CHAPTER-III

Arthaprakrti (Constituent elements of the plot)

The analysis of the plot into five Arthaprakrtis depend upon the formal division of the plot of a drama into principal and secondary actions, known in Indian dramaturgy as Ādhikārika and Prāsaṅgika Vṛttas. The 'itivṛtta' or the plot of a drama consists of situations some of which are directly connected with the main thread of the story and some indirectly. From this point of view the plot has been analysed as consisting of two parts, Ādhikārika and Prāsaṅgika or Ānuṣaṅgika. The plot of a drama is an organic whole and the so called parts are inseparably connected behaving like elements in the constitution of a living organism. When they are artificially thought to be separated, they lose their dramatic quality. Moreover, the complex structure of a drama do not so easily yield to the above sort of formal division. But the profession of a critic is sometimes like that of a student of surgery. For the sake of the analysis of the plot such a division is essential.

Ādhikārika-vṛtta or the principal action plays the leading part in the final attainment and is directly connected with the hero. The Prāsaṅgika one (incidental or secondary action) on the other hand, is not directly related to the final achievement but is contributory to it. The point has been made clear by an illustration in the NLRK. It says that in a plot where the killing of Rāvaṇa is the 'kārya' (Principal action), the slaying of Vālin by Rāma to win Sugrīva's alliance is Ānuṣaṅgika.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1. NLRK. 11. 218-219; NS. GOS. XIX. 2.
2. NLRK. 11. 222-224; 228-229, NS. GOS. XIX. 3, 5.
Sgn. informs us that according to some, the Ānuṣaṅgika is a contributory story within the main story. Evidently, this is not the opinion of Sgn. The secondary action is undoubtedly contributory to the principal action, but it may not always be a full-fledged story (kathā). It may be a mere incident.

There has been a long-standing controversy regarding the significance of the term Arthaprakṛti. According to Ag. the five Arthaprakṛtis are but means for the attainment of the fruit, i.e., the final end. This is also the opinion of Dhanika and Viśvanātha simply repeats the statement of Dhanika. The Nd. also maintains the same opinion.

The RS. takes the Arthaprakṛtis to mean parts of the story. The view is not a new one. Ag. rightly criticises the view on the ground that if Arthaprakṛtis are taken to be the parts of the whole story, then the Sandhis also should be regarded as Arthaprakṛtis, which they are not.

-----------------------------------------------
4. NLRK. I. 227...anyastvāha/kathāyam eva kathāntaram upakārakṛd ānuṣaṅg ikam iti/
5. NS.GOS. Vol.III. P.12. arthaḥ phalam x tasya prakṛtayaḥ upāyaḥ phalahetava ityarthaḥ / tadaih pañchabhīrūpayaḥ pūrṇaphalam niśpādyate/ For an exposition of Ag.'s division of Arthaprakṛtis into two groups viz., Inanimate and Animate; the first comprising the Bīja and Kārya while the second comprising other three, see H.K.Trivedi's learned paper on the topic in ABORI, Vol.XLIV, Pts.I-IV,PP.143-146
6. DR. p.5; SD. p. 351; Nd. 37.
7. NS.GOS. Vol. III. P.12; RS. P. 209.
The standpoint of the Bhā-pra. is a bit difficult to ascertain due to the nature of the text. It reads:—

Arthaprakṛtayaḥ pañca kathā-bhedasya (one ms. reads 'tathā dehasya') hetavaḥ / 
Ete kathāsārīrasya hetavaḥ parikīrtitāḥ. The ms. reading (dehasya) seems to be probable as the two statements become identical. According to the Bhā.pra. then Arthaprakṛtis are elements of the plot. They are the causes of the plot inasmuch as they combine to produce the plot. This definition of the Bhā.pra. is evidently taken from the Sr.pra. of Bhojarāja who also looks upon the Arthaprakṛtis as elements of the plot.

Leaving aside the standpoint of the RS, we get two views regarding the nature of the Arthaprakṛtis. According to Ag. and others, as shown before, they are, 'phala-hetavaḥ' or 'prayojana-siddhi-hetavaḥ', and according to Bhoja and Sdt. they are, '-kathā-sārīra-hetavaḥ'. It is interesting to note that both these schools of thought accept the word 'prakṛti' to mean hetu (cause), but according to the former 'artha' means 'phala' while according to the latter it denotes the 'kathā-sārīra'; the story.

Sgn. says:— nātakīyavastunah...pañca prakṛtayaḥ svabhāvāḥ bhavanti. It is evident that the word 'artha' here, has been taken to mean the plot of a drama, but

8. Bhā.pra. P.204. l. 22; P. 205. l.1.
9. Kumārvāmin in his com. on the PRYB (P.104) says, Arthaprakṛtayaḥ prayojanāsiddhi-hetava iti kecit/kathāsārīrasya kāraṇāniti bhoja-rājādayaḥ. Sr.Pra.Vol.II. Chap.XII. P. 482. Kathā-sārīropadāna-kāraṇabhūtāḥ Pañcarthaprakṛtayo bhavanti/artha-prakṛtayaḥ pañca kathādehasya hetavaḥ/ This definition of Bhojadeva also supports our suggestion regarding the reading of the above line of the Bhā.Pra.
10. NLRK. 11. 131-132. Saṅkara in his Rasa-Candrikā (P.162) seems to have followed the NLRK when he says :- arthasya prakṛtayaḥ svabhāvāḥ.
only a synonym of the word 'Prakṛti' is given. The word 'prakṛti' or 'svabhāva' here may however, be taken to mean constituent elements or inherent properties as other meanings of these two words appear unsuitable in this context. It thus appears that according to Sgn. Arthaprakṛtis are constituent elements of the plot. This interpretation is also supported by his own statement that without these there can be no plot of a Nāṭaka. Bhojarāja and Śāradātanaya, as discussed above, appear to have shared the view held by Sgn. It may also be pointed out here that Rūpa-gosvāmin, an ardent follower of the RS., describes Arthaprakṛti as:- Pañca-vidhyāt kathāyāstu prakṛtiḥ pañcadhā smṛtā. It is, however, not clear what the word 'Prakṛti' means here, but from the statement it appears that the Vaiṣṇava savant believed in the fivefold division of the plot. The whole statement may mean that as the plot has got fivefold divisions so their causes or elements are also five. In any case, it is a confusing description, having its origin, perhaps, to the influence of the RS. and the school of thought represented by the NLRK.

It may further be pointed out that the view held by Sgn. and Bhoja regarding the Arthaprakṛtis, seems to be an older one, as Ag. refers to it. Ag. while commenting on "Itivṛtte yathāvasthāḥ" etc., of the NS, says, - artha itivṛtte prakṛtya iti vaktavye arthagrahaṇam atiriktam syāt ityavasthābhīṣca tulya-tāvāraṇam varṇanāmātraṃ syāditi kimanena. The above verse of the NS, enjoins that as there are five Avasthas in the 'itivṛta', so there are five Arthaprakṛtis. Ag. seems to mean that 'artha' in the word 'arthaprakṛtyaḥ' of the verse, becomes superfluous if it is taken in the sense of 'itivṛta' which follows from the first half of the verse. Moreover, in that case (according to the second part of

11. NLRK. 11. 132-133. naitūn parityajya nāṭakārthāḥ sambhavanti /
13. NS. Gos. XIX. 20. itivṛtte yathāvasthāḥ Pañcārambhādikāḥ smṛtāḥ/arthapraκṛtyayāḥ pañca tathā bijādikā api//
Ag.'s above argument) Arthaprakṛtis become equated with the Avasthās, as both of these groups signify nothing more than the nature of the plot, analysed in its different stages of development and as such, the description of the Arthaprakṛtis becomes useless. So far as the above verse of the NS. is concerned, the cogency of the first argument of Ag. is unquestionable. But the editor informs us that the first half of the verse is not found in most of the manuscripts and Sgn. also has not included the verse in his text. The second argument cannot be directed against Sgn., inasmuch as according to his standpoint Avasthās are five stages in the development of the action and the Arthaprakṛtis are but constituent elements and not divisions of the plot and as such, the two pentads cannot be equated.

Regarding the order of the Arthaprakṛtis in a drama, Sgn. maintains silence. The problem will be considered in details in due course.

To sum up, Arthaprakṛtis have been taken at least in three different senses by different schools of thought. According to the Abhi-bhā., DR., ND., and SD., they are the means for the final attainment (phalahetavah). Sgn. maintains that they are constituent elements of the plot and this seems to be shared by Bhojadeva and Śdt. The RS. takes them as parts of the plot.

Bija (Germ )

Bija is the first of the Arthaprakṛtis and as the very seed of the dramatic action it comes first. Bija according to Sgn. is :

15. NS. GOS. Vol.III. P.12. f.n. l. idamardham 'ta-pa-da-da-na-ba-ya'
mātrkāsūna vartate/

16. See. Infra D. Relation among the three pentads.
It has been shown that Arthapракṛtis according to Sgn., are constituent elements of the plot and 'artha' in this context has been taken to mean the plot itself, the action as a whole with 'phalayoga' as its final stage. Thus बिज according to the NLRK, is that constituent element of the theme which causes the action culminating into fruition. Simply speaking, it is the cause of the final stage of the action. It has also been shown that according to Mg. and Sgn. each stage (Avasthā) is marked by an event or events. Germ of the final event is sown in the initial stage of the action. The action practically begins with the sowing of the germ which sprouts and develops with the progress of successive stages culminating into fruition, i.e., the final event and as such, it is said to be pervading over the entire play.

Sgn. in support of his view quotes the description of the बिज from the NS, which says that the बिज is indicated or sown (in the initial stage) slightly but spreads out in various ways and ends in fruition. We have shown three different views held by different schools of thought regarding the nature of the Arthap्रकṛtis. बिज, being an Arthap्रकṛti, has also been taken in three different senses, viz., phalahetu, नातकीयवास्तु-सवभाव and katha-bhāga. But that it causes the action to culminate into fruition, is the opinion of all. There are, however,

1. NLRK. I. 136. also I. 538 बिजम नातकस्यां भलक्षुतस्या हेतुह।
2. NLRK. I. 137-138. किंचिन्मृत्रम समुद्धितस्म भहुध्यय-विसर्पाति/यवत phalावसानम ca tad-बिज j iti kṛtitum // NS. GOS. XIX. 22. RB. attributes (Abhिसaktu. P. 15) this definition of बिज to अदि-भारata. Bhoja also (Sr. Pra. Chap. XII. P. 482) defines the बिज as, - अल्प-मत्रम उपक्षितप्तम भहुध्यय yad visarpāti/Phalāvasānam yacca syāt tad बिज j iti saṁjitam //
subtle differences of opinions regarding the exact implication of 'fruition' and this will be shown later.

The NS. says, as shown above, that the Bija is to be indicated or sown slightly (at the initial stage). By slightly (kimcit stokam) Sgn. means by such ways as 'ślesa', 'chāyā' and 'upakṣepa'. Ślesa, says Sgn., is 'dvyaarthavacana', i.e., conveying of double meanings, 'chāyā' is similarity of incidents (kathā-sāmyam) and 'upakṣepa' means introduction of the plot (arthopasthāpanam).

While discussing the Mukha-sandhi, Sgn. quotes a verse with similar import as above and attributes the same to 'Āchārya'. The text runs as:--

_____ācārya āha/

Yasminnākhyāna-bījasya śleṣena cchāyayāpi vā /
Kriyate kīrtanām sadbhis-tar-mukham parikīrttitam //6

Of the three ways of sowing the Bija, as mentioned by Sgn. above, two are included here in this verse; the upakṣepa is omitted. by the epithet 'ācārya' Sgn. refers to Bharata invariably. It may be presumed that according to the belief of Sgn. the above verse belongs to the work of Bharata. But no trace of it is found in the present NS. It is interesting to point out here that Tāranātha Tarkāvaspati in his commentary on the verse, "satpakṣā madhuragirah etc." of the V. sam. quotes, - "śleṣacchāyopadeśaiśca samuddhiṣṭam visarpati / Yat phalodaya-paryantam tād-bijam iha kīrttitam"/. The said pandita then remarks - "iti bharatokta-phalodaya-paryantam prabandhapratiśdyam arthām bījarūpeṇa śleṣena varṇayati".

4. NLRK. 11. 139-140. kimcit stokam śleṣa-chāyopakṣepaprabhṛtvir-anāgaiḥ samuddhiṣṭam kathitam.
5. NLRK. 11. 144-145.
"Upadesaih" in the first 'pāda' of the verse quoted by Tārānātha Tarkavacaspatri, may be replaced by "upaksepaih" on the evidence of the NLRK. Sgn. also illustrates the indication of the Bija through Ślesa with the same verse from the V. sam.as above, where the Sūtradhāra describes autumn but the hidden meaning of which is the total destruction of the Kauravas. The verse quoted and attributed to Bharata by Tārānātha Tarkavacaspatri also is not found in the present NS. Of the above two verses, attributed to Bharata, the one found in the NLRK describes the Mukha sandhi and the other, quoted by Tārānātha Tarkavacaspatri, describes the Bija. The former one mentions two ways of indicating the Bija while the latter points out three ways. Sgn. himself also maintains that Bija can be indicated in the same three ways. The different ways of indicating the Bija, referred to in the above two verses, have not been mentioned by any other known authority like Ag., Dhananjaya, Rāmacandra, Śdt. Visvanātha etc. But both the verses have been attributed to Bharata. The only conclusion that can be derived from all these is that there were other versions of the NS. which have not come down to us. The view contained in the above two verses might have been current in the eastern part of India, probably in Bengal, the homeland of Tārānātha Tarkavacaspati where it was extant even before a century, otherwise we could have found it in the work of any other authority, mentioned above. Tārānātha might have collected the verse from some other commentary or from any other second-hand source. But Sgn. certainly utilised a copy of the NS. which did not differ materially from its present version. It seems probable that Sgn. also hailed from eastern India and that there was an eastern version of the NS. Of course, a single instance cannot decide the issue.

8. NLRK. 11. 145-147.

9. Dr. Sukumar Sen (Bāṅgālā Sāhityera Itihāsa Ed.III, Pt.I. P.33) and Dr. Niharajan Roy (Bāṅatina Itihāsa P.745) maintain that Sāgaranandin's homeland was Bengal.
Sgn. illustrates the indication of Bija through similarity of incidents with a verse from the Jānakī - rāghava. The verse concerned, seems to be the opening one of the drama and describes how Viśṇu rescued his beloved Earth from the nether region by killing the demon who confined her there. Here a hint is given of the future events of killing of Rāvanā by Rāma and the rescue of Śītā constituting, evidently, the 'Phalayoga' of the drama.

As an illustration of the indication of the Bija through upakṣepa, the last verse of the Prastāvanā from the Kundamālā has been quoted. Here the Sūdhāra introduces directly the play with such words as 'here Lākṣmāṇa is taking Śītā to the forest'. It should be noted that in each of the above three cases hint to the final object (phala) has been taken to be the indication of Bija. Practically speaking, Bija does not differ from the Phala; the former is the unmanifested state and the latter is the fully manifested state of the same element. Ag. rightly says that the fruit also may be said to be the germ, — "phalam apica bhaviṣyadupāyāvinābhāvād bijam ityeyate." It also appears that Sgn. supports the indication of Bija in the Prastāvanā.

Sgn. offers another view according to which Bija is the means of achieving the desired end and in five successive Sandhis it should be shown as sown, sprouted,
developed, sought for and yielding fruit. This evidently is the opinion of one of those theorists who take Arthaprakṛti as 'phala-hetu.' The metaphor of the growth and development of a tree from the seed, as used here, has also been utilised in the Bhā-pra. and RS., to explain the progress of the action from its initial stage to the conclusion.

How to begin a drama is really a problem to the playwright. The genesis of action, called 'bijanyāsa' in Sanskrit dramaturgy, should be appealing and capable of leading the whole action to the desired end of the playwright which must appear as its logical consequence. Much of the success of a drama depends upon the beginning. The Bija should be so introduced as seems in the circumstances natural and appropriate. The Indian theorists took up the matter seriously and consequently we come across different suggestions regarding this vital problem. It has been shown that Sgn. speaks of three different ways in which the Bija may be indicated.

Mg., as it appears from the commentary of RB. on the Abhi. Śāku, treats: 

14. MLRK. II. 141-143. anyastvāha/iṣṭārtha-sādhanam Bija. uptam utpatram uddhatam/anviṣṭam phalitam pañca-sandhistham darsayet kramat/ The printed text reads 'utpatam' and 'pañca-sandīstham' which may be emended as 'utpatram' and 'pañca-sandhistham' respectively, as suggested by Dr. Raghavan.

the introduction of Bija more elaborately and from different angles. According to Mr. the Bija may be introduced in different manners. The playwright may begin his drama with a hint to the cause of the fruit only or the fruit itself. The play may also be started with the beginning of the endeavour for the attainment of the final end. The poet may first introduce both the fruit and activity for its attainment or simply the activity, particularly mentioned. Mr. further maintains that Phala-bija is that which ends in fruition, the story is the Vastu-bija and the hero is the Arthabija. This Phala-bija of Mr. is the Bija of the NS., explained above. But what is exactly meant either by the Vastu-bija or Artha-bija is not clear. Vastu and Artha are generally used as synonyms in the texts of dramaturgy to mean Itivrtta, the theme of the drama. Moreover, Katha is said to be the Vastu-bija, while Katha and Vastu also denote the samething. A subtle difference between Katha and Vastu may, however, be surmised: - the former may be taken to mean the main story (the Ädhikārika-vṛtta) and the latter to mean the entire subject matter of the drama (Ädhikārika and Prāsaṅgika vṛtta taken together.) In this sense the main story may be taken to be the germ of the entire theme of a drama. Aratha may also mean the 'Prayojana' and the hero is the Artha-bija in the sense that his 'Prayojana' is represented as served in a drama. Now, in every Nāṭaka these three germs are found to be present. The only significance that can be surmised in design-

16. R. B. Abhi-sakaw, p. 15. kvacit kāraṇamātraṃ tu kvacicca phaladarśanaṃ/ kvacidārāmbhamātraṃ tu phalam uktvā kriyā kvacit // vyāpāraśca viśeṣoktaḥ kvacidvā phalasādhakaḥ / bahuḥ rūpaṃkeśvevaṃ bijarūpaṇa drṣyate// Phale yasya hi saṃhāraḥ phalabijam tu tad bhavet / vastu-bijam kathā jñeyā artha-bijam tu nāyakaḥ // Dr. Raghavan points out (NLRK.Eng.Tra.P.7) that Raṅganātha in his commentary on the Vik-u. has quoted Mr.'s observation on Bija, but the same is found in the RB's commentary, as given above, and not in the commentary of Raṅganātha on the Vik-u.
nating the above three as Bija is the fact that according to the nature of the plot any one of them may get prominence over the others and the action may be started with anyone of the three types of Bija. There may be Nāṭaka where either the course of the action or the conclusion may not be definitely known to the audience. In such a case the theme itself becomes more attractive. The Kundamālā and the Uttara-rāma-carita are the best examples of this type of Nāṭaka. In both the dramas the theme, though related to the Rāmāyaṇa, is practically new in the sense that neither the conclusion nor the course of the action is borrowed from the source and known to the audience. In such a case the theme (Vastu) itself receives better attention from the spectators and we know that the above two Nāṭakas start with a critical situation of the main story, borrowed from the source. On the other hand, in a Nāṭaka like V.Sam where there is no such striking innovation in the plot or deviation from the known conclusion as in the source, the hero becomes the main centre of attraction and the poet takes special care in his characterisation. Such a Nāṭaka may be started with the introduction of the hero on the stage. Bhima in the V.Sam captures the audience at the very starting of the play. The drama Abhi.śaku begins with the Artha-bija, i.e., with the entrance of the king as chasing a deer, but very soon the poet creates opportunity of sowing the Phala-bija in the form of a benediction showered on the king by the ascetics. The drama Ratnāvalī practically begins with the Phala-bija. After the exit of the Sūtradhāra, the minister Yougandharāyaṇa enters and almost expresses the ultimate end to be achieved by the king.

17. Bhima is the hero of the V.Sam; though arguments in favour of Yudhiṣṭhira may also be adduced. Sūt. supports the case of Bhima. Cf. Bhā. pra. p. 207. 1.2. Bhīmasya veṇīsamhūre phalayogo'tra darśitaḥ.

The above three Bījas, as described by Mg. must be there in every drama but any one of them may get prominence due to the nature of the theme, as shown above. Mg's above observation thus seems to be based on a close study of the actual practice. Ag. also maintains that in different dramas Bīja may be of different forms. The sowing of the Bīja may be done by indicating the means or the Phala, or both and the Phala may be of different varieties. The ND. reiterates what has been said in the Abhi. bhā.

**Bindu (Sign of continuity)**

Sgn. quotes the definition of Bindu from the NS. and according to his interpretation Bindu is the cause of the continuity of the action up to the end when its main purpose (pradhāna prayojana) is interrupted by some subsidiary issues. He illustrates Bindu with the verse "Lākṣāgrḥānala" etc., from the V.Sam. and comments that in the verse the succession of wrongs done by Duryodhana has been referred to.

19. It is not, however, intended to suggest that Mg. actually formulated his theory after a close study of the dramas referred to above. Only the cogency of his thesis has been discussed with reference to the dramas known to us. Mg. might have gone through dramas of similar type.


1. NLRK. 11. 162-163. Prayojanānāṁ vicchede yad avicchedakāraṇam/Yāvat samāptim kāryasya sa bindur iti kathyate // NS. GOS. XIX. 23. reads the second half as: - yāvat samāptir-bandhasya etc. The verse is quoted in the commentary on the An.(P.11) by Rudepāti, there the reading differs from that of the both above. ĀL. attributes (Abhi-sāku.P.69) this verse to Ādi-bharata.

2. NLRK. 11. 164-165.
and thus the continuity of action is maintained by showing the continuity of purpose, i.e., the destruction of the Kauravas. Neither the illustration nor Sgn.'s comment on it is expressive enough to give an idea of the Bindu. The illustration is practically the opening verse of the V.Śm. and as such the interruption of the main purpose by subsidiary issues giving scope for the Bindu does not arise here at all. Śdt. informs us that according to Kohala when the main purpose (phala) of the Bija is disconnected by subsidiary purposes, Bindu is the cause of its continuation. This is also what Sgn. means. Śdt. again says:—Lākṣā-grhānaletyādi bindoḥ sāmānyalakṣaṇam. Śdt. here seems to be influenced by Sgn. and offers a clue to the exposition of the latter's view on Bindu. The verse 'Lākṣāgrhāhāmala' etc., indicates the main purpose of the drama and continuity of this purpose acts as a connecting link where there is a break in the main motif. So, this verse has been taken to be a 'śāmānyalakṣṇa' of the Bindu. Like the Bija the Bindu also continues throughout the play.

Sgn. records two other views on Bindu according to the first of which it is the basic factor of the theme of a drama which is voiced in every act with indignation and firmness till the end of the action. The view is really significant.

3. NLRK. ll. 166-172.
4. Bhā. pra. p. 204. ll. 13-14; RS. p. 210. III. ll. gives almost a similar definition of Bindu. The DR. also means the same in (I.17), āvāntarārtha - viccheda bindur-accheda-kāraṇam. The SD (VI.66) follows the DR.
5. Bhā. pra. p. 204. l. 17.
Continuity is shown here "in the form of pivotal idea, recurring in each Act."
The pulling of Draupadi's hair has been voiced in every Act of the V. sam. with
indignation, and the resolution of self sacrifice by Jīmūtavāhana has been men-
tioned with firmness in the Nāgānanda. These are two well-known instances of the
reference to the main urge behind the action in every Act. Besides these two Sgn.
cites two other illustrations, one from the Rāghavābhuyudaya and other from the
Jānakirāgava. Sdt. holds also a similar view and states that Bindu may be due to
'māna' or 'vipatti' the former is expressed through anger and the latter through
grief.

7. NLRK, Eng. Tra. Dr. Raghavan's introduction. p.7. Dr. S.N. Shastri seems to
have confused this view with that of Kohola in the statement "Kohola makes the idea
very clear when he says that Bindu is that occasional reference to the main motif
of action etc." Cf. LPSD. p. 86.

8. NLRK. 11.174-182. Rāghavābhuyudaya is a lost Rāma-play from which there are
as many as fourteen citations in the NLRK. The SD. contains one citation and that
also seems to be taken from the NLRK. Cf. NLRK. 1.1796 and SD. (below VI. 210), the
illustration of the alāṅkāra Nivedana. For details of the drama see SOLRP. p.74 ff.
Rucipati (An. rā. p.11) also points out that Lākṣāgrāhāna etc., of the V. sam is Mānala-
ksaṇo Bindu. M. Dillon (NLRK. P.69, f.n.2) informs us that a verse, stated by Sgn.
(11.1660-1663) as taken from the Rāghavābhuyudaya, is found to be attributed to
Viśākhadatta in the Saduktikārmahṛta-(1.46.5). This may be taken to be a case of
error and from this the drama cannot be assigned to Viśākhadatta.

Another view on Bindu has been discussed in the form of an illustration by Sgn. It is said that the representation of successive slaughter of Mārica, Khara with his hosts, Kumbhakarna and Indrajit is the Bindu in a theme depicting the killing of Rāvana. Similarly, the killing of Drona etc., is so in a play describing the destruction of the Kauravas. But the description of successive losses sustained by the enemy has been shown by Sgn. to be the characteristic of Niyatāpti according to Āśmakutṭa and this has been discussed before. The view seems to imply that it is only in the stage of Niyatāpti Bindu is the cause of continuity (acchedakāraṇa). Before this stage the certainty of the final achievement cannot be disclosed for the sake of dramatic suspense. In Niyatāpti a clear idea of the final achievement of the hero can be formed by the audience and as such a real connection is established between the past stages and the future Phalāgama. This view has not been referred to by any other authority and cannot be deduced from the text of Bharata. Moreover, Bindu as a connecting element may be required to be employed in any stage of the action of a drama.

Ag. seems to maintain that Bindu is the hero's knowledge of the connecting link when in course of the action, the employment of means for the attainment of the desired object becomes disconnected by something else. Arthaprakṛtis are means according to Ag. and this knowledge of the connecting link also acts as means so far as the progress of the action is concerned. According to this view the constant employment of means for the final attainment, i.e., the gradual progress

11. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 13.prayujya phalam yairupāyamāsthāmaiḥ teṣām itivrtta-vāśad-avasyakartvātādībhiv-vicchede 'pi sāti yadantu-sandhānātmakaṃ pradhāna-nāyaka-gatam sandhi-dravyajñānam bindah/. The reading 'Pradhāna-nāyaka gatam' seems to be questionable. Ag. himself says that the connection may be established by the efforts of the ministers of the hero, as will be shown forthwith.
towards the final end, constitutes the main thread of the action. This progress may be side-tracked due to the subsidiary elements of the story. In such cases the playwright revives the main current of the story tactfully by representing the character or characters aiming at the final achievement as conscious about the employment of means. Ag. further seems to mean that under different circumstances in different dramas, the hero himself or his associates or both may be represented as searching after the means for the final achievement and as such, the revival of the main current of the theme (Bindu) may also be represented as due to the effort of the hero or his associates or both. It is also clearly stated by Ag. that both Bija and Bindu continue throughout the action and the difference between the two is that the scope of the latter originates after that of the former. From the above discussion it appears that there is no two opinions so far as the basic function of the Bindu is concerned. Sgn. offers three views regarding the nature of the Bindu and the last two are referred to as those maintained by others. The first view, evidently his own, follows the line of Kohala, as presented by Sdt. This one is the generally accepted view on Bindu. The second one is really significant, inasmuch as it shows that a single idea maintains the continuity throughout the action of a drama. Both the views have been recorded by Sdt. without any line of demarcation drawn between the two. The third view, referred to by Sgn., has been shown to be an obsolete one. Ag. elaborates the matter and shows how Bindu, as means originates and maintains the continuity of the action and also in so many words practically says the something as said by Kohala and partially supports the

13. Cf. supra, f.n. 4.
14. Ag. also seems to have partially supported this view when regarding the Bindu (NS. GOS. Vol.III. p.14) he says:—tathā hi tāpasa-vatsarāje vāsavadattā-premanusandhānam rājamukhena prayāṅkaṁ dārītāṁ/
second view, referred to in the NLRK. But in another place Ag. states that Bindu is the speech at the end of each Anka which connects the preceding Anka with the succeeding one. The ND. and the DR. also, maintain the same view. It is also interesting to note that in the commentary of the Nā-kaṭyavana has pointed out Bindu at the close of each Anka. The above view occurs in the discussion of Anka in both Abhi.bhā. and ND. The close of an Anka may be taken to be an occasion of the Bindu but certainly not the only one, and the above two works also do not mean so. Bindu may occur whenever there is a break in the main current of the story and at the close of an Anka it is to provide for a fresh impetus to the movement of the play.

The word Bindu, meaning a drop has been taken up in different works to elaborate the idea with the help of similes. Sān. says that as drops of water dripping from the sides of a thatch indicate the fall of water even when the rain is over, so, Bindu also indicates the purpose and maintains the continuity of the main action when it is interrupted by secondary issues. Ag. maintains that Bindu is like a drop of oil and the simile has been elaborated by Dhanika when he says that as a drop of oil spreads over the surface of water Bindu also is a wide-spreading element. Rucipati quotes a verse with similar meaning and attributes the same to Bharata. The verse, however, is not found in the present RV. The RV. draws

15. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 423. Pratyāṅkāntamyo binduḥ anusandhunūbhiddhāyī-विक्यमः
Cf. ND. p. 31. Purvottarayaṅkayor-asambaddhārthatvam mū bhūd-iti Purvottarasyamā Purvāṅkasyante bindur-nibandhanīyaḥ. DR. III. 37. Bindur-ante tu bijavat. This also seems to be the view of Kohala. Śrt. (Bhā. pra. p. 36. 1. 18) records that Kohala prescribes the use of Bindu at the close of an Anka (bindurante ca).


17. NLRK. II. 159-161. Bhoja maintains a similar idea. Śr. pra. (Vol. II) p. 482.


19. An., p. 11. Tailabinduryathā toye svāsāktyā vyūpya tiṣṭhati/ केव्याङ्गुनि ताथु binduḥ samdarṣya mukhyatā (अम? ) vrajet //
a very interesting simile on Bindu. It says that as drops of water being sprinkled to the root of the tree produce fruit, so also the Bindu is indicated again and again. This simile suits better with the view that holds Bindu as a pivotal idea, recurring in each Act.

Patākā (Episode)

It has been pointed out before that the plot of a drama is generally analysed in Indian dramaturgy as consisting of two Parts, - the Adhikārīka and the Prāsāṅgika, i.e., the principal and the secondary action. This secondary action or the subsidiary portion of the plot (Prāsāṅgika-vṛtta) is of two kinds, - the Patākā and Prakāra. The main difference between the two is that the duration of the former is longer than that of the latter.

The naming of the subsidiary portion of the action of longer duration as Patākā seems to have given rise to several conjectures regarding its exact significance. Sgn. says that as a banner on a pole, placed in a certain place indicates the whole army, so also the Patākā occupying a certain portion of the action exposes the entire play, 'नृत्ताकाकदेशावांती मुद्यांकम साकांम एव प्रकाशायाति (nṛtākākadeśā-vartini nāṭakam sakalam eva prakāśayati').

Ag. says that the episode (Patākā) is called a Patākā by tradition as it is useful. Dhanika maintains that as the banner is the symbol of the king, so also the


1. Dhanika Dr. p.4; Bha.pra. (p.201. 11. 11-12) includes Patākā-sthānaka also as a subdivision of the Prāsāṅgika-vṛtta. The matter will be taken up in connection with our discussion on the Patākāsthānakas.

2. MLR. 11. 186-188.

Patākā bears the special marks of the hero, so far as it helps him. Similar also seems to be the view of the RS. The subtle differences of views regarding the nature of Patākā, among above authorities, are brought home to us in the above. According to Sgn. Arthaprabhaktis are elements of the plot and as such Patākā being an element helps the delineation of the entire plot, through its assistance to the main plot. According to Ag. Patākā, being a means, as all Arthaprabhaktis are, is useful to the hero. Dhanika and Śīngabhūpāla state this more explicitly.

Sgn. quotes the definition of the Patākā directly from the RS. and adds a gloss on the same. Sgn. maintains that the existence of the Patākā is for the sake of another as it contributes to lead the main action to its goal. The Patākā (vṛttta) itself also assumes the character of the main action for the display of heroic quality. As an illustration of Patākā-nāyaka Sgn. cites the character of Karna in the V.sam and comments that though this character has been introduced to help Duryodhana yet itself displays its own valour and has been endowed with the qualities of a hero by the poet. It appears from the above that according to Sgn. Patākā may be the helper of even the Pratināyaka, i.e., the enemy of the Pradhāna-nāyaka.

Sgn. further says that Patākā according to some is the action of the Upanāyaka and it is 'sthūlārtha'. According to this view, adds Sgn., what is done by the Upanāyaka (secondary hero) coming forward (Pradhānyam avalamvya) to help the main hero, constitutes Patākā; as the activities of Nakaranda in the Mālatī-mādhava, coming to the help of Mādhava.

4. Avaloka. DR. p. 43 RŚ. pp. 210-211.
5. NLRK. 11. 189-190. Yad-vṛttam hi parārtāmp syāt Pradhānasayopakārakam/ Pradhāna-vacca kalpeta patākā sābhidhīyate // iŚ. GOS. XIX. 24.
7. NLRK. 11. 195-198. According to Ag. (NLRK. 1.465) 'mitra-sampat' is Patākā, but this 'mitra-sampat' belongs to whom has not been stated.
The Bhā. pra. and the RS. explicitly state that the 'upanāyaka-vṛttānta' is the Patākā. Sdt. maintains that the Patākā-nāyaka is almost equal to the main hero (tatsamāna). Ag. cites the characters of Sugrīva and Vibhiṣaṇa, as Patākā-nāyakas. Dhanika maintains that characters like Sugrīva etc., which help the hero are Patākās. Visvanātha also holds the view that the Patākā-nāyaka should always be an ally of the main hero. It is evident then that Sgn.'s view that an ally of the 'Pratināyaka' also may be taken to be the leader of the Patākā is opposed to the views of almost all the reputed authorities on dramaturgy. It is easy to understand the position of Ag. and others who take the Arthāprakṛtis as means for the final achievement of the hero (Prayojana-siddhi-hetavah or phala-hetavah). Either by the 'Pratināyaka' or by his ally no 'Prayojana-siddhi' of the main hero is possible if not in an indirect way. The NS. says that the Patākā is 'pradhānasyapakāraka' and 'pradhānavat'. Ag. and others take the word 'Pradhāna' to mean the main hero, while Sgn. seems to have taken the word as referring to the main plot itself. In a drama where the main theme is related to a struggle between the hero and his enemy (nāyaka and pratināyaka), both of them should be considered as 'pradhānas'. Both the characters are equally important as the main plot rests on both. In such a drama an ally of the either may be called a Patākā-nāyaka if only he satisfies other conditions. In dramas where there are no such struggle the ally of the hero may occupy the position of a Patākā-nāyaka if otherwise suitable. This seems to be the view of Sgn. The drama V. Sam. mainly describes the struggle between Bhīma and Duryodhana and Karna an ally of the latter whose 'vṛtta' bears the marks of the 'Pradhāna', may

8. Bha. pra. P. 201. 11. 14, 16; RS. p. 211.
9. Abhi. bha. NS. Gos. Vol. III. p.15; Avaloka, Dh. p.4. Cf. also Dh. II.
8, and Avaloka p. 40.
10. SD. below VI. 67 yathā-rāmacarite sugrīvadeh, venyām Bhīmādeh, sākuntale vidūṣakasya caritam. Bhīma may be called the hero of the drama according to modern taste. Sdt. actually calls him so as has already been pointed out.
rightly be called a 'Patākā-nāyaka' from the above point of view. The view that the 'upanāyaka-carīta' is the Patākā is 'sthūlārtha-varṇana' according to Sgn. Here he seems to mean that generally the 'Upanāyaka', who is an ally of the hero, is considered to be a 'Patākā-nāyaka' but not everywhere. The 'vṛttta' of the 'Pratināyaka' himself in dramas like the V. saṃ., cannot be called a Patākā as he also aspires for the achievement and his struggle against the main hero constitutes the main plot; in short, his 'vṛttta' according to Sgn. is also 'Pradhāna'.

Regarding the problem whether a Patākā-nāyaka may be depicted as gaining some end or not, Sgn. maintains silence but clearly states that the Prakārī should be of shorter duration serving always the interests of others and not of its own. It appears then that some sort of incidental gain may be shown of the Patākā-nāyaka where it is possible at all, according to the NLRK. Sgn. seems to have given stress on the merits of the Patākā-nāyaka and not on his gain. The ally of a 'prati-nāyaka' cannot be described as gaining some end in a drama as the defeat of the 'Prati-nāyaka' himself in any Sanskrit drama is a settled fact. There is, however, no difficulty of showing the gains of a helper of the main hero who is sure to win.

Ag. maintains that Patākā, though means, as all Arthāprakṛtis are, and as such serves other's interests; the hero of the Patākā-vṛttta may be described as serving his own interests too. This is evident in the characters of Vibhiṣaṇa, Makaranda etc. The Bhā. prā., the ND., the RS. and the NC. hold that the Patākā-nāyaka also achieves his own object of desire. The DR. does not specifically say anything regarding the problem but from its definition of the Prāsaṅgika-vṛttta it

appears that both Patakā and Prakāri may be delineated as having incidental gains. 

Visvanātha appears to be apparently self-contradictory when in the same breath he enjoins:

Patakā-nāyakasya syān-na svakiya-phalāntaram /

Garbhe-sandhau Vimarsé vā nirvāhas-tasya jāyate //

and, - yathā sugrīvādeh rājyaprāptyādi / A host of suggestions to mitigate the difficulty in finding out the exact significance of the above extract, have been offered both by classical and modern critics. The suggestion that the portion of the Patakā-vrtta which deals with the personal achievement of the 'Patakā-nāyaka' should not be treated as Patakā proper, is untenable, at least Visvanātha seems to have given no such indication. The second half of the verse and the illustration, taken together, may mean that the 'svartha-lābha' of the Patākā-nāyaka is to be depicted within the Vimarsa-sandhi. But the first half of the verse explicitly denies any separate 'Phala' of the Patakā. What exactly Visvanātha means here is not clear. The whole may be taken to mean that the 'Patakā-nāyaka' should not have any separate 'Phala', (svakiya-phalāntara), whatever the 'Patakā-nāyaka' gains is but incidental and ultimately comes to the help of the hero. The 'rājya-

labha' of Sugrīva, is not a separate 'Phala-lābha' but a means through which the hero himself gets an ally. This 'mitra-lābha' of the hero is to be shown latest in the Vimarsa-sandhi.

Regarding the extent of Patakā's duration in a drama the NS. says:- āgarbhād 

āvimarsād vā patakā vinivartate / According to Ag. the verse enjoins that the

15. LPSD. pp. 74-75.
16. NS. GOS. XIX. 29.
achievement of the desired object of the 'Patākā-nāyaka', is to be depicted either in the Pratimukha or in the Garbha Sandhi. After that, says Ag., the 'Patākā-nāyaka' can persist being engaged in the assistance of the principal hero and in that case the designation Patākā may be applied, not of course in the primary sense of the term but simply because it was termed so before. Moreover, the existence of the 17 Patākā in the Vimarśa-sandhi is almost essential according to Ag. Then it comes that according to Ag. the Patākā may exist up to the last Sandhi but the achievement of the 'Patākānāyaka' should be depicted before the Vimarśa-sandhi. Viśvanātha also 18 informs us that this is the opinion of Ag. The ND. makes this point more clear. It has got no objection to take the 'ān' both in the sense of 'ubhividhi' and 'maryādā'.

17. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p.18. . . ā garbhad-āvimarsād-veti Pratimukhe garbhe yadi va/ yam arthaṃ vyāpyānivartate Patākātvrttāṃ tāvatyeva patākā-nāyakasya svaphala-siddhir upa-nibandhanyā, siddha-phalastvasau Pradhāna-phala eva vyāpriyamāna āsindopi bhūta-pūrva-gatyā Patākā-sābda-vācyo na mukhyatvena /....vinipāta-pratikūra-pradhāna-(Text reads...Pratikaraḥ pradhāna-vimarśa etc. which seems to be corrupt) vimarśa-sandhau prastutopayogaḥ Patākāyāḥ/ It is evident that Ag. attaches much importance to the Svārtha-lābha of the 'Patākā-nāyaka'. The correctness of the underlined portion of the text is questionable. Ag. further says that 'ān' in 'āgarbhad' - etc., of the above is to be taken in the sense of 'abhividhi' and criticises the view that takes it in the sense of 'maryādā' as untenable. Cf. (P.18) abhividāvān / ye tu māryādāyāṃ tam vyācakṣate te na samya-gamaṃsata /. But in that case the 'Phala-lābha' of the 'Patākā-nayaka' cannot be restricted in the second and third Sandhis only. The view of the ND. as given below, seems to be more reasonable.

18. SD. p. 353 Yattu muninoktam - āgarbhad-vā Vimarśād-vā patākā vinivartate/ iti tatra patāketi patākā-nāyaka-phalam nirvahapa-paryantam api patākāyāḥ pravṛtti-darśanāt, iti vyākhyātam abhinavagupta-pādāḥ /
According to the ND. thus, the achievement of the 'Patākā-nāyaka' may be depicted in any one of the first four Sandhis. The ND. further states that the Patākā, as means, helps the main action and as such the achievement of the desired object of the 'Patākā-nāyaka' cannot be depicted in the Nirvahaṇa Sandhi where the final attainment of the main hero is to be shown. This seems to be the most reasonable view. The DR. is silent regarding the duration of the Patākā, so also the position of the RS. and the NC.

Here also Sgn. seems to hold an unfamiliar view. He says:-

Sa ca garbhe avamarṣe ca nivartata iti nātyantikam etad avagamātavyam.

This observation of Sgn. undoubtedly refers to the verse of the NS. quoted above. It appears that unlike the Abhi. bhā. and the ND., the NLRK. takes Patākā here to mean the subsidiary action and not the achievement of the Patākā-nāyaka. According to the NLRK. then, the operation of the Patākā may be completed either in the Garbha-sandhi or in the Vimarśa-sandhi. But this should not be taken as an universal rule. (ātyantika), i.e., the Patākā may continue upto the last Sandhi also.

In conclusion it may be pointed out that any achievement of the desired object by a Patākā hero is purely incidental. The presence of more than one motif

21. M.Dillon translates the above statement of Sgn. as,- "And it is completed in the 'garbha' juncture or the 'avamarṣa' juncture. This is not to be carried through to the very end. Cf. NLRK. Eng. Tra. p.11. But syntactically the pronoun 'Sa' in Sgn.'s statement undoubtedly refers to Patākā, and 'etat' through 'Iti' refers to 'saca...nivartata'. The sentence thus means,- (The statement) that Pataka comes to an end in the Garbha or Vimarśa, should not be taken as 'ātyantika'. 
in a drama has never been favoured in India either in practice or in theory. There are many Patākā-nāyakas having no personal interest in our dramatic literature. In cases of military alliances the dramatists generally depict some sort of 'svārtha-labhā' of the 'Patākā-nāyaka' through the cooperation of the main hero. This is done simply to convince the audience that the alliance between the Patākā-nāyaka and the main hero is strong enough to withstand the trial of adversity. Vibhīṣaṇa and Sugrīva, two well known 'Patākā-nāyakas' of Rāma plays, are depicted as assisting Rāma whole heartedly being highly grateful by latter's co-operation in their own cause. The gain of Makaranda in the Mā-mā has been shown just to heighten the effect of the drama by introducing parallelism. The gain of the 'Patākā-nāyaka' is to be depicted logically before or in the Vimarṣa-sandhi because for the sake of 'Vinipāta-pratikāra'; the help of the 'Patākā-nāyaka' is essential here as stated by Sgn. Moreover, there are many 'Patākā-nāyakas' like the Vidūṣakas or ministers in Sanskrit dramas, in whose cases no achievement is depicted. Thus the achievement of the 'Patākā-nāyaka' is purely an incidental affair and Sgn. seems to have found no necessity of mentioning this point particularly. The NS. also does not state anything explicitly regarding the matter.

Prakarī (Incident)

Sgn. quotes the definition of Prakarī from the NS. and adds a gloss on the same, which means that the Prakarī should have no uninterrupt development (nairantarāyena Pravartanaṁ tena vihīnam) and that its necessity is for the sake of other's interest. That the Prakarī serves other's interest only comes from its derivative meaning according to Ag. The duration of the Prakarī is also very short.

These are the two characteristics which differentiate it from Patāka. The ND. maintains that the Prakārī is not essential like the Patāka in a drama. But it will be shown that even the Patāka is not 'avasyambhāvi' in every drama or even in every Nāṭaka. From Dhananjaya's definition of the Prāṣaṅgika-vṛtta as given before, it appears that like Patāka the Prakārī may have its 'svārtha', a view which is supported by none. The general opinion regarding the Prakārī is that it is almost an interesting casual incident occupying a small portion of the whole action.

Sgn. upholds the utility of Prakārī as a decorative device of the plot and says that like a floral design (puṣpa-prakara) it produces beauty. The Bhū. pra. seems to have taken up this idea of floral decoration but have gone a step further. It says that as flowers and 'akṣatas' are for the beauty of the religious rites so also the description of the Prakārī in a composition.

5. Ā. NLRK. I. 199.
   tathātra varṇānādīstau Prabandhe Prakarera-bhavet //

The RS. (p.211) quotes the above from the Bhū. pra. but reads the second half as:-
   tathā tu varṇānādīstau Prasāṅgau prakārī bhavet //

RB also quotes from the Bhū. pra. the same passage with a different reading of the second half of the verse yielding a new meaning. Abhi. sāku. p.168, -
   "athartuvarṇānādīstau prasāṅgau prakārī bhavet". On the authority of this reading RB. calls the description of the spring season in the Act.VI. of the Abhi. sāku as Prakārī. The contention that the description of a season in a relevant place is Prakārī is quite a new idea. But how a simple description can be taken to be an Arthaprakṛti is not known to us.
As an example of Prakari Sgn. cites the incident of Rāvaṇa and Jaṭāyus from the Kulapatyanka. It is interesting to note that the same illustration has been cited by the Bhā. pra. and the SD. The ND. also says that in Rāma plays Jaṭāyus is Prakari. As an example of a 'Prakari - nāyaka' Ag. cites Vāsudeva from the V. Sam.

Kārya (Denouement, Object, Purpose to be achieved)

Every serious Sanskrit drama, as a rule, ends in some sort of achievement of the hero which is called 'phala-yoga'. In our previous discussion on the fifth Āvasthā, it has been shown that the dramatist also aspires for the attainment of some end. Kārya may be described as the consummation of the end both on the part of the principal hero of the drama and the dramatist himself.

Sgn. seems to have taken Kārya in the sense of the main purpose to be served in a drama i.e., the main undertaking for which the action begins and when it is accomplished, the drama ends. Now it is generally found that many purposes are served at the conclusion of the action. For example, the death of Rāvaṇa in a Rāma-play may serve several purposes like the recovery of Sītā, the killing of an enemy of the gods and country alike, the victory of Dharma etc. But the poet aims at one as the main and there may be subsidiary purposes which enrich the main purpose, says Sgn. Thus Kārya according to Sgn. is the main purpose for the accomplish-

8. ND. p. 41.
1. NLRK. 11. 209-210. Yadarthe kāvyā ārambhuḥ (kāvyāārambhuḥ ?) siddhe yasmin samāpanam/ ānuśāṅgika-sampannaṁ tat kāryam iti kathyate //

The SD (VI. 69-70, p. 353) gives a very similar description of Kārya, ēpekṣitaṁ yat sādhyan ārambhō yannibandhanāḥ/ Samāpanaṁ tu yat siddhyai tat kāryam iti samamatam/

It may be pointed out here that according to this definition the Kārya cannot be called a 'Prayojana-siddhi-hetuj' as maintained by Viśvanātha himself (Cf. SD. p. 353). In that case the purpose and the means become the same thing.
ment of which the action begins and ends when it is finally accomplished. At the conclusion the true nature of the Kārya is revealed to the audience.

In support of his view Sgn. quotes from the NS. and as a gloss on it adds that there are two Kāryas, one is Ādhikārika and the other is Prāsāngika. Here Kārya seems to be identified with the 'itivṛtta' which has got two elements Adhikārika and Prāsāngika. Sgn's treatment of the matter here is a bit of confused nature, the word Kārya has been used here loosely. According to Sgn. Arthaprakṛtis are elements of the plot, as discussed above; Kārya being an element cannot be taken to be the entire plot. Perhaps Sgn. means to say here that Kārya as an Arthaprakṛti is the purpose related to the Ādhikārikavrūta; otherwise the entire 'itivṛtta' is Kārya i.e., for some purpose. The main purpose in a drama is represented as served with the final achievement of the main hero. The main hero is one, says Sgn., who brings the representation of the drama invested with Liya, Bindu, etc., to a close and by whom everything is represented as completed. He also enjoys, adds Sgn., the fruit in the form of Dharma (doing good to others), Kāma (winning the desired woman) and Artha (attainment of something rare). Thus a subtle difference between the Kārya and Phala has been drawn by Sgn.

2. NLRK. 11. 211-215. Yadāha bhārataḥ :-

Yadādhi kārikam kāryam pūrvameva prakīrtitam /

tadartho yāḥ samārambha-stat kāryam iti kīrtitam//

NS. GOS. XIX. 26. The reading here differs from that of the NLRK., mainly in the first half of the verse. The GOS. text reads 'Vastu' instead of 'kāryam' of the NLRK. But the reading of the NLRK. is supported by one ms. (ya) as given in the GOS. version.

RB, quotes the verse in his Arthadyotanikā (Abhi.śaku. P.230) and attributes it to Matṛgupta. RB's reading tallies with that of the GOS. text.

3. NŚ. GOS. XIX. 2. quoted in the NLRK. 11. 218-219.

4. NLRK. 11. 257-261.
It has been shown before that Ag. takes the Arthaprakṛtis as means. Kārya as an Arthaprakṛti is definitely 'means' according to Ag. What can be made out of the confused text of the Abhi-bhā is this:

In the achievement of the hero various means in the form of resources both physical and mental and their proper employment are represented as adopted by the Pradhānā-nāyaka, Patākānāyaka and Prakārī-nāyaka (Pradhānā-nāyaka-Patākānāyaka-Prakārī-nāya-ścetana-rūpāh). The Bīja is the chief of all these means (Pradhānāsya bījā-khyopāyasya) and all other means which contribute to the final fruition of the 5 Bīja constitute what is meant by Kārya. The ND. follows this opinion of Ag. fully.

"But this meaning of Kārya", points out Dr. Kulkarni, "is rather unusual and even the Abhi-bhā and the ND., not to speak of other theorists, take the term Kārya to mean Phala or Sādhya in the treatment of Avasthās and Sandhyāngas". It is evident that there is a confusion regarding the exact implication of the Kārya. Ag. takes all the Arthaprakṛtis as means (Phalahetavah), but Kārya has been taken in several places of the Abhi-bhā, to mean Phala. Now the Phala and Phala-hetu cannot be the samething. The position of the ND. also is similar to that of the Abhi-bhā. Dhanān-jaya and Dhanika frankly asserts that Kārya is nothing but the Phala which is Tri-varga in the form of Dharmārthakāma. Here also the inconsistency is apparent,

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
5. NS. Gos. Vol. III. pp.15-16...Cetanaś kāryate phalam iti vyutpatyā (kāryam)///tena janapada-kosā-durgādika-vyāpā-ra-vāicitryaṃ sāmādyupāya-varga ityetat sarvam kārye antarbhaavati/tatra param prathama-parigṛhirhitaḥ pradhānabhūtō bhyupāyo bijatvenoktaḥ /
6. ND. p. 42.
8. DR. I. 16 and Awałoka on it.
according to the DR. also the Arthaprakṛtis are means. RS. and NC. also take the word Kārya to mean Phala and according to the former the Phala is trīvarga. According to the RS. the Arthaprakṛtis are parts of the story and hos. part of the story can be regarded as the Phala is not known to us. The Bhā. pra. takes ṣādhya, Kārya and Phala in the same sense and this Phala is trīvarga. Sdt. mitigates the confusion as he, following Sgn., takes the Arthaprakṛtis as elements of the plot (kathū-śārīra-hetavāḥ).

Dr. Kulkarni points out that Prof. H.K. Dhruva's attempt to draw a distinction between Kārya, the object of the play, and Kārya the Arthaprakṛti is baseless. According to Dr. Kulkarni "Kārya is the main drive for the hero's action and as such a means to the end." The said scholar further observes, "The SD. gives slaying of Rāvaṇa as an example of the Kārya. Taking a clue from it one may say that with the killing of Rāvaṇa, Śītā's recovery is as good as achieved which is the fruition of the Bīja. Thus Kārya may be taken as the event immediately antecedent to the final fruition (Phalagama)". It may be pointed out in favour of Ag., that there is no material difference between the means and the phala, bija the Chief of the means transforms into Phala with the assistance of other means and Kārya is nothing but this transformation and as such it is a 'hetu'.

As a résumé of the above it may be said that in Indian dramaturgy there are as good as three different schools of thought regarding the exact implication of the term Arthaprakṛti which has already been discussed above. That the Putākā and Prakārī

constitutes what is called the Ānuṣaṅgika or Prēṣaṅgika, vṛtta has been accepted by all including the NS, and this is evident from the description of the two. The DR; Bhā. prā. ND. and the RS. explicitly mention this fact. Curiously enough the Bhā. prā. includes the Patākā-sthānakas with Patākā and Prakārī us constituting Ānuṣaṅgika-vṛtta. But this is not after the NS, and is also supported by none.

Sgn. concludes his discussion on the Artha-prakṛtis with the remark that sometimes one of these five may get prominence and the others may become subordinate. In his support he quotes from the NS a verse which means that anyone of these five Artha-prakṛtis may get prominence in cases where some special purpose is served by it and is deemed more useful, the others becoming subordinate. ag. in his commentary on the same verse remarks that unlike the five Kāryāvasthās, which are equally essential in every drama, any Artha-prakṛti may become main when it serves the purpose of the hero best; others though may exist become as non-existent. But Bīja, Lindu and Kārya are essential in every case though there may be prominence of the one over the other. In short, the prominence of a particular Artha-prakṛti in a drama depends, according to Ag., upon its usefulness in serving the interests of the main hero. Sgn. is silent about the problem whether the Patākā or Prakārī or the both may be absent in a plot. The ND., evidently more following Ag., clearly states that if not required by the main hero, the Patākā and Prakārī may be omitted altogether. Where the hero does not require any help

13. NLRK. 1. 234.
14. NLRK. 11.235-236. NS. GOS. XIX. 27. eṣāṃ tu yasya yenaर्थo yataśca gūṇa iṣyate/ tat pradhānaṃ tu kārtaṇyāṁ gūṇabhūtānyataḥ param //
15. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 16... na sarvatra prārambhādīvat sarva artha-prakṛtya'pi/api tu yasya sāyakasya yenaṛthaprakṛti-viśeṣeṇa prayaōjana-sampattir-adhikā tadeva pradhānam, anyattu bhavadapi gūṇa-bhūtam. asatkalpaṃ,...bīja-lindu-kāryāṇi tu sarvatrānapāyīni/tatprāpica gūṇa-pradhāna-lāvah/
then only the three means Bija, Bindu and Karya may serve the purpose. Bija and Bindu are considered to be 'mukhya' by the ND, as they pervade the entire plot. Among the rest the Karya may be regarded as more prominent. Ramachandra refers to his drama Satyabariscandra, where there is no Prasangika-vrtta.

According to the RS, the Patākā and Prakāri are always subsidiary and even Bija etc., in some places may come under the subsidiary division, the 'āṅga'. But this is undoubtedly a curious view and finds support from none.
