRK. l.364. Cf. Ra-ca. (Abhi-saku. p.70) pravesāka eva viṣkambhakah. NLRK. ll. 371-372. Sgn. (ll.372-373) cites the illustration of Sudhaviṣkambhaka from the Ma.mā (Act IX) and Saṃkīrṇa-viṣkambhaka from the Rāmānanda where a 'kṣapāṇaka' and a 'kāpālikā' take part. The SD. (below VI,56) also cites the same illustration, but the name of the drama is stated there as Rāmābhīnanda. NLRK. refers to the name Rāmānanda again in l.385. From the Act 'kṣapāṇaka-kāpālikā' there are two more citations below ll. 3113 and 3117. Citations from the drama also occur in the RS., Sr. pra. and the Bha. pra, where a Śrīgadita Rāmānanda is also referred to. For details see SOLRP. pp.82-87.
permits Sanskrit-speaking 'madhyama' characters to take part in a Pravesāka and as such, the use of Sanskrit or the participation of a 'madhyama' character cannot be the mark to distinguish a Viśkambhaka from a Pravesāka. To show the distinction between the two Sgn. quotes from an anonymous source and adds his comment:

kuto 'pi svecchayā prāptaḥ sambaddho nobhayorāpi/
viśkambhakaḥ sa vijñeyah kathārthasyāpi sūcakah// kuto 'pi hetoh
svayam evāgataḥ/sambaddho nobhayorāpi nāyaka-tadvipakṣa-yorāpi
na pratibaddhāḥ/

The above verse occurs also in the Bhā. pra. and Saṅ. dā. Among the commentators Rucipati and Jagaddhara quote the verse and ascribe it to Bhārata. Saṅkara also quotes it but gives no name of the source. Rucipati further says: "viśkambhako nāma pātrabhedaḥ". This gives a clear hint to the implication of the above verse and Sgn.'s comment thereon. A Viśkambhaka is to be carried on by a character or characters who should not be directly connected with the hero or his enemy. The character thus involved, is to enter the stage out of his own accord and should indicate relevant matters of the plot.


12. Bhā. pra. p.215. 11.15-16. In the first half Śdt. reads 'sambandho' in place of 'sambaddho' of above. The second half there is read as: Viśkambhārthaḥ sa vijñeyah kathāmāsyāpi sūcakah// Subhaṅkara's reading (Saṅ. dā. p.72) tallies exactly with that of Sgn. excepting in 'saṅgato' instead of 'samīdha'.

Sgn. tries to give an etymology of the word and says that a Viṣkambhaka is so called as it supports (the progress of the action) out of joy.

Dr. Raghavan remarks, "It is usual to interpret Viṣkambhaka on the basis of the meaning, the supporting thing:" its relation to exhilaration mentioned by NLRK. is original, but not universally applicable." Sgn. also does not claim it to be so. Ag. says: "viṣkambhayatyupastambhayatīti viṣkambhakāḥ," and this sense has been made more clear in the ND. when it says that the Viṣkambhaka supports the action by linking (the scattered portions of the story).

From the above discussion, it appears that Sgn. admits of no essential distinction between the Viṣkambhaka and Pravesāka. In common with other theorists he maintains that there should be at least one Sanskrit speaking 'madhyamapātra' in a Viṣkambhaka. But neither Sanskrit speech nor 'madhyamapātra' is prohibited in a Pravesāka according to the NLRK. A Pravesāka maintains Sgn., indicates the entrance of the next leading character and this seems to be the only distinguishing feature of a Pravesāka over Viṣkambhaka in his opinion.

It has been shown before that with other theorists Sgn. also do not admit the use of Pravesāka at the beginning of the first Act of a drama, though the ND. refers to the view as maintained by some. As to the position of the Viṣkambhaka, Sgn. maintains silence and this may be explained as his consent to its use either between two Acts or at the beginning of the first Act. Ag.

14. NLRK. l. 368. Here a citation is given from the Nagavarmāṅka of an unknown drama.


16. NS. COS. Vol. II p. 433; ND. p. 34. Viṣkabhrātyanusandhānena vṛttam upastambhayatīti viṣkambhakāḥ/
informs us that Kohala favours the use of the Viśkambhaka at the beginning of the first Act only and this is corroborated by Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra, while Śdt. attributes the view of Bhoja. Ag. himself seems to maintain that unlike the Praveśaka, the Viśkambhaka, may be used at the beginning of the first Act, but this does not mean that it should not be used between two Acts; i.e., it may be used between two Acts and also between the Prastāvanā and the first Act. This is also the generally accepted convention.

Dr. M. Ghosh observes, "First it (Viśkambhaka) related to the Natāka" and that perhaps in a later stage of the development of Indian drama, it came to be related to the Prakaraṇa also. But the NS (GOS. XVIII) defines the Viśkambhaka while describing the Prakaraṇa and the definition found in the chap XIX (GOS) has been suspected to be interpolation. Bhoja clearly states that the Viśkambhaka, serving the purpose of the Praveśaka, is to be used here in the Prakaraṇa, and Sanskrit speaking 'madhyama-Pātras' are to take part in it. Ag. also maintains that the Viśkambhaka is much more useful in a Prakaraṇa which contains a large number of middling characters. This makes the very reverse of Dr. M. Ghosh's above observation more

17. NS. GOS. Vol. II. 434. The verse attributed to Kohala has been quoted before. Bhā. pra. P.215. 1.22. nivesāḥ prathamānke 'pi viśkambhashyāvadhūryate/ p.216. 1.1 ādau viśkambhakam kuryād iti bhojena darsitam/ ND. p.34. kohalaḥ punar etam prathamāhūkādāvevecchati/
19. DR. III. 28-30; ND. p. 34; SD. VI. 62.
21. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p.433. prakaraṇe nāyakāpeksayā prāyaśca upayoginī 'pi madhyama eva sambhavantītī tatra viśkambhakasya bāhulyena sambhāvanam iti...
probable. The NLRK. gives the view of Cārāyaṇa who favour the use of Viṣkambhaka in Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa alike. But in another place while describing the Prakaraṇa Sgn. asserts that Viṣkambhaka is obligatory in Prakaraṇa. The KM. and KSS. editions of the NS. read a verse: "aṅkāntare mukheva" etc. as quoted above, that restricts the use of Viṣkambhaka in Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa only. Another verse, that occurs in all the editions of the NS., clearly states: "Prakaraṇa-nāṭaka-viṣaye praveśakāḥ saṃvidhātavyaḥ." Ag. in his commentary on this verse says that the scope of the theme in 'rūpākas' other than the Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa is limited so the Praveśaka is not a necessity there. Here Praveśaka undoubtedly stands also for the Viṣkambhaka. For the above reason the ND. restricts the use of the two in Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī; the last two types of plays are later developments in the model of the first two respectively. It thus appears that according to the established principle of dramaturgy, the use of Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka is recommended in Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa alike for the representation of complicated plots. This principle, as shown above, is also supported by the canons of the NS.

22. NLRK. 11.362-363. Cārāyaṇa, as an authority on the Kāmaśāstra has been twice referred to in the Kāma-sūtra, I.1.12 and I.5.22.
22 a. NLRK. 11. 2789-2790.
23. p.250. supra.
24. NS. GOS. XVIII. 33(KSS, XX.32; KM. XVIII.35) Ag. (Vol.II. p.424) says: anyatra rūpake parimita-kāryopadeśat na tathā praveśakopayoga iti.....
25. ND. p.35.
26. We cannot accept the observation of Dr. S.N.Shastri (LPSD. p.66) that the above statement of the ND. "does not amount to an established principle of dramaturgy; nor has it any support in Bharata's canons", for the reasons stated above.
III Ankāvatāra (Garbhāṅka)

There has been a longstanding confusion regarding the nature and utility of Ankāvatāra and Ankamukha. The introduction of other two terms Garbhāṅka and Ankāṣya by some theorists has made the problem more complicated. Sgn., however, takes no note of these two terms and explains only Ankāvatāra and Ankamukha.

Ankāvatāra, says Sgn., is the transition of an Act, "aṅkāṣyāvatara-ṇam", and then quotes the following definition from an anonymous source:

samāpyamāṇa ekasminnaṅke hyanyasya sūcanam/
samāsato hi nātyoktaṁ (nātyajñaiḥ or nātyoktyā?) so'ṅkāvatāra

iṣyate//

The confused text of the Bhā. pra. gives, with a minor difference in reading, this definition of the Ankāvatāra along with the other definition of the same from the DR. Jagaddhara in his commentary of the Mā. mā. quotes this definition of the Ankāvatāra. Dr. Raghavan informs us that the above verse is quoted by Bahurūpa Misra in his commentary of the DR. and is ascribed to the Dvādaśa-

1. NLRK. 1.397.
2. NLRK. 11. 398-399.
3. Bhā. pra. (p.218, 11. 16-17) reads: samāpyamāṇa ekasminnitarāṅkasya.../
and 'nātyajñaiḥ' in place 'nātyoktaṁ' of the NLRK in the second half.
4. Mā. mā. p.369. reading differs from that of the NLRK in...ekasminnaṅke 'nyasyaca.../, the second half is found as in the Bhā. pra.
According to the above view, Ankāvatāra is the indication of the next Act by means of short (dramatic or cryptic) speech at the end of the preceding Act. Sgn. illustrates this Ankāvatāra by the closing verse of the Act I of the Nāgānanda. The hero of the drama here in this verse, describes the plight of an elephant due to the scorching heat of the mid-day sun and Sgn. means to say that this indicates the representation of the longing of the hero for the heroine in the next Act. It may be noted here that the Act II depicts the longing of both the hero and heroine for each other. It thus appears that Ankāvatāra, according to this view, is the dramatic fore-shadowing of the events of the next Act at the end of the preceding Act. Jagaddhara also takes it in this sense as appears from the context and his comment. It is important to note here that there is a Praveśaka between Acts I and II of the Nāgānanda. Similarly a Viṣkambhaka intervenes between the Acts VIII and IX of the Mālatī-mādhava. Thus, it appears that


6. NLRK. 11. 400-406.

the above view on Ankāvatāra admits the intervention of an interlude between the two Acts concerned. But this is opposed by the DR. and its followers, as will be shown. It is curious that Visvanātha practically follows the DR. in defining the Ankāvatāra but for illustration cites the transition of the Act VI from the Act V of the Abhi. śaku; and between these two Acts there is also a Pravesāka; the fisherman scene. Dr. K.K. Datta Sastri informs us "The Bengal recension of the drama, however, deems it (the Pravesāka) as a part and parcel of the fifth Act and gives it the designation Ankāvatāra." The said scholar also shows reasons and justifies the standpoint of the Bengal recension in designating the fisherman scene itself as an Ankāvatāra instead of Pravesāka. But the theorists, as shown above, do not maintain that the interlude itself is the Ankāvatāra. Thus, according to the school of thought followed by Sgn., Ankāvatāra consists in prior indication to the events of the next Act at the close of the preceding Act; and there may be an intervention of an interlude between the Acts concerned.

According to the DR., as interpreted by Dhanika, that is the case of Ankāvatāra when without any intervention of a Viśkambhaka and Pravesāka, the next Act commences as a continuation of the incidents of the preceding one being just hinted at by some dramatic personae, evidently at the close of the pro-

---

8. SD. VI. 58-59. ankānte sūcītāḥ pāтраistad ankasyāvibhāgataḥ// yat-rāṅko'vataratyeṣo' ankāvatāra iti smṛtaḥ / After this Visvanātha remarks: "Yathā-abhijñāne pañcamāṅke pāṭraḥ sūcītāḥ saṣṭāṅkastad ankasyāṅga-viśeṣā ivāvatīrṇah /


10. DR. I. 62 aṅkāvatārāstvaṅkānte pāto 'ṅkasyāvibhāgataḥ/ Dhanika specifically says: pravesāka-viśkambhakādi-śūnyam/
ceding Act. For illustration, Dhanika cites the passing of the first Act, to
the second in the Ma. ag. This is the generally accepted view regarding the
Ankāvatāra. The Bhā. pra., in its usual way, reproduces the above definition
and illustration from the DR. along with the other definition, as stated be-
fore. The SD. also gives a similar definition of the Ankāvatāra, though the
illustration cited goes to support the view of Sgn., as pointed out before.
Vidyānātha endorses this view of Dhananjaya. Śiṅgabhūpāla cites the same illus-
tration as in the Avaloka and seems to follow the DR. when he defines the Ankā-
vatāra, as where all the characters of the preceding Act enter the next Act to
represent the continuation of the same event. Rūpa Gosvāmin reproduces this
definition of the RS. with a minor modification. Thus, according to this group
of theorists, headed by Dhananjaya, Ankāvatāra is the device for passing from
one Act to another without any intervention of an interlude.

In the NS. with Abhi. bhā. we get at least three more or less similar
but confusing definitions of the Ankāvatāra. The GOS. version in chapter XIX
defines it as :

```
11. DR. (Avaloka ) p. 33.
15. RS. III. 191-192. ankāvatāraḥ pātrāṇām pūrvavāryānudvartinām/,
avibhūgena sarveṣām bhāvinyānke praveṣānām//
16. NC. p.58. The second foot is read : pūrvāṅkārthānudvartinām/
```
anākānta eva cāṅka nipatati yasmin prayogam āsādyā/ 17
bijārtha-yukti-yukto ājñeyo hānkalavatāro 'sau//' But the commentary
of Ag. on this verse is not found. In another place, however, Ag. gives almost
an identical definition of the Ankalavatāra and seems to regard the same as from
the NS. According to this definition, when in practice an Act comes immediate-
ly after the close of another and is related to the central theme, it is Ankal-
avatāra. The incident represented in the preceding Act directly continues to
the following Act, as Ag. seems to understand it. This is exactly what the DR,
says about Ankalavatāra more clearly. The ND. also gives a similar definition of
the Ankalavatāra and cites the same illustration as in the DR.

17. NS. GOS. XIX. 115; KSB. XXI. 115; KM. XIX. 115.
18. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 421. yathoktam: anākantar evanako nipatati yasmin
prayogam āsādyā/nātyārtha-kathā-yogād vijnayo'hānkalavatāro'sau/' Here the
word 'anākantar' is misleading, the use of the seventh case-ending may
be taken to signify 'in an anka'. But the introductory sentence 'katha-
ayaiva' etc., as given below, and also the reading of the NS (given
above) suggest that the word 'antar' here signifies proximity. The
whole word may also be grammatically explained as 'anyah ankah ankalantaram'
and then the 'adhekaraṇa' is to be taken as 'aupaśleśika' like 'vate gā-
vaḥ suśerate'. Cf. also the view of the ND. below.
hānkalavatāraḥ/
20. ND. I. 27. p. 36. so 'hankalavatāro yat pātrairankalantaram asucanam/' In the
gloss it is said: aviccinnārthataya sūcaniśārthasyābhāvāt/pravesaka-
viśkambhaka-sūcana-rahitaṁ ankalantaram bhavati/
"That there was further confusion", regarding the Ankāvatāra is seen not from the ND. alone, as informs Dr. Raghavan; but from the Abhi.śā, itself which the ND. follows and the name of the Śr. pra. also cannot be omitted as the source of the confusion noticed in the ND. Ag. informs us that Kohala defines Ankāvatāra, a kind of Anka, as: "aṅkasyāṅkāntare yogastvavatārāḥ prakīrtitaḥ" i.e., when one Act is directly connected with the other, it is Ankāvatāra. This Ankāvatāra of Kohala appears to be the same as that of the NS., as discussed before. Ag. himself, on the other hand, says that when in an Act the central theme of all other Acts, i.e., the Bija is introduced, it is called Avatarāṅka. The illustration is cited from the Act II of the Ratnāvalī where Susaṅgata in appreciation of Sāgarikā's love for the king remarks "Such a bride should desire such a groom". It is apparent that Ag. here gives practically a separate definition of the Avatarāṅka than that is given by Kohala whose view he himself quotes. Now this Avatarāṅka of Ag. is nothing but Ankāvatāra and thus we get two definitions of the same from Ag. himself:

2. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 417. Here also the use of the seventh case-ending creates confusion, but the word 'yogāh' supports our interpretation.
3. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 417. yatra tvanke sarveṣāṃ aṅkanāṃ yo'artho bija-lakṣaṇastasya samhārah sammilitatvena prāptir bhavati so' vatārāṅkāḥ/This is a part of Ag.'s gloss on "yatārthasya" etc. of the NS (GOS) XVIII. 16. The full verse has been quoted before. Ag. does not accept the traditional interpretation of the verse as describing an Anka. (Cf. supra. p.215). In his opinion it describes three types of Ankas, as according to the view of Kohala. The above illustration has also been cited in the Bhā. pra. p.219. 11. 1-2.
(1) Passing from one Act to another without any break; this is the most common view, supported by the NS. and is held by Kohala, Dhanañjaya and others.

(2) Introduction of the central theme of all other Acts in one Act; first found in the Abhi.bā.

The encyclopaedic text of Bhoja's Śr. pra. is much more confusing. In one place in the chapter XI it describes Praveśaka, Viṣkambhaka, Aṅka-mukha, Garbhāṇka and Cūlikā, but omits Aṅkāvatāra. Here the Garbhāṇka has been described as:

anākāntare paraṇko (evānko ?) nipatati yasmin prayogamūsādyya/bijārtha-yuki-
yukto garbhāṇko nāma sa jñeyah// This Garbhāṇka of Bhoja is the Aṅkāvatāra of the NS and Ag. But in another place we find that the name of the Ankamukha is missing and Aṅkāvatāra is included and thus the number five is not disturbed. Again in the same chapter we find another description of Garbhāṇka, where it has been stated to be a synonym of Aṅkāvatāra:

bijārtha-yukti-mān anko yo'nkeṣvekah prayujyate/
sa nātakaśu garbhāṇko 'ṅkāvatāraśca kathyate//

According to this view, among the Acts the one which is 'bijārthayukti-mān' (containing the introduction of the central theme, i.e. the Bija) is called the Garbhāṇka or Aṅkāvatāra. This definition of Garbhāṇka-Aṅkāvatāra is offered in

26. Śr. pra. (Vol.II) p.471. garbhāṇka-cūlikā-ṅkāvatāra-viṣkambhaka-
praveśaka-vidhānam.../
another words by Ag. as that of Avatārānka. Bhoja, as it appears from the above, gives two separate definitions; one of the Garbhānka and the other of the both Garbhānka and Ankāvatāra. The Ankāvatāra of the NS. and others has been taken as the Garbhānka, and the Avatārānka of Ag. has been recognised as Garbhānka or Ankāvatāra. Sdt. also seems to understand Garbhānka as another name of the Ankāvatāra, but it has been pointed out before that he records both the views, one held by Sgn. and the other found in the NS., DR. etc. We are not sure with what Ankāvatāra Sdt. identifies the Garbhānka.

The ND. first sets forth the most common view on Ankāvatāra and then practically in the words of Ag. records his view on Avatārānka, as being the definition of Ankāvatāra according to some. The same illustration as in the Abhi. bhā. has also been cited, and then is stated:

\[
\text{ayam ca garbhānko 'pyucyate/yadānuh:-} \\
\text{ānmonkeyeva cānko nipatati yasmin prayogam āsādyā/} \\
\text{bijārtha-yukti-yukto garbhāṅko nāma vijñeyāḥ// iti//}
\]

This verse is undoubtedly the same as found in the NS., as the definition of the Ankāvatāra. But the slight changes in readings of underlined words here have completely changed the meaning of the verse. The verse, as it is, means that when an Anka comes within another Anka, it is called Garbhānka. But this does not appear to be the intended meaning of the authors as the verse has been cited to support the view that Garbhānka is Ankāvatāra. None of the two defini-

28. supra, second view of Ag.
29. Bhā, pra. p.219. l. 9
30. ND. I. 27, p.36.
31. ND. p.36. anye tu yatrānke anyānkanām bijalakṣaṇo' artho' avatāryate tam ankāvatāram āmananti/yathā ratnāvalyām ete.
32. ND. pp. 36-37.
tions of Ankāvatāra, given before by themselves can be taken as fully identical with this definition of Garbhāṅka. It is not also clear which one of two Ankāvatāras according to two different views is intended to be referred to by the pronoun 'ayam'. Most probably the Ankāvatāra according to the common view is meant here by 'ayam' and Dr. K.K. Datta Shastri rightly opines that this form of Garbhāṅka is obviously based on a doubtful version of the NS., available to the authors of the ND.

In practice also, we find that the introduction of some sort of a stage performance within the stage came to be a recognised dramatic device even from the time of Kālidāsa. In the Act II of the Mālavikāgnimitra, there is a solo performance of Chalitaka type of dance by Mālavikā, followed by songs. Śrīharṣa, in the 7th. century, made a further development of the idea. In the Act III. of his Priyadarsīkā what we actually find is almost an 'embryo drama' (to use Keith's terminology), a small play with bits of preliminary details, within a play, and in the text it is rightly named as 'Garbhaṅātaka'. Bhavabhūti in the last Act of the Uttaracarita and Rājaśekhāra in the Act III of his Bālārāmāyaṇa adopt the same device.

In the realm of dramaturgy, as it appears from above discussion, Garbhaṅka, as a device of the representation of plot appears first in the Śr. pra. of Bhoja in the 11th century, so far as extant texts are concerned. But here and also in the ND. (12th cen.) and Bhā. pra. (13th cen.), it is treated as identical with Ankāvatāra. The ND., however, records a new definition of Garbhaṅka according to which the above old practice of inserting a dramatic representation within the body of an Act seems to be first recognised in theory. The definition concerned, as quoted before, is apparently taken from the NS. but with significant changes in reading. This definition with its basis in the NS. was most probably shaped by

some theorist with an eye on the said old practice and was included in some version of the NS, reasonably long before Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra who without any question to its authenticity included it in their work.

Later in the 14th century Viśvanātha and Śiṅgabhūpāla took up Garbhāṅka, but not as an Arthopākṣepaka. They treated it as topically related to Āṅka. According to Viśvanātha, Garbhāṅka is a play with 'rangadvāra' and 'āmukha' within a play. As an illustration Viśvanātha cites the Śītā-svayamvara scene, called a Garbhāṅka by the poet himself in the Act III of the Bālarāmāyaṇa. Śiṅgabhūpāla describes Garbhāṅka in the same light but more elaborately and Rūpa Gosvāmin follows the NS, closely. This is in brief the history of Garbhāṅka in theory and practice.

IV. Āṅka-mukha (Ankasya)

The NLRK defines Āṅka-mukha, as the Act where there is a résumé of the leading ideas of all the following Acts. The illustration is cited from the opening scene of the Mālatī-mādhava where there is an introductory report of all the main events to follow in succeeding Acts. In the text, however, the scene is called a Miśra-viṣkambhaka. The Bhā. pra., as usual, with other views gives the

34. SD. VI. 20 and below.
36. RS. III. 206-211.
37. NC. p. 60.
1. NLRK. I. 408. sūtraṇām sakalāṅkānām jñeyam āṅka-mukham budhair iti/
2. NLRK. II. 410-412.
above definition and illustration of Anka-mukha. Dr. Raghavan informs us that Bahurūpa wrongly ascribes the definition to Bharata (ṣaṭsahasrikāra). As in the case of Ankāvatāra, Sgn.'s view of Ankamukha also is quite different from the more common conception. According to Sgn. Ankāvatāra consists in the prior indication of the events of the next Act at the close of an Act and Anka-mukha means a résumé of the events of all other Acts in a particular Act. Thus, from this standpoint the difference between the two is clear. But this Anka-mukha of Sgn. is the Avatarānka (Ankāvatāra) of Ag., as explained before.

The definition of the Anka-mukha, as available in the NS., but which has been ascribed to Kohala by Ag., means that when the detached beginning of an Act is linked up by means of prior indication by some male or female role, evidently in the previous Act, it is called Anka-mukha. In principle, this definition of Anka-mukha is supported by Dhanan̄jaya, Rāmacandra and Śīngabhūpaḻa, but they use the term Āṅkāsya instead of Anka-mukha, and in the ND. both the names are clearly stated to be synonyms. Bhoja also gives the definition from the NS. Sdt. while enumerating the Arthopakṣepakas uses the term Āṅkāsya but in his usual way gives all the variant definitions of Āṅkāsya and Anka-mukha. He quotes the definition and illustration of Āṅkāsya verbatim from the DR.

7. Śr. pra. Vol.II.p.463, Śr. pra. (Vol.II.p.477) gives the same illustration as NLRK.
and Avaloka respectively and from the NLRK, he takes those of Anka-mukha.

Again he gives another definition of Ankāsyā which is very similar in form to that found in the RS, and in matter to that of the DR., and a second of Anka-mukha which appears to be similar to that found in the NS. Thus Bha. pra. seems to give two definitions of each of the Anka-mukha and Ankāsyā which appear to be recognised here as two separate devices. But the number of the Arthopakṣeṇapakas is five and Śdt. seems to have no intention to disturb this fact, recognised by all. It may thus be supposed that Śdt. takes Anka-mukha and Ankāsyā as the two names of the same device but gives all the available definitions, with the name Anka-mukha or Ankāsyā, as found in his sources. Viśvanātha defines and illustrates Anka-mukha and his definition is quite in line with that of Sgn. and the illustration is also the same as in the NLRK, i.e., from the beginning of the Nā. mā. But then he simply quotes the definition and illustration of Ankāsyā from the DR. and Avaloka and also frankly admits, "etacca dhanika-matānusārenoktam. Lastly Viśvanātha informs us that according to some this Ankāsyā is covered by the definition of Anka-vatāra. It is thus clear that he himself does not recognise Dhanika's form of Ankāsyā. Rūpa Gosvāmin, though at the very beginning of his NC. despises the 'prakriyas' of Viśvanātha, yet follows him closely in respect of Anka-mukha. He first gives the definition of Anka-mukha

12. SD. VI. 59-60. yatra syād anke ekasminnaṅkānāṁ sūcanākhila/tad anka-mukham ityāhur bijārtha-khyāpakaṁ ca yāt// yatha mālatīmādhave etc.
13. SD. VI. 60 and below, pp. 349-350. It is interesting to note that Viśvanātha here seems to identify Dhananjaya and Dhanika.
from the SD. with the word 'āṅkāsyā' in place of 'aṅka-mukha' in the source, but remarks that this Āṅkāsyā is identical with the Aṅka-mukha according to some. Then the definition of Āṅkāsyā is quoted, apparently from the NŚ., with the remark that it is covered by Āṅkāvatāra according to some. Thus it appears that Rūpa Gosvāmin prefers to use the term Āṅkāsyā but follows Viśvanātha, so far as the treatment of the topic is concerned. It may be noted here that the definition of Āṅkāsyā, as found in the DR. and NŚ. is similar to that of the Aṅka-mukha of the NŚ. and that again has been ascribed to Kohala by Ag., as stated before. But we have seen that Sgn. defines Āṅkāvatāra as the indication of the following Act by means of a cryptic speech at the end of the preceding Act. This is undoubtedly similar if not identical, to the definition of Aṅka-mukha, as available in the NŚ. and ascribed to Kohala by Ag.

Regarding the term Āṅkāsyā it may be said that among the texts available to us, it is first found in the DR. The term itself signifies nothing new; only 'mukha' of Aṅka-mukha of the NŚ. is substituted by its synonym 'āsyā' and this may be supposed to be due to metre causa, as it appears from the definition of Āṅkāsyā in the DR. Sgn. and Bhoja stick to the old term. Other theorists who use the term Āṅkāsyā either directly follow the DR. or record its view as reference only.

We thus get two distinct views before us regarding the nature of Aṅka-mukha:

(1) It is the résumé of the leading events of all other Acts. This is the view of Sgn. Śdt. records this definition of Sgn. and Bahurūpa ascribes the same to Saṭṣahasrīkāra i.e., to Bharata, but it is not found

16. NC. p. 58.
in the present NS. Visvanātha gives a similar definition of Anka-mukha and Rūpa Gosvāmin follows him. The definition of Anka-mukha, as available in the NLRK, is similar to that of Avatārāṇka (Ankā-vaṭāra) of Ag.

(2) According to the NS. or Kohala (in the opinion of Ag.) Anka-mukha links up the detached beginning of an Act by means of prior indication. This is the most common view and is supported by the Śr., pra., DR., ND., RS. and Bhā. pra. also records this view. But this definition of Anka-mukha is similar to that of Anka-vaṭāra, as found in the NLRK. Visvanātha and Rūpa Gosvāmin, perhaps due to the influence of Sgn. maintain that this Anka-mukha (Ankasya) is covered by Anka-vaṭāra according to some.

It thus appears that there has been a long standing confusion regarding, the nature of Anka-vaṭāra and Anka-mukha with its root in the NS. and A. hi. bhā. At the present state of our knowledge and also with the present NS. in our hand, we cannot say which one of the two views, stated above, is earlier. The NLRK. maintains silence regarding the source of the definitions of the both Anka-vaṭāra and Anka-mukha, but the view upheld therein cannot be declared later at least in the face of Bahurūpa's opinion, as stated before. The view had also enjoyed a wide recognition, and this is evident from the works of some commentators and theorist, as shown before. Had it been a theory of obscure or later origin or of Sgn's own, it would not have been recognised by them. Who knows whether there was a version of the NS. or some similar renowned work available to Sgn., from which these views were derived.
V Čūlika

Sgn. says that Čūlika is the name conventionally used to denote the speeches uttered by persons from behind the screen to serve some dramatic purpose. In support of this statement Sgn. quotes:

\[ \text{yathāpaṭī-madhya-gataiḥ sūta-māgadha-vandibhiḥ/} \]
\[ \text{arthopakṣepanam yatra kriyate sa hi ċūliketi} / \]

Čūlika neither indicates some future event necessarily, nor introduces a character on the stage always. When something related to the plot is hinted, indicated or reported from behind the curtain, it is called Čūlika, and this is the common view. Sgn. maintains that generally Sūtas (charioteers), Māgadhas (panegyrists) and Vandins do the job. The word 'vandinah' has been taken to mean Nagnācāryas, referring to 'minstrels (not to naked teachers') as has been shown by Dr. Raghavan with evidences from lexicons. But the word in this sense is not of common use and the reading may be emended as 'nāndyācāryaṣ' meaning 'māngala-pāṭhakas'. Sgn. further maintains that others, even leading characters may also take part in a Čūlika and it is not intended that only

---

1. NLRK. 11.412-413. Čūlika saṃjñā-sābdo 'yam nepathyā-sthānasthitānāṃ (Dr. Raghavan's enendation accepted. NLRK. Eng. Trā. p. 72) The text reads 'nepathyē') kārya-vasād-vihitānāṃ ālapānām/

2. NLRK. 11. 414-415. The second quarter of the verse is found in the Bhāṣ. pra. (p.217. l.18) Bhōja (Śr. pra. Vol.II. p.463) also read 'māgadha-sūtādibhiḥ'.

3. DR. I.62; Avaloka p.32; ND.I.26, p.35; SD.VI.59; NC. p. 58. These texts maintain that Čūlika is the 'sucana' (indication) of the 'artha', but Sgn. by 'arthopakṣepana' means 'arthaprakāṣaṇa' (l.417).

4. NLRK. 1. 416-417.


4b. Cf. Bhāṣ. pra. p.294, l.6, .. Here in a list of 'sadasyas' Śdt. mentions one 'nāndi-māngala-pāṭhaka'.
the characters, mentioned above should always perform it. This contention is supported with the views of Bharata and Asmakūṭṭa.

\[
\text{ata eva munirāharatācāry / asmakūṭṭas'ca/}
\]
\[
antāḥ paṭinivīṣṭair yat kriyate'ṛtha-nivedanam/
\]
\[
antar yamanikā-saṁsthais-cūlikārtha-prakāśānам//
\]

It is evident that this is not a full verse, as is treated in the text of the NLRK., but two halves of two separate verses from the two different sources and Sgn. himself means that when he says 'ata eva' etc., as given above. Both, however, mean the samething that Cūlika is the information concerning the plot conveyed from behind the curtain by any role.

Ag. informs us that Kohala defines Ćūḍā (cūlika) as: 'arthopāksē-panam ċūḍā bahvarthaih sūta-vandiḥhih'. It is interesting to note that Kohala also assigns the task of performing the Ćūḍā to such roles as Sūtas and Vandīns etc. The ND. gives two names of this device viz., Ćūla and Cūlikā and then says: 'śā. cūdeva cūlikā'. From all these it appears that Ćūḍā, as given by Kohala, was the original name and the Ćūla and Cūlikā came from it.

5. NLRK. 1.426. The illustrations of Cūlikā, performed by Sūta and Vandin are cited from the third Acts of the V.san. and Mu.śa. (11.418-425), and of those where leading characters take part are cited from the Act VI of the V.san. and Act. I of the Jānakī-rāghava where Bhīma and Rāvaṇa respectively, do the job of 'artha-prakāśāna'. This contention of Sgn. that even major characters take part in Cūlikā is supported by a reading found in the KŚŚ. edition of the NS OXI. (133) Here the second quarter of the verse is read as: 'uttamādhamamadhyamah'.

6. NLRK. 11. 437-439. The GOS. edition of the NS. defines Cūlikā as: antaryavanikāsāmsthaiḥ sūdābhūhīr anekadhārtha-paṅkṣe-paṇam yattu kriyate sē hi Cūlikā/ Ag.'s commentary on this verse also, is not available. It is evident that Sgn. did not take the verse 'yathā Paṭi' etc., as given above, from the NS. as he himself gives the view of Lhārata here. But none of the above two definitions of Cūlikā, given by Sgn. tallys exactly with that of the NS.


8. ND. p. 35.
Singabhūpāla gives a detailed account of Cūlikā and expressly states that it may occur at the beginning, middle or end of an Act and this has been taken up by Rūpa Gosvāmin. In the RS, a distinction has been drawn between Cūlikā and Khaṇḍacūlikā. The former is the same as maintained by all other authorities. But when at the beginning of an Act, one character on the stage and the other behind the curtain, take part in conversation and serve the purpose of Cūlikā, it is Khaṇḍa-cūlikā. Singabhūpāla points out that others call it a case of Viśkambhaka, but he himself does not prefer to call it so, "enām viśkambham evānē śrāhur naitan matamara." The illustration of this Khaṇḍa-Cūlikā has been cited from the Act I of the Ālā-rāmāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara. But this is not the common view of Cūlikā which has already been explained.

A general review of the Arthopakṣepakas.

The five Arthopakṣepakas have been explained with a comparative study in the theories advanced by different theorists. The position of the KLIK, has also been made clear. But there is a confusion regarding the term Arthopakṣepaka itself. The NS, as we have it, uses the term Arthopakṣepaka only in one occasion and defines each of them. These verses have, however, been held to be spurious by the editor of the GOS. version, obviously on the grounds that (I) some of the manuscripts omit these verses, (II) Ag. does not comment on them.

9. RS. III. 182-188.
10. NC. p. 58.
11. RS. III. 187.
1. NS. GOS. XIX. 110-116; KI. XIX. 108-116; KSS. XXI. 108-116. Viśkambhaka and Pravesākaka are elaborately treated in the previous chapter of the NS (XVIII. GOS). Here mainly other three are defined.
2. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 64; Dr. Raghavan also maintains (KLIK. Eng. Tra. p. 62, note on 1.437) that these verses of the NS, are later additions from Końhala or some post-Kharata writer.
(III) some of these verses are mere repetitions as they are found in the previous chapter, and (IV) some of them are identical with the verses of Kohala, quoted by Ag. But Dr. K.K. Datta Shastri maintains that these verses of the NS. cannot be held spurious because (I) omission of a passage in one or other manuscript does not necessarily imply its spuriousness, (II) Ag. does not explain each and every passage of the NS. (III) repetitions are not totally unknown to the NS., (IV) verses attributed to Kohala by Ag. may be considered as taken from the NS. verbatim by Kohala himself. Dr. Shastri has justified each and every one of these contentions with sufficient evidences from the NS., Abhi. bhā, and the NLRK. But he himself admits that the text of the NS. is extremely uncertain in this portion. Moreover, what portions of the present NS. are pre-Bharatan, post-Bharatan, and Bharatan is yet to be finally settled. Kohala is presented before us in the NS. as one of the most prominent pupil of the sage Bharata and he has been entrusted with the duty of treating all matters left out in the NS. His "relation with the NS. is not quite clear."
The time and extent of the supposed influence of his work on the redactors of the NS. has not yet been properly assessed. It may also be supposed that many verses of some earlier version of the NS. were taken verbatim by Kohala in his work and many verses from which on the other hand were included in the NS. long before Ag. So, if some verses appear as identical with quotations from Kohala, we are not fully justified to call them spurious. It is also a fact that Ag.

5. NS. KSS. XXXVI. 65. "sesam uttaratantreṇa kohalāḥ kathayiṣyati/ ."
6. "Mm. P.V. Kane ISP. p. 24."
himself regards Kohala in some places as coeval with Bharata. Moreover, the
definition of Ankkavatāra, as quoted in the Abhi. bhū. with the introductory
remark 'yathoktam' shows that Ag. himself recognises it as from the IS. This
definition is almost identical with that found in the chap. XIX of the (GOS)
8
In another place Ag. remarks: "tathā ca kohalo 'arthopakṣepa-panḍeṣe..." i.e., Kohala enumerated the five Arthopakṣepakas. If we are to be
lieve on the evidence of this statement of Ag., that Kohala first defined each
of the Arthopakṣepakas, then we are to accept that the above mentioned definition
of Ankkavatāra was taken by Ag. from the work of Kohala. But Ag. himself
does not appear to have meant that, as shown above. We have seen that the IS,
elaborately treats Pravesaka and Viṣkambhaka in chapter XVIII (GOS). In chap.
XIX (GOS) along with these two, other three Arthopakṣepakas are defined. Of
these three the definition of Ankkavatāra appears to be genuine from the above
evidence of the Abhi. bhū. From all these it appears that the definitions
of all the five were there and Kohala brought them under one general term Ar-
thropakṣepaka, enumerated the five as Ag. puts it, and systematised the whole
scheme. Kohala thus, may be credited with the coining of the term Arthopakṣe-
paka. Moreover Ag. most reasonably points out that the IS. uses the term Prave-
saka in several places instead of Arthopakṣepaka, as a generic one to signify
either all the five devices or the two main ones, Pravesaka and Viṣkambhaka.
Had the term Arthopakṣepaka been known originally, it could have been conveni-
ently used. This term appears once in the IS. (GOS. XIX, 110) in the verse that
enumerates the names of five devices and this verse may be said to be included
in the IS. after Kohala.

7. Mm. P. V. Kane BSP. p. 24.
7a. Cf. Ankkavatāra, supra, fn. 18, and the definition quoted above that.
8. IS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 421.
An Act in a Sanskrit drama, as has been shown before, may consist in itself of more than one scene. But Pravesaka and Viškambhaka are clear-cut scenes in the modern sense of the term. The back-ground is never represented as changed in a Pravesaka or Viškambhaka, as is very often done in an Act. But regarding other three Arthopakṣepakas, it may be said that they are never treated, either in theory or in practice, as separate scenes outside an Act. Aṅkāvatāra and Aṅka-mukha are always included within one or other of the Acts and are never treated as entities exterior to the Acts like Pravesaka or Viškambhaka. Cūlikā consists of simply in the indication of something from behind the screen and nothing more. So, if it occurs even at the very beginning of an Act, it cannot be taken as a separate scene. Thus, generally speaking, Aṅkāvatāra and Aṅka-mukha signify the nature of the beginning of an Act or a particular relation between two Acts. We have also seen that 'Aṅkāsa-vacana' and 'nepathyavacana' are taken by Mā, Sūrya, and others as Sandhyantararas. Cūlikā (i.e., utterance of something from behind the screen) in an Act is nothing but 'nepathyavacana', i.e., a Sandhyantara and cannot be included in the Arthopakṣepakas. Like the Aṅkāvatāra and Aṅka-mukha Cūlikā, perhaps, was also used to denote a particular style of beginning of an Act. Most probably it was taken to mean the starting of an Act with the indication of something from behind the screen through 'nepathyavacana'. The Viškambhaka at the beginning of the Act II, and Acts III and V proper, of the Uttara-rāma-carita start with Cūlikā. Thus these three Arthopakṣepakas (viz., Aṅka-mukha, Aṅkāvatāra and Cūlikā) denote the modes of the beginning of Acts.

10. Dr. K.K. Datta Shastri, Garbhāṅka; OII. Vol. VII. pt. I. p. 46. It may be noted that the Garbhaṅka itself is a scene in an Act but came to be recognized later, as shown before.

11. Rucipati (An. rā. p. 77) takes Cūlikā as a decorative device; "ayam eva cūlikā nāmālaṅkārah."

The above seems to be the view of Kohala who maintains that there are three types of Acts marked by Āṅkāvatāra, Cūḍā (Cūlikā) and Āṅka-mukha, as G. informs us. It thus appears that according to Kohala the Āṅka itself is the main Arthopakṣepaka, because the three types of these āṅkas have been included in the five Arthopakṣepakas by himself. Sgn. also maintains that the arthopakṣepakas are but 'artha-pratipādakas'; those which set forth or introduce the theme of the drama. In this sense also Āṅka may be taken as an artha-pratipādaka.

From the viewpoint of representation on the stage the NS. originally appears to have recommended the division of the plot into a number of acts (āṅkas) and scenes (Praveśaka and Viśkambhaka) to maintain a link of the theme. The definitions of three types of āṅkas, marked by Āṅkāvatāra, Āṅka-mukha and Cūlikā were there in the NS. But perhaps it was not clearly stated that they were the three varieties of Acts. Kohala, as it appears from the above discussion, first brought all the devices of representation of the plot, under one general term Arthopakṣepaka and enumerated the names of five Arthopakṣepakas and clearly stated that Āṅkāvatāra, Āṅka-mukha and Cūlikā are but three marks of Acts. Being the modes of their beginning these three appear to have been taken as the marks of Acts by Kohala.

13. NS. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 416-417. tatha coktaḥ kohalādau

(Kohalena ?) tridhānko 'āṅkāvatāraṇa cūḍāyaāṅka-mukhena viś/
arthopakṣepaṃ caubhālahvarthaiḥ sūta-vandibhiḥ//
āṅkasyāṅkāntare vastra-vatāraḥ prakīrtitah/
viśliṣṭa-mukham āṅkasya striyā va puruṣena va//
yadupakṣīpyate pūrvam tadaāṅka-mukham iṣyate/

14. Cf. f. n. 8 supra.

15. NLRK. I. 396.
Sgn. seems to be conscious of the old conception. He, after fully describing the Āṅka, begins his discussion on the arthadānakas with the remark: "sampratyāṅka-vidyā pravesākādaya ucyante," implying thereby that from the viewpoint of representation on the stage before an audience, the Pravesāka etc., do not differ materially from an Āṅka.

The nature and function of two types of interludes, Pravesāka and Viṣkambhaka, which are well marked scenes, have been elaborately discussed. It has also been shown that Sgn., following the Nś. maintains that there is no material difference between these two. He says that the Viṣkambhaka is 'pravesākasthānīya.'

Even later commentators also accept the above view. PL. in his Arthaddyotanīka informs us that the Pravesāka between the Acts V and VI of the Abhi-śaku is called the third Pravesāka by some as there are two Viṣkambhakas; one in the Act III and the other in the Act IV, thus this is the third Pravesāka. Saṅkara in his Rasa-candrika commentary on the same drama says: "pravesākā eva viṣkambhakaḥ."

Prof. Jagirdar, on a study in the Pravesākas employed in the plays of Bhūsa, arrives at the general conclusion that the Pravesākas in Sanskrit drama in general, simply introduce the following main scenes. This seems to be somewhat in conformity with the view held by Sgn. that Pravesāka introduces the entrance of the following leading character. Prof. Jagirdar further maintains that Viṣkambhakas are "concerned with incidents unrepresented on the stage, or supposed to

16. NLBK. I. 306.
17. NLBK. I. 364.
18. Abhi-śaku. p. 183. kacit pustake tṛtiyāḥ praveśakāh iti pūthah/tatra viṣkambhadvayaṁ tṛtiya-caturthayor-āṅkāyoh śasthe tṛtiyāḥ praveśakāḥ ityartah/
19. Abhi-śaku p. 70.
20. DSL. p. 54.
have happened during the interval and so incidents connected with the hero and the heroine or the central theme." According to the said scholar here lies the distinction between the two, Pravesāka and Viśkarṇahaka, and a parallelism can be established between Viśkarṇahaka and Greek Chorus. But these arguments do not seem to hold good so far as the dramas of even Kālidāsa are concerned. The Dhīvarā scene is a Pravesāka in the Abhisēka; but it summarises the incidents unrepresented on the stage. It appears that both Pravesāka and Viśkarṇahaka help the introduction of the following main Act and summarise the events or incidents unrepresented on the stage. Their difference lies elsewhere and that has already been discussed.

Later theorists, at least beginning from Dhanařāja, divide the plot from the view point of representation on the stage, into two 'dṛṣṭa-śravya' and 'sūcya'. The first division is to include portions which are meant to be elaborately delineated in Acts, and the second includes events and incidents which are only to be indicated through Arthopakṣepakas, as being unfit or uninteresting for elaborate and visible representation. All the Arthopakṣepakas are thus limited as means for indication (sūcanopāya). This sort of division of the plot is unknown in the NŚ and Śrṅ, also does not recognise this division. The original conception of Arthopakṣepaka, consisting of three types of āṅkas, marked by Āṅkāvatāra, Āṅkanukha and Gūlikā; and two types of scenes the Pravesāka and Viśkarṇahaka, was totally lost. A strict line of demarcation came to be drawn between Āṅkas and Arthopakṣepakas. These later theorists missed the original implication of Āṅkāvatāra, Āṅka-mukha and Gūlikā and naturally a confusion arose. This confusion was worse confounded by the introduction of two new terms Cūrthaṅka and Āṅkāṣya. An attempt has been made to bring out the original significance of the devices which seems to be maintained, at least to a reasonable extent, in the NŚ.

22. DSL, p. 55.
23. DSL, p. 54.