CHAPTER-V

TREATMENT OF CHARACTERS
IN THE DRAMAS OF
BHĀRTENDU
HARĪŚHCHANDRA
&
LAKŠHMĪNĀṬH BEZBAROAĀ
5.00 INTRODUCTION:

As stated in our previous chapters that both Bhārtendu Harishchandra and Laksmināth Bezbaroa were famous dramatists who enriched their respective literatures with their dramas along with other writings. Both of them tried to reform their own societies by influencing readers and the audience directly or indirectly through dramas. With this end in view both of them created various characters and tried to translate their ideas into action through them. They selected characters from different walks of life and through them depicted various problems of the society. Therefore it is necessary to analyse the characters depicted by both of them.

The characters depicted by Bhārtendu and Bezbaroa in the dramas under consideration can be classified into two classes—Primary (Mukhya) and Secondary (Gauna).

5.1 CHARACTERS DEPICTED BY BHĀRTENDU:

Bhārtendu was a wise litterateur of his age. Therefore, he selected the plots of his dramas touching the country, society and religion. The view point of Bhārtendu relating the point was quite liberal and wide. Therefore, the life-force of the society was inherent in his writings. Bhārtendu followed a traditional method in selecting the characters of his drama. His views on the heroes are.

“विनयशीलता, वदान्यता, दक्षता, क्षिप्रता, शैर्ष, प्रियभाषिता, लोकरंजकता।
वास्तविक प्रभृति गुणसमूह सम्यन सृद्धशस्मभूत युवा को नायक होने का
अधिकार है।”

It is found that Bhārtendu has accepted fully the basis of Sanskrit 'Natyashastra'.

In addition to the hero, Bhārtendu regarded the 'Vidushak' as a necessary character. But he realised that the Vidushak is not indispensable to all forms of dramas. He has taken characters from all walks of life. There are two types of characters available in his dramas - idealists (Satya Harishchandra) and realistic social (Prem Yogini). Being ancient (Satī Pratāp) and historical (Nildevī), the heroes and heroines had the sense of ideal in them.

The following are the main characters in his dramas: Maharaj Griddharaj (Vaidiki Hinsā Hinsā Na Bhawati); Rāmchandra (Prem-Yogini); Bhandāchāryya (Viśashya Viśhamauṣhadham); Chandrāwali (Shri Chandrāwali); Bhārat (Bhārat Durdasha); Bhārat Janani (Bhārat Janani). Nildevī (Nildevī); Chaupatta Rajā (Andher Nagaṛī), Sāvitrī (Satī Pratāp Sāvitrī) and so on.

5.1:1 THE MAIN MALE CHARACTERS IN THE DRAMAS OF BHĀRTENDU:

(a) GRIDDHARĀJ:

Mahārāj Griddharāj is the symbol of those kings and rich people in the ‘Vaidiki Hinsā Hinsā Na Bhawati’, who supported the priests and accepted the wrong interpretation of religion only to fulfil their carnal desires. The main aim of Griddharāj's life was:

"जुआ, मदिरा और नारी संग बिहार ॥"

The statement of Chitragupta made the character of Griddharāj more clear:

"राजा जन्म से पाप में रत रहा, इसने धर्म को अधर्म माना और अधर्म को धर्म माना, जो जी चाहा किया और उसकी व्यवस्था पूर्ण हो गईं। लाखों जीव का इसने नाश किया और हजारों घड़े मंदिर के पी गया या आझ सर्वथा धर्म की रक्षा। अहिंसा, सत्य, शौच, दया, शान्ति और तप आदि सभ्य धर्म इसने एक न किया, जो कुछ किया वह केवल विकंडा कर्म-जाल किया, जिसमें मांस भक्षण और मंदिर पीने को मिले, और परमेश्वर-प्रीत्यर्थ इसने एक कोड़ी भी नहीं व्यय की, जो कुछ व्यय किया सब नाम और प्रतिष्ठा पाने के हेतु। 3"

The king was always willing to get honour and celebrity through all his activities—good or evil, under the cover of religion. The character of Griddharaj is based on reality.

(b) RĀMCHANDRA:

Rāmchandra is a character in the drama—'Prem Yogini'. Here Bhārtendu himself seems to appear as Rāmchandra in the play. In this drama one can find several hints about the life of Bhārtendu. In the preamble the Sutradhar also hinted at Bhārtendu:

"................. हम लोगों का परम बन्धु पिता-मित्र-पुत्र सब भावनाओं
से भावित, प्रेम की एकमात्र मूर्ति, सत्य का एकमात्र आश्रय, सोजन्य का
एकमात्र पात्र, भारत का एकमात्र हित, हिंदी का एकमात्र जनक, भाषा
नाटक का एकमात्र जीवनदाता, हरिशंकर ही दुखी हो। ...... स्मरण स्वर्णों
वे कोड़े ऐसे ही रहेंगे और तुम लोक बहिष्कृत होकर भी इनके सिर पर पेंर

3. Bhārtendu Samagra, p-316.
In the background of such emotion there is a hint at the difficult and pitiable circumstances of Bhārtendu's life. When there was the distribution of their property, his grandmother, knowing the prodigal nature of Bhārtendu, gave his share to his elder brother. Bhārtendu gave expression to his own specialities of love for poetry and music through the character Rāmchandra.

(c) BHANDĀCHĀRYYA:

Bhandāchāryya is such a character in the 'Vishashya Vishamaushadham' that he could express any situation in front of the audience through his acting and dialogues in humour, satire and music, which could make the desired subject clear to the audience. The interpretation of Bhandāchāryya is useful to readers. The hero Malhār Rāo did not come under the cunning class due to his behaviour, but Bhandāchāryya may be grouped under that class:

"देखो पर-स्त्री संग से चन्द्रमा यथार्थि लोच्चित हैं तो भी जगत को आनन्द देता है वैसे ही (मोछिये पर हाथ फेरकर) हम बड़े कलकित सही पर हमी इस नगर की शोभा हैं। भला दुष्ट बाबा भट्ट क्रम हुआ, तुम्हें हमारा सब भेद खोल दिया, इस भेद खुलने पर भी हमने तुम्हें और कृपण्डावाइ दोनों को न छकाया तो मेरा नाम भंडाचार्य नहीं।" 

4. ibid, p-406.
5. Bhārtendu Harishchandra, Brajaratna Dās, p-106.
In the above dialogue, Bhandāchāryya expressed his own and others opinions on Malhār Rāo authoritatively. Here his skill of speaking and scholarship can easily be ascertained. His whole dialogue is in a soliloquy and there is no change of the scene. There is the 'Kaishiki Vṛtti' in it because of its 'Shringaar Rasa.' Being mixed up with abuse, the conversations are quite musical in tone. Citing some historical facts, Bhandāchāryya wondered at the progress of the British rule and gave his critical remarks as follows:

"भग्न य है ईश्वर! सन् 1599 में जो लोग सीदागें करने आए थे वे आज स्वतंत्र राजाओं को यों दुध की मक्खी बना देते हैं।"

According to Bhandāchāryya:

"राजा और देव बरबर होते हैं, ये जो करें सो देखते चलो चोलने की जगह ही नहीं"

In spite of being a single character in the drama, Bhandāchāryya produced different 'Rasas' through the use of proverbs and sayings and the humorous use of Padas, Slokas, Chutkulas etc. relating to a woman, which saved the audience from being bored.

(d) KRISHNA:

Krishna, the hero of the love-play 'Shrī Chandrāwālī' of Bhārtendu is steady and handsome. Being a steady and handsome hero, he was a skilled singer and had love with loving princess. Chandrāwālī, daughter of Chandrabhānu was also adept in music and lovable, who was devoted to Krishna. But due to fear Brajaswamini Rādhā, he could not meet Chandrāwālī.

\^ ibid, p-420.
Krishna appeared as the 'Lord Himself' in the fourth act of the drama:

"........... tumare ka tum aur ham to aak hi hai ne tum ham son joodi hote n pyari joo son. Hamne to phirte hi kahiee kii yeh sab lilee hain. (Hath joddak) pyari chiffa kariyo, ham tii tumhare sabun ke jinam jinam ke raniyain hain. Tumshe ham kaha urin hoi dibee kii nahin.

Both the virtues of being a lover and Godliness are seen in Krishna, while a beloved and devotee are in Chandrawali. In the drama Krishna is the 'Alamban Vibhav'. When at the departure of Krishna, Chandrawali was almost mad, he appeared in guise of a 'Yogin' but Chandrawali was almost senseless before the Yogin and then Krishna appeared in person. So Krishna was the 'Alamban Vibhav'. Krishna walked playfully throughout Braja with a healthy and satisfied mood.

(e) BHĀRAT:

In the 'Bhārat Durdashā', the character Bhārat is the symbol of Indians. It is the real depiction of the then environment in India. Bhārat was groaning amidst the ruins of civilisation and culture:

"ko hoye pyar hote hath. Boos koote sute hoye pefar main haa ha hoye

anuṭāth ||

Bhārat was very much eager for his own safeguard and protection. He was suffering from troubles and misfortunes and therefore, was restless. He prayed the Empress and the British for relief. Bhārat then remembered the

8. ibid, p-459.
9. ibid, p-461.
age of the Mahabharat and hinted at valour and courage of his predecessors when he uttered:

"हा! यह चही भूमि है जहाँ साक्षात् भगवान श्रीकृष्णचन्द्र के दृश्य करते पर भी वीरोत्तम दुर्योधन ने कहा था, 'सूच्याँ नैव दास्यामि बिना युद्धे वेदव में' और आज हम उसी की देखते हैं कि समस्यान हो रही है।"  

While depicting Bhārat, Bhartendu made the then thoughts and ideas of Indian people clear. The last picture of the hero, Bhārat is based on realities. The last part seems to be quite disappointing, but in reality it is due to his desire for uprooting the causes of India's evils and troubles. Bharat was not dead, but he fainted. So, hope still exist.

(f) BHĀRAT SANTĀN:

Bhārat Santān (Bhārat Janani) is the symbol the then Indian people. In them there is the lack of self-reliance; and therefore, they thought that their development and rising were impossible:

"पहला- माँ फिर अब हम क्या करें?
दूसरा - हम अपने माता के कर्ष को कैसे दूर करें?
तीसरा - माँ तुम किस्से कहती हो! हम लोग तो अब मनुष्य नहीं, हम लोग तो अब आलसी हो गए हैं, हमारी गणना तो अब अज्ञान तिमिरावृत, कृष्णनवासी विशालगोरों में हैं, तो फिर हम क्या करें?"  

10. ibid, p-461.
11. Ibid, p-475.
This dialogue expresses the helplessness and difficulties of the Bhārat Santānas.

(g) Sūryyadev:

In the character of Sūryyadev, (Nildevi) there reflected the nature of an ideal Indian Kshatriya. There is unbeatable capacity of valour and bravery in him. He could never be defeated in the ‘just war’ (Dharm Yuddha) by any body in the world, and it was his boastful statement. He was never be frightened by the war; but there was religious timidity and consideration of just and unjust in him. He told to his wife on her doubt:

"वे अथवाम से लड़े हम तो अथवाम नहीं न कर सकते। हम आर्यवंशी लोग धर्म छोड़ कर लड़ना क्या जानें? यहाँ तो सामने लड़ना जानते हैं। जांते तो निज भूमि का उद्धार और मेरे तो स्वर्ग। हमारे तो दोनों हाथ लड़टू हैं; और यश तो जीते तो भी हमारा साथ है और मरे तो भी।"  

Having faith on his self-confidence Sūryyadev did not have any fear for imminent danger and remarked:

"प्यारी। कुछ चिंता नहीं है, अब तो जो कुछ होगा देखा ही जायगा न।"  

He did never fell into the trap of imminent danger and fear. There was patriotism and dutiboundness in him even when he was entrapped by the enemy. Sūryyadev was steady towards religion and he did not accept the Islam even when he was tortured. It was his peculiarity. Out of anger, he attacked the Yavanas with iron arrows and killed twenty seven of them and met his death. Bhārtendu satired the tradition of the Rajputs in which they

12. ibid, p- 480.
13. ibid, p-480.
believe that it was their only duty to be martyrs by fighting the enemies in the open field in the name of religion. Had they fought with little intelligence along with their valour, probably the history of India would have been different than what is it now.

(h) CHAUPATTA RĀJĀ:

In the farce 'Andher Nagari', Chaupatā Rājā is a symbol of kings who are idle, licentious and unable to administer justice. This Rājā is the direct representative of the then 'Rajas', and 'Nawabas'. In some places, the British government is also satirically represented indirectly, then it becomes the symbol of the Indian government. At the beginning he showed that the kings were all ruined:

"क्या कहा ? सुपनखा आई ए महाराज। (भागता हार)"¹⁴

+++ +++ +++

"दुष्ट लुच्चा पाजी। नाहक हमको डरा दिया। मंत्री इसको सो कोढेल लगिं।"¹⁵

The foolishness and dictatorial attitude of the king is also evident when complainant came for justice:

"राजा-(नौकर से) कल्लू बनिया की दीवार को अभी पकड़ लाओ।
मंत्री - महाराजा, दीवार नहीं लाई जा सकती।
राजा - अच्छा, उसका भाई, लड़का, दोस्त, आश्रय जो हो उसको पकड़ लाओ।"¹⁶

The king was a fool and arrogant. He proved these qualities in him when he was prepared to go even for hanging for attaining heaven:

---

¹⁴. ibid, p-532.
¹⁵. ibid, p-533.
¹⁶. ibid, p-533.
At the end of the farce, the Mahanta expressed his opinion on the Rājā as follows:

“जहाँ न धर्म न बुद्धि नाह, नीति न सुजान समाज।
ते ऐसहि आपुहि नसे, जैसे चोपटराज।”

Humour introduced for the Rājā is definitely superfluous.

(i) SATYAVĀN:

Satyavān, son of the king of Shalwa, Dyumatsen, is the main character of the ‘Satī Pratāp’. Devotion to parents and love for his wife were equally inherent in him. After the marriage with Sāvitri, Satyavān had only one-year life span. When Yamraj came to take away the life of Satyavān, Sāvitri with the power of Chastity got back the life of Satyavān.

5.1:2 THE MAIN FEMALE CHARACTER IN THE DRAMAS OF BHĀRTENDU:

(a) CHANDRĀWALĪ:

Heroine Chandrāwalī is the central point of the drama, ‘Shri Chandrāwalī’. Right from the very beginning of the drama she appears to be a ‘Viyogini’:

---

17. ibid, p-536.
18. ibid, p-536.
Krishna's unique beloved Chandrāwali felt severe distress and dismay of separation from him. She herself was entrapped in love and with tearful eyes described her condition:

"मन मोहन ते बिछुरी जब सों
तन आंसुन सों सदा धोवती हैं ।
हरिचंद जू प्रेम के फंद परी
कुल की कुल लाज हि खोवती हैं ॥२०॥

Chandrāwali loved Krishna; but considering the heart rendering pain of seperation, she did not like to make a 'Viyogi'. There is a beautiful expression of love and separation:

"मैं उस निर्दयी को चाहूँ पर वह मुझे न चाहें ॥२१॥

Here there is a trace of true and selfless love of Chndrawali:

19. ibid, p-443.
20.  ibid, p-444.
21.  ibid, p-444.
“संसार में जितना प्रेम होता है, कुछ इच्छा लेकर होता है और सब लोग अपने ही सुख में सुख मनाती है। ”

Therefore, - “प्रेमियों के मंडल को पवित्र करनेवाली है। ”

In this manner, Chandrāwali’s love is incomparable because:

“जहाँ माहात्म्य-ज्ञान होता है वहाँ प्रेम नहीं होता और जहाँ पूर्ण प्रीति होती है वहाँ माहात्म्य-ज्ञान नहीं होता। परन्तु चन्द्रावली के प्रेम में माहात्म्य-ज्ञान और प्रीति का पूर्ण सामर्थ्य है। 22”

There is no question of return in the love of Chandrāwali. The love of this Viyogini Nayika is found to be sacred and self-less. The greatness of self-sacrifice is inherent in submission.

Chandrāwali’s personality is a duel one – on one hand she is a lover and on the other, she is a devotee. When Kṛṣṇa asked about her desire, she replied:

“और कोई इच्छा नहीं, हमारी तो सब इच्छा की अवधि आपके दर्शन ही ताई है। 23”

There is no question of lust in the answer but devotion in it.

The position of a ‘Virahi’ is quite heart rendering, when she forgets everything of the world and seeks for her lover. Chandrāwali was in stage and behaved like one, which was quite natural for her. It was true that at the end of the drama it turned into a ‘Sanyog’. What she brooked being mad of ‘Virah’ (separation), had deep impact on the society. As a result, the reunion of Chandrāwali with Kṛṣṇa could not impress the society. Chandrāwali was satisfied at her union with Kṛṣṇa as a devotee and her ‘Virah’ was pacified.

22. Bhārtendu Harishchandra, Dr. L. Vārṣhneya, p-105.
23. Bhārtendu Samagra, p-460.
arriving at its goal. Love of Chandrāwālī raises devotees from worldly to spiritual level.

(b) BHĀRAT JANANĪ:

Bhārat Jananī is the symbol of India of Bhārtendu's time. After the revolution, India lost her property and greatness as she was entrapped badly by the British. As a result, Bhārat Jananī expressed her disappointment and pitiable condition through symbols:

"तस्माज तुम्हारी माँ के पास क्या अब दूध रक्खा है जो तुम लोगों को दे,
बेटा इतर खराबों की क्या गणना है मेरे शरीर का तो अब रक्त भी शंप
नहीं, यवन सब चूस ले गए। बेटा तुम लोग कब तक ऐसे पड़े रहोगे अब
अपना-अपना काम देखने के लिए तुम लोग शीघ्र प्रयत्न करो। 24"

Different emotions like the 'Vatsalya', 'Vivashata' (helplessness), poverty, sense of reformation etc. are found in her character. Bhārat Jananī was willing and worried to do something for her children. But she could not decide what to do. Her character as a symbol, demonstrated the real status of India. In that time the whole of India was helpless and to improve their own lot, they found no way out than to ask for the help of the British. Bhārat Jananī expressed clearly the emotion of the countrymen through symbol. In the end Bhārat Jananī encouraged her sons and called for a rising to manage their own distracted affairs through unity and inspiration. In her heart of hearts, she wanted that all means of progress be united into one

"पुनि इदय ज्ञान प्रकाश तें अज्ञातमा तम तुरतही देहः ||
तजि द्वेष इण्यां द्रोह निन्दा देस उननति सब चाहें ||
अभिलाख यह जिय पूर्ववत्-धन धन्य मोहि सबही कहें || 25"

24. ibid, p-475.
25. ibid, p-477.
Nildevi, wife of king Suryyadev is the heroine of the 'Geeti Rupak'. 'Nildevi'. The dramatist wanted to expose the excellence performance of Nildevi. Because it is a Nayika pradhan Geeti Rupak (Balladic allegory). The character of Nildevi symbolises the character of an ideal kshatriya woman. She was much fore-sighted and she pointed out the unjust principles of the Muslims in the war before her husband and asked prince Somdev not to fight with Muslims in the open:

"पर सुना है कि ये दुष्ट अधर्म से बहुत लड़ते हैं।" 26

"जु़ मुम अच्छी तरह जानते हो कि यदि सेना कितनी असंख्य है और यह भी बली भीतर जानते हो कि जिस दिन महाराज पकड़े गए उसी दिन बहुत से राजपूत निराश होकर अपने अपने घर चले गए। इससे मेरी बुद्धि में यह बात आती है कि इससे एक ही बेर संयुक्त युद्ध न करके कोशल में लड़ाई करना अच्छी बात है।" 27

Nildevi was well-versed in politics as well as in the tactics of war. She also knew how to win over the sinful and unrighteous people. Her going to the camp of the Šarīf as a dancer shows her diplomatic skill. It could not make her forget her own aim and objects, which can never be regarded as downfall of her character. Her killing of the Šarīf shows her devotion to her husband and love of the motherland. The Šarīf and his men were enchanted at her music and dance which proved her efficiency in music:

26 ibid, p-480.
27 ibid, p-486.
Her character prevails over the whole drama like soul. She knew how to work independently and expressed her knowledge and intelligence at the time of crisis. She was skilful and dauntless. When she went to court of the Sharif as a dancer, she showed her verbocity as follows:

"मूँझको अभी आपसे बहुत कुछ लेना है। अभी आप इसको अपने पास रखें, आखिर में एक साथ में सब ले लूंगीं।"

After fulfilling all her desires, she performed the rite of Sati along with the deadbody of her husband. Bhārtendu depicted the glory of ancient 'Kshatrani' in the character of Nildevī. But such glory was not in those who gave up their intelligence at the vanity of their strength and were defeated in the war. There is a sign of the skilful politician in her character.

(d) SĀVITRĪ:

The character of Sāvitrī in the Sati Pratāp is the symbol of the Indian woman. There is the fullest excellence of chastity, i.e. devotion to her husband. For this special quality in her, her husband was fully enchanted and even she could subjugated both the 'Yamdut' and Yamraj himself. She with the power of her chastity asked Yamraj of the eyes to her blind father-in-law, his lost kingdom and after all the life to her husband. It was the power of
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her chastity that not only her husband got back his life but also a long healthy life. Prior to her marriage, although she was a young woman her love was not over-irritated when she saw Satyavan. In some of her speeches, the bashfulness and gravity of an Indian spinster. When she heard that Satyavan was accepting their hospitality, she told her friends:

"सखी! उनसे निवेदन कर दे कि हम लोग माता पिता की आज्ञा लेकर तब किसी दिन आतिथ्य स्वीकार करेंगे, आज विलम्ब भी हुआ है।" 30

5.1:3 THE SECONDARY MALE CHARACTERS IN THE DRAMAS OF BHĀRTENDU:

(a) PUROHIT:

The Purohit in the 'Vaidiki Hinsā Hinsa Na Bhawati', is the symbol of those priests who interpreted the Vedas in accordance with the likings of the 'Yajmans' (the people who performed Pujas etc.) and to fulfil their own interests:

"सच है और देवी पूजा नित्य करना इसमें कुछ सन्देह नहीं, और जब देवी की पूजा भई हो मांस भक्षण आही गया। बलि बिना पूजा हो ही गी नहीं और जब बलि दिया तब उसका प्रसाद अवश्य ही लेना चाहिए। अजी भागवत में बलि देना लिखा है, जो वैष्णवों का परम पुरुषार्थ है।

"धूपोपहारबलिभिन्सस्वर्कामवरेशति।" 31"

As soon as the Purohit smells the liking of the 'Yajmana', he makes new rules by citing some slokas:

30 ibid, p-538.
31 ibid, p-310.
In practice the Purohit was the supporter of all three Vyasanas (debaucheries) — Mansa (meat), Madya (alcoholic drinks) and Maitluna (mating). He regarded these Vyasanas as the indispensable part of religion. From the point of his character and behaviour the Purohit was rather a 'Dharma Pravanchak' (Religions deceit).

(b) SĀDHU GANḌAKĪḌĀŚ:

In the ‘Vaidiki Hinsā Hinsa Na Bhawati,’ Sādhu Gandakīḍāś is the symbol of so-called modern corrupted sadhu. Sadhus like Gandakīḍāś produces only ‘Gandgi’ (Filth) in the society. This character is the true and realistic representative of his own class. He is the symbol of those priests, who for their pride, wanted only to perform ‘Pujas’ to deceive the society. Such people defile the sacred temples. Chitragupta also remarked:

"कभी भक्ति से मूर्ति को दंडवत न किया होगा पर मंदिर में जो स्त्रियाँ
आई उनको सर्वदा तकते रहे, महाराज, इन्होंने अनेकों को कृतार्थ किया
और समय तो में श्रीरामचन्द्रजी का श्रीकृष्ण का दास हूँ पर जब स्त्री सामने
आवे तो उससे कहेंगे मैं राम तुम जानकी, मैं कृष्ण तुम गोपी और स्त्रियाँ
भी ऐसी मूर्ति तक फिर इन लोगों के पास जाती हैं।" 33

The main part of the character of Gandakīḍāś was deceit of religion.

---

32. ibid, p-310.
33. ibid, p-316.
The 'Mantri' is the symbol of such people who fulfil their own desire by agreeing with their masters in all cases. Mantri represents the sycophant ministers who wanted to appease the king at every moment:

"संसार के सार मदिरा और मांस ही हैं।

'मकारा: पञ्च दुर्लभा:'

+++ +++ +++

"ईश्वर ने बकरा इसी हेतु बनाया ही है, नहीं और बकरा बनाने का काम क्या था? बकरे केवल बजार्थ बने हैं और मद्य पानार्थ।" 34"

Chitragupta remarked on the Mantri as follows:

"इसने कभी स्वामी का भला नहीं किया, केवल चुटकी बजाकर हाँ में हाँ मिलाया, मुँह पर स्तुति पीछे निद्रा, अपना घर बनाने से काम, स्वामी चाहे चूल्हे में पड़े, घूस लेते जन्म बीता, मांस और मद्य के बिना इसने न और धर्म जाने न कर्म जाने—यह मन्त्री की व्यवस्था है, प्रजा पर कर लगाने में तो पहले सम्पति दी पर प्रजा के सुख का उपाय एक भी न किया।" 35"

(d) ŚHAIVA & VAIŚHNAVA:

These two characters in the 'Vaidikī Hinsā Hinsā Na Bhawati' are such characters who opposed those doing fraud in the name of religion only to fulfil their interest. Bhārtendu wanted to enhance the tradition established by Sadhus and Sants and through the characters Śhaiva and Vaiśnava he

---

34 ibid, p-314.
35 ibid, p-316.
showed his opposition to religious superstitions. He also wanted to show the modern writers that one can go in the path of progress only when one opposes strongly the religious superstitions. Bhārtendu wanted to unite all the persons of different faith through Śaiva and Vaiśṇava.

(e) **CHITRAGUPTA AND YAMRĀJ:**

These two characters represent their own classes.

(f) **DHANDĀS AND BANITĀDĀS:**

Dhandās and Banitādās in the 'Prem Yogini' are two Vaishnavite characters. Both of them took pleasure in the discussion about women:

“धनदास - भाई साहेब, अपनो तो ऊँची काम का जे भोजन सोजन दुनो दे।

बनितादास - तोहरे सिद्धान्त से भाई साहेब हमारा काम तो नहीं चलता।

धनदास - तबे न सुरमा चुलाय के आँख पर चरणामृत लगाए हो जे में पलक बाजी खूब चले, हाँ एक पलक एहरे।”

Knowledge of Gosāi’s attachment to women can be had through their conversation:

“अरे भाई गोसाईन पर तो समुरी सब आपे भहराई पड़ थीं पत्रित होंचे के वास्ते, हमका पहुँचेंगे।”

---

36. ibid, p-409.
37. ibid, p-409.
(g) DALĀL, GANGĀPUTRA AND OTHERS:

In the ‘Prem Yogini’, there is nothing like ideal or principle in the characters of Dalāl, Gangāputra etc. In the Pardeshī (Prem Yogini), the capacity to destroy sins by the holy water of Kashi is not shown. On the contrary, there is the depiction of a Kashi, full of filth and evils:

“देखिये तुमनी काशी, लोगो, देखिये तुमनी काशी।” ³⁸

The power of observation of Bhārtndu is evident in depiction of the real position of present Kashi. He depicted the down graded culture of kashi in a very suitable manner. A different picture of Kashi is shown in the description of Sudhākar’s ‘Kashi-Mahatmya’. There are a lot of secondary characters like Chakkujī, Jhaptiyā, Mākhandās, Jhūrī Singh, Bubhukṣhit-Dikṣīt, Gappa Pandīt, Rām Bhatta, Chambū Bhatta, Mādhab Śāstrī, Gopāl Śāstrī and others.

(h) SHŪKDEV AND NĀRAD:

Śukdev and Nārad were introduced in the interlude of the drama Shri Chandrāvalī and as such they are not directly connected with the main plot. The dialogue of Śukdev at the end of the interlude is quite remarkable:

“धन्य हैं धन्य हैं, कुल को वरन जगत को अपने निर्मल प्रम से पवित्र करेंवाला है।” ³⁹

From it, a slight idea can be had of the root. They simply referred to the Premanand (estacy of love) of the Gopies and unparallel love of Chandrāvalī towards Krishna.

³⁸ ibid, p-411.
³⁹ ibid, p-442.
(i) BHĀRATDURDAIV (Bhārat Durdaśā):

Bhāratdurdaiv is responsible for the sad plight and difficulties of India. He was at first the symbol of the ‘Yawans’ and later of the British government. His duel symbolic position has been depicted by Bhārtendu through his dress:

"आधा क्रिस्तानी आधा मुसलमानी वेष, हा ध में नंगी तलबार लिए।"  

The British government was severely criticised through Bhāratdurdaiv:

"अंगरेजराज सुख साज सजे सब भारी।
पै धन विदेश चलि जात इहे अति खाबारी।
ताहूं इहे महंगी काल रोग बिस्तारी।
दिन दिन दूने दुःख ईस देत हा हा री।
सबके ऊपर टिककस की आफत आई।"  

Bhāratdurdaiv, the symbol of the British government arrested the well-wishers of Indian under the section ‘Hakimechacha’ (prerogative of the magistrate) of the Disloyalty to English policy Act. The hopes and aspirations of the countrymen towards the British government were depicted by making Bhāratdurdaiv the symbol of the British; and the dramatist proved the hollowness of these hopes of the people on the government satirically. Bhārtendu wanted to give the impression that there could be no hope of reformation by the British, since it was the sole cause of all troubles. All the plans for the misfortune of India (Bhārat Durdaśā) are shown in the Bhāratdurdaiv, which was completed with the help of Satyānāsh Fauzdar. Bhāratdurdaiv speaks of himself:
His symbolic existence has been clearly described by himself.

"काफ़र काला नीच युगाहँ तोड़ पैर और हाथ।" 43"

(j) BHĀRAT BHĀGYA:

It is a personified character. Bhārat Bhāgya is a friend of India. He tried to awake the sleeping India.

"जागो जागो रे भाई।
सोचो निसि बैस गँचाई जागो जागो रे भाई।
निसि की कौन कहें दिन बीते न काल राति चलन आई।
देखि परत निहं हित अनहित कबु परे बैरि बस जाई।" 44"

Bhārat Bhāgya tried to infuse delight to fainted Bharat by reminding the ancient glories:

"हाय यह वही भारत है जो किसी समय सारी पृथ्वी का शिरोमणि गिना जाता था।" 45"
Finally when Bhārat Bhāgya found no sign of life in Bhārat, he thrust knife into his chest. The suicide of Bhārat Bhāgya is a symbolic satire that if Indians would not be conscious in time, then they will have to commit suicide by thrusting their own knives into their own chests.

(k) SATYĀNĀŚH FOUZDĀR (Bhārat Durdashā):

During the reign of Bhāratduraiv, he introduced affectation, satisfaction, fashion, ill-spending, courts etc. The character of Satyānāśh became clear when he uttered:

"धरके हम लाखों ही भेस। किया चौपट यह सारा देस।
बहु हमने फैलाए धर्म। बढ़या छुआधूत का कर्म।" 46

Bhāratduraiv had the plans of Bhārat Durdashā, which Satyānāśh fulfilled. There are certain human characters like Bengali, Kavi, Editor etc which represented their own class. There are certain personified characters like Rog (disease), Ālasya (idleness), Madirā (wine), Andhakār (darkness), Disloyalty etc. in the Bhāratduraiv.

(I) PEHLĀ ANGREJ:

Pehlā Angrej in the ‘Bhārat Janani’ is the symbol of those people who wanted to destroy the country.

"रे दुराशय ! दुर्बिन्तिगण ! कया इसी हेतु हमने तुम लोगों को ज्ञान चक्षु दिया है ? रे नराधम ! राजविद्रोही महारानी के पुकारने में तुम लोगों को तनिक भी भय का सज्जार नहीं होता। उंह ! यदि ऐसा जानते तो क्या हम...

46. Ibid, p-462.
He did not care for any call from the Indians. The Englishmen, who came to India as officers, looked down upon Indians and their only aim was to exploit India. The first Angrej i.e. the first Englishman represented the British officers in India.

(m) DUSRĀ ANGREJ:

Dusrā Angrej is the symbol of those who wanted good and progress of the country:

“माता! अब और रोदन न करो तुम्हारा दुख देखने से पाया भी द्रवीभूत हो जाता है। तुम्हारे निरन्तर धारावाही अधूरबाहु के अवलोकन से कौन ऐसा कठोर चित्त मनुष्य है जो फिर भी स्थिर रहेगा।”

The British is a civilised and cultured nation. The learned community of the British had sympathy to India. The 2nd Englishman (Dusrā Angrej) was the representative of such people.

(n) ŠARĪF KHĀN (Nildevī):

Šarīf Khan is a supporting hero in the ‘Balladic allegory’-the ‘Nildevī’. He murdered Suryyadev only to spread Islamic religion. He took up unreligions ways to spread religion; and used dishonest means for it. He was the cause of all struggles and disasters in the drama.

47. ibid, p-476.
48. ibid, p-476.
(o) AMIR ĀBDUR ŠHARĪF KHĀN:

This khan was cruel, and diplomat who liked appeasement. He was a sensualist also. He was frightened much at the bravery of the Rajputs and uttered:

“सूरजदेव एक ही बदला है। इहातेज पंजाब में ऐसा बहादुर दूसरा नहीं।”

Here he did not want to praise his enemy but wanted to warn his soldiers to be vigilant against the enemy and to defeat them. He was prepared to adopt all means fair and foul for his own victory. Therefore, he attacked the Rajput fort during night and capturing the king he was boastful of his own vile success:

“अलहमदुदिल्लाह! इस कम्बख्त काफिर को तो किसी तरह मिलना किया। अब बाकी फोज भी फतह हो जायगी।”

The sensualist Šharīf being over head and ears in lust could not imagine that his deceit and tortures might be challenged. He was found to be fond of flattery.

(p) BASANT:

Basant was an attendant of the king Śūrıyadev. His ravings were not only humourous but also full of meaningful elements with certain aims and objectives. In addition to Basant, Bhaṭāry, Chapargatu khan and Pīkdān Ali on one hand created an envirorment of a pleasure before the war and on the other created humour.

49 ibid, p-479.
50 ibid, p-482.
(q) SOMDEV:

The character of Somdev, 'son of Suryyadev is full of bravery. On receipt of the news of his father's death, he became furious and marched against the Yawanas with the Rajput to defeat them.

"भाइयों चलो इसी क्षण हम लोग उस पामर नीच यवन के रक्त से अपने आर्य पिताओं को वृष्टि करें। .............

c्व महें नासिहं आर्य नीच जवनन कहें करि छय।
कहूं सबै भारत जय भारत जय भारत जय। 51"

(r) MAHANTA (In the Andher Nagari):

Mahanta is the symbol of those persons who wanted to lead his followers through right path with their advice; and were ready to help at the time of crisis. When his main disciple Gobardhan Dās offered sweets and praised the city, then Mahanta was frightened by imminent danger and advised them to leave the city at once. According to him one should not remain in such a city for a moment:

"सेत सेत सब एक से, जहाँ कपूर कपास।
ऐसे देस कुदेस में, कबहुं न कोजे बास॥ 52"

Mahanta left the place with one of his disciples, Nārāyan Dās. But Gobardhan Dās stayed there against the wishes of his Guru. But later Mahanta saved Gobardhan Dās from execution. Mahanta remarked:

\[51\text{ ibid, p-485.}\]
\[52\text{ ibid, p-532.}\]
"इस समय ऐसा साहित्य है कि जो मरेगा सीधा बैठकुंठ जायगा।" 53

On such statement of Mahanta, the minister, the soldier and the king all began to hurry to die and finally the king was hanged.

There are some characters in the ‘Andher Nagari’ like Kababwalá, Ghāsirām, Narangīwǎlī, Haluwai, Kunjarin, Machliwālī, Jātwālā etc who uttered single dialogue. But all of them represent their classes, which expressed their racial, personal and classical peculiarities.

(s) CHÚRANWĀLĀ:

Bhartendu used such rural and language of illiterate people in the mouth of Chūranwālā that through them the way for reformation of society might be easy and clear:

"हिन्दू चूरन इस का नाम। विलायत पूरन इस का काम।

चूरन जब से हिन्द में आया। इसका धन बल सभी घटाया।

+++ +++ +++

चूरन साहेब लोग जो खाता। सारा हिन्द हजम कर जाता।

चूरन पृथिवीवाले खाते। सब कानून हजम कर जाते॥ 54"

(t) DYUMATSEN (Satī Pratāp):

Dyumatsen was the king of Shalva. He lost his eyesight at the thought of the short life-span of his Satyavān. His love of children and patience is evident in this incident. Additing to it he was found disappointed when he

53: ibid, p-536.
54: ibid, p-531.
could not satisfy the beggars. Nārad Muni came to the hermitage of Dyumatsen and made him agree to marry Sāvitri to Satyavan:

“तुम्हारे पास सत्यदन, तपोधन, धैर्यधन अनेक धन हैं, तुम क्यों दीन हो।”

5.1:4 THE SECONDARY FEMALE CHARACTERS IN THE DRAMAS OF BHĀRTENDU:

The following are some of the secondary female characters in the dramas of Bhārtendu:

(a) LALITĀ (Śrī Chandrāwalī):

Lalitā was the friend of the Chandrāwalī. At the beginning of the play special importance was laid on her. Chandrāwalī exposed her love affairs before the intimate friend and well wisher, Lalitā on her request:

“सखी में क्या करूँ में कितना चाहती हूँ कि यह ध्यान भूला दूँ पर उमनिदुर की छूट्टी भूलती नहीं इसी से सब जान जाते हैं।”

Lalitā was much sympathetic towards Chandrāwalī:

“उदास न हो में तो सब भाँति तेरी हूँ और तेरे भले के हेतु प्राण देने का तैयार हूँ।”

The intimate conversations between, Lalitā and Chandrāwalī and the former’s assurance to co-operate gave birth to the elements of a drama – Bij Arthprakrity, Arambh, Kavyavyavastha and Mukh-Sandhi.

---

55. ibid, p-541.
56. ibid, p-443.
57. ibid, p-443.
Lalitā again appeared in the last part of the play. The other friends of Chandrāwali like Madhāvī, Vilāsinī, Kāmmanjari etc. tried to console Chandrāwali. Much importance has been given on Kāmmanjari, Madhāvī and Viśhakha in case of union of Chandrāwali and Kṛishna. Viśhakha also appeared in the last part of the play; but in the meantime Kāmmanjari and Mādhurī left. There are certain other friends of Chandrawali who do not subscribe to the development of the plot.

(b) NIRLAJJATĀ AND ASḤĀ (Bhārat Durdāṣhā):

Nirlajjatā and Aṣhā had no important role to play in the plot. When Bhārat was fainted at the time of describing troubles and distress, Nirlajjatā appeared, who could attract others towards her own physical beauty. She uttered:

"एक जिन्दगी हजार नेआमत है। 58"

With the help of Aṣhā, Nirlajjatā carried the unconscious Bhārat away and began the treatment. Aṣhā has only one dialogue in the play:

"मेरे आँख किसी ने भी प्राण दिया है? 59"

At last victory came to Aṣhā.

In the 'Sātī Pratāp', the friends of Sāvitrī like Surwala, Madhukari and Lawangi produced attraction to the stage through their dialogues and humour.

58. ibid, p-461.
59. ibid, p-462.
5.2 CHARACTERS DEPICTED BY BEZBAROĀ:

Lakṣmināth Bezbaroā was the famous litterateur of the Jonaki era. The dramas of Bezbaroā have a great importance in world of Assamese dramas. Because when Bezbaroā entered into the dramatic world, then modern Assamese drama was not fully developed. Even the Ankiya Nats and Bhāonas composed by the Vaishnavite litterateurs were in a bad plight since Assam was under the impact of Bengali literature and culture.

Bezbaroā earned a special fame as a dramatist. His dramas are priceless treasure for Assamese literature. Bezbaroā has been recognised as the first national dramatist by the first film-maker and writer of Assam, Jyotiprasād Agarwāllā. In Bezbaroā’s drama, there is an impact of Assamese tradition. He selected such characters in his dramas in which the picture of classified Assamese society is reflected.

Bezbaroā composed eight dramas in total, of which three are historical dramas and four farces. The historical dramas of Bezbaroā are – the Jaymati Kunwarī, the Chakradhwaj Singha and the Belimar, while the Litikāi, Pāchani, Nomal and Chikarpāti-Nikarpāti are his farces. In addition to these he wrote a drama, Gadādhāra Rajā which is neither an one-act play nor a farce nor a historical play. Bezbaroā has classified as a ‘Choraghariyā Bhāona’- a drawing room play.

5.2:1 THE MAIN MALE CHARACTERS IN THE DRAMAS OF BEZBAROĀ:

(a) TITĀI:

Titāi in the ‘Litikāi’ is such a character who proved his intelligence in the end although he was a fool. In the drama the irrelevant activities of the seven brothers proved their foolishness. Titāi was the youngest of the seven brothers. Their foolishness was depicted in the scenes:
When the seven brothers asked the old mother of Deorām Brahmin as to where they should keep the bundles (Dangari) of paddy, she out of rage replied - "If you do not find any place, keep it on my head." The seven fools took her sentence in literary sense and kept the bundles on her head. As a result she died. Then Deorām was very angry at their work and skilfully killed all six brothers of Titāi, whom he could not kill. He was alert at the death of his brothers.

But when Deorām could not kill Titāi, he sent Titāi to his brother-in-law with a letter, in which Deorām wrote that the bearer (Titāi) of the letter should be killed by all means. As stated Titai became very alert after the death of his brothers. He could not believe Deorām and read letter on the way:

"मझ आज्ञायेकै कै खेमाँ। भामूलशत पतितन नाइ बूलि; एतै बामूल एढ चिंचै मझ नपढाकै केतियाँ निब नोबाँ। सेहरे निले मुझे मोर डाकजुसेत जाह मै मराहे हब।" 62

---
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Knowing the intention, Titäi changed the letter asking his brother-in-law to give his sister-in-law in marriage to Titäi because Titäi had done a great job for them by saving them from fire. When Deoram’s brother-in-law received the letter he got Mänikî, his sister married with Titäi. In this manner, Titäi with his intelligence took revenge of the death of his brothers. Titäi came back to Deoram’s house with his wife Mänikî to the great surprise of Deoram.

(b) PÄCHANI (the Pāchani):

Pāchani was a character of a superstitious householder. His philosophy of life was- to eat food without entertaining guests was a sin:

“अतिथिक निदि जिटी करय भोजन।
सिजय पातक तार अगम्यागमन॥ ६३”

Pāchani was by nature a love of guests. He did not like to take his food without a guest. Because a guest is the symbol of God. The day in which he ate food without a guest, was a bad day for him. He always wanted to bring somebody as guest to his house and when he did not find anybody, he rebuked his own lot:

“इमान पुरुषार्थ करिद आलही-अतिथि काफ केनालों। कि करिदिच।?
कपाल! ६४।”

When he got somebody as guest his delight knew no bound. He welcomes guests like a God:
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He was also very unhappy when some guests left without taking meal. But he did not know that it was his wife who managed to send the guests off. Finally he had to be satisfied with his cats and dogs on his guests.

(c) NĀHARPHUṬUKĀ:

Nāharphuṭuka (Nomal) is such a character, which has no coherence between the name and his activities. In Nāharphuṭukā there is a reflection of the character of a simple Assamese cultivator. He was worried at the immature death of his five sons, and therefore, he wanted blessings from the Satra to keep him livings:

“गोखाँइ-इष्टर आगते लरा पोवालिकण दिओंके पेलाइ, तेखेते जिहके करे करक। मारे मारक, तारे तारक, राखे राखक, बोलैं जि-जि-जि करे करक।”

The simpleton Nāharphuṭukā went to the ‘Satrādhikār’ of Āthiabāri Satra to get a name and blessings for his sixth son. But the behaviour he met from the ‘Dwārpāl’ (gate keeper) to the Satrādhikār himself was really sad and disturbing. He got such neglectful behaviour because he was poor. They made taunting remarks when some ‘Pithaguri’ (Powdered rice) as the Dakshina to the Gosain:

“तोर पिठागुरि कोनेड नाखाय। पाइ–पड़ा फिटा आछेजिद उलिया।”

---
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When Naharphutuka returned with the blessings and the name, he had to face certain difficulties on account of his foolishness. He began to utter the name 'Nomal' given by the Satradhikār for his son, so that he could remember it till he arrived at his residence.

Naharphutuka had the idiosyncrasy of saying 'Jiggs Kari Chao' which means, 'Let me discuss the matter,' at every time. The responsibilities which were given to his wife, Nichali at the time of his departure to the Satra reflect the nature of a master of the household in Assamese society. It also shows that Naharphutuka was conscious of his household duties:

"मोर उभति आहौंति पलम हले गधूलि गरु-गाइ केटा तड़ चपाब्रि। गरुर पपा एडाल एधा-बटा है रल। सेइदाल हेदालित तुलि थबि। मह जाओँहे एतिया। (दोखोजमान मै उभति आहिः) शुनिछ ने लरार माक! शुकावले दिया सेइ बगारिर डलाखन तुलि थबि, नेपाहरिबि।"

(d) CHIKARPATI:

Chikarpati (Chikarpati-Nikarpati) was such a thief who with his stealing skill was able to gain the title 'Bor-chor' (the big thief). He stole the 'Lota' of Bethāi with a very cunning way:

"आजिकालिह इयाल बर चोर ग्रंताप हैसे। मानुहर आगे परा चोरे वस्तु चुर करि निये। सिंदिना एटा चोरे रजामुकार आगे परा तार पानी खोवा लोटाटाँ।"
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Although Chikarpati stole the ‘Lotâ’ yet justice came to his side. The king was satisfied with Chikarpati’s stealing of his ring and conferred the title ‘Bor-Chor’ on him. Chikarpati made friendship with Rangdai, the maid of the king to steal his ring:

“राजाद को भविष्यचित रखके शोधे ? +++ +++ मैं सुधिश्चू, मान्द काना फाले आर सरसिद कोन फाले शोधे ? आर रजार आडुवा केनेकि तरा हय ?”

After learning the required informations from Rangdai, Chikarpati entered into the bedroom of the king in guise of a relative of the king, and successfully did his own work.

Even the king was so satisfied with the performance of Chikarpati that he requested Chikarpati to find out groom for his daughter. Where he was out for such a groom, he met another thief, Nikarpati.

Nikarpati stole Chikarpati’s belongings very skilfully. But Chikarpati successfully deceived Nikarpati’s wife and got back his belongings:

“सेघ नावर गराकिए तेहाओ नाखल मझ लुटिपुटी अनाटो केनेवाहाँ जानि पुवाई रजार आगत मोर नामे दो दिलाग ठिक करिछे। रजार कोटोवाले आमार घरत सेघ बस्तुबोय विचारि पाले सेडबोय जे निबद, आमारबोयो निच

---
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Nikarpati now knowing Chikarpati to be the ‘Bor-chor’ made friendship with him. Chikarpati discussed his plan to abduct the king of Dinganagar to Chikanpur with Nikarpati. Later he successfully abducted the king of Dinganagar and took him to Chikanpur.

(e) GADĀPĀΝI (Jaymati Kunwari):

Gadāpāṇi was the prince of the Tungkhungia dynasty and the husband of Jaymati. He was powerful, stern and foresighted. King Chulikaphā wanted to make all probable heir to the throne from different dynasties handicapped to make the way clear for his own dynasty. But he failed to arrest Gadāpāṇi and make him handicapped with the advice of his wife Jaymati, he absconded to Nagahills. He was enamoured by the natural beauty by Nagahills. He made intimate friendship with one Dalimi, a Naga girl. Gadāpāṇi was enchanted with the simplicity and love of Dalimi. When he heard that Jaymati was tortured by the king to know his whereabouts, then he was worried about the fate his family:

"जया! मेर दुःखु नि जया! मेर एक्प्रकार माउत लाईलेखा बतल कत परि आाछे?"

Gadāpāṇi could not contain himself. He rushed to Jaymati in guise of a Naga youth. He witnessed the tortures inflicted upon his wife. It was for him the ‘trying moment’. But there was the victory of self-reliance of the chaste Jaymati; because he had to tolerate like a coward. But his self-reliance did not gave away:
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Gadāpānī was handsome and strong not only physically but also mentally and morally. He did not lose patience even being separated from his family. Because he had immense love for his motherland. He promised to freed the country from the clutches of Chulikaphā. In Gadāpānī there was the surrendering of personal happiness to collective happiness. It was rather a greatness in him.

(f) LĀCHIT BARPHUKAN (Chakradhwaj Singha):

Lāchit Barphukan was the commander-in-chief and the viceroy of Ahom Kingdom. He is well known for his bravery and patriotism. He is a glory for Assam. He was always ready to sacrifice his life for the motherland:

“रणवासकलं! सर्गेद्वर आज्ञात आमि आमार असम देश शत्रु हातर परा। रक्षा करिबर निमित्ते एँ युद्ध करिबले आहिंतां। एतिया आमि भय-भ्रान्ति आहु आन चिंता भावना सकलके परिहार करि आमार कर्त्तव्य साधन करिब लागे।” 74"

Lāchit defeated the Mughals in the battles of ‘Bānhbari’ and ‘Kājalimukh’ and occupied Guwahati. Again when Ram Singh, the commander of the Mughals attacked Guwahati, Lāchit was ill. But inspite of his ill health he fought against the Mughals:
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"मोगलर सेना गुवाहाटी निचें औचर चापिलें। मोर चालपीरा माटित नथबि, नथबि। एकेबारेड नाबले ने! ............ मोक सरगटेबे बझाटर हातर परा गुवाहाटी राखिबलै इयाल थैछे। एतिया मझ गुवाहाटी बझाटर हातत शोधाई दि गरगान्त लाे-तिरुला ले सुख करिबले जाम ने? आजि मोक बझाटे भरि नियक। राजे यहाँसुह उजाइ ने सरकेतक गांड चालागर दिशके।!......मोर नाब एं मुहुर्ती ब्रह्मपुत्र माजले मॉल दे। 76"

Lāchit was so dutibound that even he cut off the head of his maternal uncle for neglecting his duties:

"मोर देशतके मोमाइ डाडर नहय। 76"

(My maternal uncle is not superior to my motherland)

Lāchit also remarked that even he would happened to be his son or his father in place of his Mama (maternal uncle), he would have got the same fat.

Rām Singh the Mughal Senapati praised Lāchit for his bravery and patriotism. A kshatriya could understand and realise the bravery and strength of another kshatriya and place him in high places:

"धनी लाचित ! धनी! तुमि जदि भारतर एं एसुकत नहे दिल्लोत हलाहिंतेन, तोमाक जदि आमार आउरेजीब बादछाइ पालेहिंतेन, तोमाक ले बादछाइ गोटिए भारतवर्ष जय करिब पालिहिंतेन। रामसिंह क्षत्रिय।
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Praising Lachit’s skill of war and fore sight, Ram Singh remarked that what he thought of doing after one month, Lachit did it before hand. Lachit was successful to earn fame for the nation with his valour, courage and fore sight.

(g) CHANDRAKANTA SINGHA:

Chandrakanta Singha in the ‘Belimar’ was a king of the Ahom dynasty in Assam. He was weak, drunkard and was after luxury always. He brought the downfall his rule with the advice of selfish friend Satram. He spent more time after his own happiness than in the business of the state:

“सतराम! आँधा आजी कि डेमालि करिमहैंक? 78"

+++ +++ +++

“मोर पिठिन्हन पिरिपिराईङ, खजुवाईङ। हेर सोवणशिरी! लाहे लाहे पिठिन्हन खजुवाई देधो。” 79"

When Satram was presented as the royal court as a traitor, Chandrakanta tried to defend him. But when he could not save his friend, he then appealed:

“देखियालफुकन! बृहसङोहहँ डाडरीयाक कबा-जेन मोर पुखले चाङ,
चारिडीयाकफुकन प्राण संहार करा नहय। कबाँ, मइ मोर शपत दिँछो। 80"
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The two weakness of Chandrakanta were exposed when the Rajmata (Queen mother) came to take permission of the king to kill Badan Barphukan with the help of 'Rupsing'. The first weakness was that he committed wrong in recognising a man and the second, that he did not like to give death sentence to anybody. He said in clear terms:

"अनाहकत मानुहक बंध कराटो मइ देखिब नाेवारो।
अवकथे सेगटो मोर मनां दुव्त्तिलता हच पारे।" 81

Chandrakanta Singha was thrown out of the throne by Purandar Singha with the help of Ruchinath. But he was again enthroned after the second invasion of the Burmese. But subsequently fled to Kamrup.

5.2:2 THE MAIN FEMALE CHARACTERS IN THE DRAMAS OF BEZBAROA:

(a) JAYMATĪ (Jaymatī Kunwari) :

In Jaymatī there was great devotion to her husband like that of Savitri and deep patriotism. Jaymatī, wife of Ahom prince (later the king), Gadāpāni is the symbol of ideal Assamese women. For her patriotism comes first and she was prepared to sacrifice herself for the sake of the country, she also inspired her husband, Gadāpāni. She co-operated with her husband at times of weal and woe. So Gadāpāni praised her that he was aided by her in times of crises:

"तोमार हिँहि, तोमार मातेि सकलो बिपद-आपदत मोक जोयाइ राखिछे।" 82

---
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When king Chulikaphā made all the princes of different dynasties handicapped, then Jaymati prayed Gadāpāni to fly away and escape the wrath of Chulikaphā. Because she knew that the life of Gadāpāni was very precious for the whole country:

"आपने पलम करा उचित नहय। निष्पुर बौद्धगोहाँ, स्वार्थपर, दुष्कर्म आर बौद्धगोहाँर हातर पुनला लेरा रजार हातर परा पलाड आत्मरक्षा करक। जयमती अाँचल पाठिर सोण आपोनार अपघात मृत्यु तुँज़ गुप्तघातकर हातत पाठिब नोवरे।" ⑧३

The sacrifice and valour of Jaymati was unique.

"आपोनार लगत थाकिआपोनार सकलो आपद बिपदत सहायकारिणी हव पारिम, एडु आशा एने प्रस्ताव।" ⑧४

She regarded this sacrifice as the 'Vrata' of her life:

"आपोनार सुख आर आपोनार मदलर बाहिरे जयार निजर सुखर कथ जयाइ नेभाइ।"

+++ +++ +++

"जयाइ रद्दो हाँैहब पारे, बिपदको हाँैहरे सामरि लच पारे।" ⑧५

In spite of being her soft-hearted woman she remained prepared to bear physical and mental tortures for her husband and motherland and she could be very firm and resolute for the sake of safe guarding her motherland. She was a daughter of an aristocratic family and the wife of a hero of the
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land. She did not hesitate to call evil Burāgohāin as the ‘Ahomar Kular Kalanka, Naradham.’

On the otherhand Borgohain praised her as the ‘glory of the dynasty’ considering her devotion to husband, patriotism, valour and sacrifice:

"आइ जयमती! तड़ आमार बंशर पद्मकुल। तोर पुण्य जीवने तोर पितृकुल।
आरू शहरर कुल एह दुरु कुलके पवित्र करिले।"

The soldiers (Chaudangs) were tried of torturing Jaymatī since she did not care for them and did not tell them about the hiding place of her husband; but Jaymatī, the idol of sacrifice, remain unpurturbed and firm against the tortures, and brook all tortures with smiles. She even sang devotional songs at that time.

When Gadāpāni came to her in guise of a Naga youth and requested her to tell the king of the whereabout of her husband, then it was the extreme moment of the test of her devotion to Gadāpāni. She did not hesitate to reject the request even from her husband. She embraced death for the sake of her husband as well as for the motherland. So, She has been called the ‘Satī Jaymatī’ and remained as one in the hearts of the people of Assam due to her devotion and patriotism.

(b) PĀCHANIYANĪ (Pāchani):

She was the wife of Pāchani. She was careful about her family life. She believed that the 'great soul' might be realised through ordinary animals and creatures. She believed in the philosophy of Mahāpuruṣ Shri Shankardev:
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It means to say that like that in the heart of human being, Lord Rām lives in the heart of all-dogs, donkeys, jackals, and so on. Therefore, one should serve these animals also.

Pāchani loved guests; but he could not realise the burden of work of his wife. She had to do all the household duties of the family since she was the only woman of it; like gathering of water, husking rice, cleaning the house, weaving of cloths etc. she was tried of all these works. But Pāchani was indifferent to these duties. He only knows the entertaining of the guests as a part of his religion. Therefore, Pāchani was worried about this superstition of her husband:

"दिनी मोर ओपरत बरमता उलाइ देखर मानुह माति आनि घरत आलही
चपाब आरू मझ गोलामीये धान बानि, पानि कड़ियाह सेह्बोरक खुबाब
लागे। भाल निकिना गोलामीजनी फाइछिला नहय ने? 89"

When even a good virtue crosses its limits, it becomes an obsession and then it becomes an object of laughter. Pāchani was tried of her husband’s nature of collecting guests. She was successful in driving out such collected guests by means of the ‘Dheki Thorā’ at one time and of a cat at another time. The scene of rural agricultural family of Assam is reflected in the husking of rice with a padle and here request to Pāchani to repair the padle. Finally she was successful in convincing her husband that it was better to feed cats and dogs than feeding the ungrateful human beings. Because the dogs and cats are always faithful to their masters.
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According to Pachanian, animals are always faithful and grateful so, it is far better to feed them than feed human beings. She also told her husband that the cats would save them from rats and mice so also the dog from the thieves. The arguments of Pachanian are reasonable. She was successful in achieving her ends.

(c) RĀJMĀṬĀ (Belimār):

Rājmāṭā was the mother of Ahom king Chandrakānta Singha. She was well-versed in politics and knew the flows of time. She had a strong faith upon the Prime minister of the country, Pūrnānanda Burāgohāin. When Burāgohāin informed Rājmāṭā of the misdeeds of Satrām, a friend of the king, Chandrakānta, then Rājmāṭā warned her son against Satrām and told him to keep himself away from Satrām:

"एतेके तोमाक मोरे शपत दि केसौं, तुम्ह चारिडयाकुकनन लग एरि दिया,
....आजि तुम्ह लाक मरम करिछ, भाल पाइछ देखि सि तोमार हैं।
काइङ्ग मरम जोख अलप कमाइ दियाँचें, सि तोमार महा राजु हैं
उठिब ""91""
Rājmātā could not tolerate that Badan Barphukan would invite the Burmese soldier to attack his own country. Because with this attack, the foreign enemies might try to take over the whole country under them:

"आगे आमि दन्त-खिरियाल कटा-कटि करিছিলে যদিও, সি নিজের 
ভিত্তিতে ছিল। এতিতে সি বাহিরে আলাল। এতিতে আমার গৃহচিঠ্ঠিদিন 
বাহির রাখু বেজীটি হে সোমাই নাঙ্কর ফাল্ল হে আলামার চল লাগিল। 92"

When Badan Barphukan attacked Assam with the help of Burmese soldiers Pūrnānanda Burāgohāin committed suicide. But Rājmātā planned to kill Badan Barphukan. She got Barphukan killed by one Rupsingh. Rājmātā believed that any person (like Badan Barphukan) who could attack his motherland with the help of foreigners, could sell his motherland to them if he feel it necessary. The firmness and bravery of Rājmātā is quite unique.

(d) RANGDAI:

Rangdai in the ‘Chikarpati-Nikarpati’ was a maid to the king of Chikanpur. Although she was a faithful servant of the royal family yet she did some important functions to please her lover Chikarpati. The king of Chikanpur told Chikarpati that he would confer the title of the ‘Borchor’ on Chikarpati if he might steal the ‘Shri Angathi’ (Royal Ring). Chikarpati knew it well that it was not easy to steal the ring from the finger of the king. Therefore, he took help from king’s maid, Rangdai. So, Rangdai told everything to Chikarpati. Chikarpati was successful in stealing the ring for which he was able to receive the title ‘Borchor’ from the king. The writer has introduced a conversation between Rangdai and Chikarpati, which is found in case of low-grade people:

92: ibid, p-1204.
“रंदे — आको दुर्पालिः आको चुपति? आरु एभुकु लागे नेकिः?
चिकरपति— पाले लागे। मुख्ये परमाण खाओते सिफाले पिठंर सोवाद उभ गल। आरु एभुकु दिबलै आइगा हउक।" ⁹³

Rangdai had her own opinion about casteism prevalent their society. She expressed her ideas as follows:

“एडखन हातेरेड कत ओखकुलीया बामुण चिपयार ओख कुल समान करि।
परमाण रानभ खुवालौ तार लेख-जोख नाह।” ⁹⁴

When Chikarpati was successful in abducting the king of Dingā Nagar, the possibility of the marriage between Rangdai and Chikarpati became brighter. Finally Chikarpati was made a minister in Dingā Nagar. Rangdai became the wife of a minister there.

5.2:3 THE SECONDARY MALE CHARACTERS IN THE DRAMAS OF BEZBAROĀ:

(a) DEORĀM:

Deorām in the Litikāi was a very intelligent Brahmin. He made the seven foolish brothers his servants with his intelligence. He hoped that all these seven servants could do all his households works and works of the cultivation. But in practice things did not happen in the way he hoped. For the seven idiots difficulties after difficulties had to be faced by him. Once the mother of Deorām and another old woman had to die for the foolishness of the seven brothers. Now, therefore, wanted to kill all the seven idiot brothers.

⁹³ ibid, p-1060.
⁹⁴ ibid, p-1059.
Deoram was successful in killing six out of the seven brothers. One Titai survived. Deoram failed to kill the youngest one-Titai. But Titai in course of time became much intelligent and managed to marry the sister in law of Deoram. A thing becomes clear from the character of Deoram that neglect of others may bring forth loss to somebody and sometimes intelligence may have adverse effects.

(b) BIHANGABILAS DEV:

He was the Satradhikar of Athiabari Satra in the Nomal. He was a conservative person. He had only one intention to fulfil his own selfish interest. He did not feel it unjustified to do evil in the name of religion. He had no good feeling towards ordinary common people, on the other hand he was crude for them:

"इया क तिनि बाध-ढळा मारि, रदर फाले मुख कराइ, पाछले हात करि बन्धोवाइ भोवा हाओक! 95"

His knowledge of Sanskrit was very incomplete and he used wrong Sanskrit to show his scholarship.

"सहासनमभिप्रय उत्कृष्ण अपकृष्ण जा। कट्टांको निर्माणस्थ सिंह बास्यकर्त्येत्॥

95. ibid, p-1028.
96. ibid, p-1046.
The Satrādhikār had no respect for his own tradition. So, the love of Bengali was evident in him. He translated the Ankiya Naat, the 'Dadhi Mathan' into Bengali and wanted to perform it in the death anniversary of the Guru. He sang the Bengali songs translated from 'Dadhi Mathan' to show his scholarship:

"अरे नद आइल, नद आइल, नद आइल, हुवा।
अरे दुजन लोक दाड़ाय आछेह, खाहि कि नेखाय गुजवा॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥

(c) SĀDHURĀM BARUĀ:

Sādhurām Baruā was such a man in the 'Nomal' who raised his voice against the corruptions within the Satra. He spoke against the custom of the Bhakats not to sit any seat before the Satrādhikār that if we can sit before the God himself why not before the Adhikar?

"कौतनं घरत परमेश्वर आगते जेतिया सकलोचेआसनत बहिवले
अधिकार आछे, मनुष्य गुरु आगतनो तमे अधिकार नातीकिच्यात्र कामण
कि? ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥

Sādhurām had his own opinion regarding the study of Śāstras. To him all the castes of people—the Brahmins, Chandals, Sudras etc. had the

\[97\], ibid, p-1045.
\[98\], ibid, p-1047.
\[99\], ibid, p-1044.
right to study the scriptures. One did not attain Brahmanic qualities when one was born in a Brahmin family. A Sudra might also attain the Brahmanic qualities through his knowledge and good deeds:

"भागवतर मले ईश्वर कृष्णत शरण लोवा प्रकृत वैष्णव, शूद्र कथाह नाई. चंदाल हलेन, सें अवैणाव द्वारशपुरीया विन्यटकैन श्रेण चुति केले।"

(d) NIKARPATI (Chikarpati-Nikarpati):

Nikarpati was a famous thief of Dingā Nagar. But he was forced to surrender his stolen materials along with his own belongings at the instance of Chikarpati, another artful thief. He then recognised that Chikarpati was far better a thief than him, and consequently a friendship grew between them. He then told Chikarpati how the king of Dinga might be abducted and he accorded full support to Chikarpati in this matter:

"आमार रजाह दुर्पीया भात खाबर समयत तेओर गार राज-अलंकारपाति, मूरर मुकूट खहाई, साजकापोर सोलोकाई धे भात खाबलेज जाय। में चेंगते यदि तुमि सें राजअलंकार, साजकापोर, आरु मूरर मुकूट पिंधि रजार सिंहासन बहिब पारा, तेने तुमि रजा है हुकुम दि तेलियाई रजाक वनरी करि धरि ले जाब पारिबा।"

With the help of Nikarpati-Chikarpati abducted the king.

100. ibid, p-1045.
101. ibid, p-1063.
PITHU CHANGMAI (Jaymati Kunwari):

Changmai was liberal minded young man of free Assam. Although he killed pitilessly creatures for his "Changmai shall" (Cooking shed) yet his softness of heart was evident in his love for Tarbari:

"तइ वाकलि नहें तरबरी! तह धिमु चामाकर शार्डफविले। आह धिमु चामाम

चामे मांगा नसय वापालिं, बॊधोमलि तमरगोंमे लोपायले। 102"

Pithu tried to free Jaymati from the tortures of the king. But Jaymati rejected his proposal. In the last part of the drama, the proof of Changmai's loyalty to his master and the country can be witnessed when he killed one 'Jallad' by thrusting his dagger into the chest. He expressed his mind in the following words after killing the 'Jallad':

"एने पूण्यकर्ती देवी गोखानीर गात हात लगाइलिं? तार प्रतिफल तोक

dिलों। 103"

BORGOHAIN (Jaymati Kunwari):

Borgohain was a liberal independent-minded politician who opposed injustice. Although Jaymati and Borgohain belonged to the same family yet, he gave more importance to politics. But when a woman of the high family was taken to open field for inflicting punishment, he could not tolerate it. He tried his level best to step that nuisance.
Since Chulikaphā was the victim of the diplomacy of Burhāgohain and Barpātragohain, Borgohain was not successful to save Jaymatī.

(g) BURĀGOHĀIN (Jaymatī Kunwari):

Burāgohāin is the main villain of the drama who was selfish and mean minded. In fact Burāgohāin reaped the benefit of young age of the king Chulikaphā and wanted to keep the rein of the administration in his own hand. So he advised the king to make the young princes handicap, because no handicap person was allowed to be a king under the custom of the Ahoms. Chulikaphā came under the control of Burāgohāin and wanted to safeguard his throne by making the princes of other families handicap. Although Burāgohāin expressed that he did it only to make the throne enemyless yet his utterances showed that in is heart of hearts he had the intention to capture monarchical power:

"बुरागोहाँइँ : (रजार फाले आहुलियाह)। एँ पुतलाटी सम्प्रति मोक लागे। इयार नाचेरे मोर अनेक मतलब सिद्धि हब। (निजर वुक्ले आहुलियाह) अमुकाइँ! तड़ निराश नहबि। एदिन तोर आशा फलिया०ह०इँ। तड़ एँ करॅँ। एँ राजपाटर गराकी। कोने जाने? असंभवेँ बा कि? (निजर मूरत हात दि) मूराइँ! तड़ माथोन परिस्कार है थाक, हिचापत जेन भूल नकर।"  

\(^{104}\) ibid, p-1145.  
\(^{105}\) ibid, p-1149.
Burāgohāin was a heartless cold Calculator. He did not like to be defeated before a proud woman like Jaymatī; because she wanted to humble him down:

"बरगोहाँये मोले चाइ-चाइ गाँफर तलते सन्नोधर जि मिचिकोया हाँहिमारिम, देखिम मइ सहिम केनेके?" 106"

Because of the proud and obstinate character of Burāgohāin brought forth disaster to the whole country. He knew nothing except fulfilling his own wishes. So, he is the villain in the play.

(h) BARPĀTRAGOHĀIN (Jaymatī Kunwari):

In the ‘Jaymatī Kunwari’ Barpatragohāin was not equal to Borgohāin in politics and liberalism. Nor he was equal to him in diplomacy. His character was slavish and servile minded. Because while referring to himself he always used the term 'Bandi' (meaning a slave):

"बरपात्र गोहाँयका oily tongue है, तेल में भीगी हुई जोख में अनेक पंच क्यों होती है" 107"

Not only he spoke against Borgohāin before the king but also tried to separate Rājmātā from the king so that Rājmātā could not advise him:

"नहयो नि राजमाओदेउता! आपुनि भितरले जाओक, बन्दीये काबोके मातिछों" 108"

---

106 ibid, p-1159.
107 Lakshmināth, Dr. Maheswar Neog, p-125.
108 Bezbaroā Granthāwali, p-1147.
RAJA CHULIKAPHA (Jaymati Kunwari):

Raja Chulikapha in the Jaymati was a king without his personality and he had no capacity of judgement of his own. He was a doll in the hands of Buragohain and Barpatragohain. He danced to the tune of these two ministers.

At the time of producing Jaymati before the court of the king, he told his at the inquiry of Rajmata:

"आइदेउता ! तोमाक एडबरे डाल पात जोरोवा मिन्हा कथा लगाइ कोने आमनि करिखे कब नोवारेः । । । ।

Chulikapha was a timid person. He was broke down when he heard that Gadapani fled away:

"कि! गदापाणि पलाल! कोने कले? कि सर्वनाश! मझ ऐतिया कले जाओ? करौं कि? ।

Like Buragohain he also thought that he should not bow down before proud woman. When Jaymati refused to reveal the hiding place of Gadapani, he regarded it as an insult not only to him but also to all three ministers:

"एजनी मदगव्ही तिन्हुँलाई तिनिजना डाडीयारे सैते असमर रजाक एइदरे एटा कथाते हस्तुवाब लागिले अपमान राखिबलैं ठाइ नोहोवा हब। ।

109 ibid, p-1147.
110 ibid, p-1144.
111 ibid, p-1168.
(j) GAIJPURĪĀ (Chakradhwaj Singha):

With the character of Gaijpuriā, Bezbaroā introduced a new tradition in Assamese literature. It is an imaginery character which Bezbaroā picked up from the character of Falstaff of the Henry IV. But Bezbaroā has given a complete Assamese form.

Gaijpuriā had all the characteristics of Falstaff like fat body, humour eloquence, love of wine and with presence of mind:

"मइ गजहस्ती हले गाध हब नोवारो। माहरुलि हले सरियहरुलि हब नोवारो ।............. मइ यदि गजमूर्ख भाओ लाब लागिल, तेने बोजा बोवा 
दीघल काणेि सेइ चाइड़ीया जनुटोर भाओ तुमि लाब लागिब।" 112"

Like Falstaff, Gaijpuriā saved himself in the battle by falling near the deadbody of another soldier. He spread the false news that he had arrested Firoz Khān who was actually arrested by Priyarām like Falstaff who said that he killed Percy and Hotspur whom he did not actually kill. But when he was dictated, he skilfully averted the main question. Bezbaroā copied this idea from Shakespeare.

(k) PRIYARĀM (Chakradhwaj Singha):

Priyarām was the only son of Lāchit Barphukan on whom he had complete faith. Like Prince Hall in the Henry IV, he had no interest in administration but enjoyed life with Gaijpuriā and other mates by taking wine:

"अलबतू। लाउ, लाउमानी।" 113"

112 ibid, p-1098.
113 ibid, p-1099.
Like Prince Hall, Priyarām was insulted by his father:

"तई मोमाइतामुली बरबरुवार घरर कुलकलंक। 114"

Although he was ideal and drunkard, he showed his valour in the battle and imprisoned Firoz Khān. But he did not possess the personality of Prince Hall. Falstaff loved Prince Hall very much. But Gajpuriā wanted Priyarām only to fulfil his own selfish interests.

(I) PŪRNĀNANDA BURĀGOHĀIN (Belimār):

Pūrnānanda Burāgohāin was a patriot inspite of his greed for power. He wanted to run the administration by keeping Chandrakānta Singha under his control. Being dissatisfied with behavior and dealings of Satrām, a friend of king Chandrakānta, he reported to Rājmātā against Satrām:

"सत्रामे सर्गदिव लाई पाइ मोर डिडिलेके जोँप्याब खोजें। ताक जिखन हाते गाखीर खुबाइ तुलिले, सेजखन हातेस सि एतिया कामोर मारि दिवर खोजें देखोन? 115"

At the beginning Pūrnānanda made Satrām a servant of the king. But when the same Satrām became the friend of the king and tried to keep upperhand against Burāgohāin then Burāgohāin got him banished. There was a struggle for power between Pūrnānanda Burāgohāin and Badan Barphukan and being afraid of defeat, Burāgohāin committed suicide by licking diamond.

---

114 ibid, p-1104.
115 ibid, p-1180.
(m) SATRĀM (Belimār):

Satrām was a power-hungry, devoid of reason and enfore sighted person. He regarded Purnānanda as a barrier in way of his fulfilment of interest. Therefore, he took the king in his good book and tried to remove Burāgohāin from his path:

"नकरे, थाकक नाबालक है। आरू सेड़ बूढ़ा शामिलिये सिफाले जि पावे
कार थाओक।" 116

He extended his net to trap Pūrnānanda Burāgohāin, but he himself was entrapped in his own net. Satrām although drank wine with the king but he did not loose himself. Because he wanted to bring the king into his grip. The king being boozed under wine scolded Burāgohāin easily. But Satrām's trick failed.

(n) BADAN BARPHUKAN (Belimār):

Badan Barphukan in the Belimār was tyrannical and a traitor. He was first appointed as the viceroy at Guwahati by Ahom king Chandrakānta Singha.

As the king of Assam was the victim of Pūrnānanda's conspiracy he wanted to teach a lesson to them and with the help of the Burmese king he attacked Assam.

116. ibid, p-1182.
After the suicide of Purnananda Buragohain, he became the chief minister (Buragohain). But because of his being a traitor, Rajmata got him killed by a secret killer, Rupsingh.

(o) CHANDRAKANTA SINGHA (Belimar):

Chandrakanta Singha in the 'Belimar' is a weak, luxurious and drunkard man, who was very much lacking in fore sightedness. He believed in selfish person like Satram. Being in alcholic impact and under the evil influence of Satram he destroyed the further of the country. When his mother, Rajmata warned him against Satram, Chandrakanta refused to hear anything against his friend. On the other hand, he expressed his anger upon Buragohain in the following way:

“किन्तु तुम्हि भाविब्रज ने बुद्रागोहीये निस्वार्थभावे आमार उपकार करिबलेके एडबोर कार्य करिछिल बुलि? ....... मह कणा रजा होवातके आको सेंद आमार आगार नगण्य अवस्थाले जाबले शत मुगे भाल याम। 118”

He surrendered to the Burmese and when the Burmese attacked for the third time, he fled to Kamrup.

117 ibid, p-1203.
118 ibid, p-1189.
In addition to the above secondary characters, there are certain other characters for which the plots of the dramas moved forward. Moreover through these characters there was revelation of humour in the dramas.

They are:

(a) GANGĀRĀM UKIL AND ĀDHUNIK SIKSHITA UKIL (Chikarpati-Nikarpati):

These two symbolises the old and new ideas in the Chikarpati-Nikarpati.

"एड घिलि कराइ दुपाल आइन मुखस्थ करि उकिल हे आहि वृत्ति वेढ डुकाण जेन देखिया. आमि डाळ-चुलित फकालों, आमाक मानुहे जेनके नेदेखे।" 119

An old person like Gangārām advocate can never accept new persons immediately. Here there is reflection of the struggle between the old and the new.

(b) SUTULI GOHĀIN (Chikarpati-Nikarpati):

Sutuli Gohāin is the symbol of such persons who always think to be a member of 'Bare-log' (high class family) families. They try to attract the attention of other by feigning as ill. They buy anything at high prices to show that they only can buy good things, even when the things might be very bad.

119. ibid, p-1053.
Although both of them are insignificant characters in the 'Jaymati Kunwari' and the 'Belimar' respectively, yet they produce humour through their dialogues. Both of them criticise the main characters and try to attract the attention of the audience. Khuhuṭia is completely an Assamese Brahmin. He is very clever. He pretended that he dreamt certain incidents and on the basis of his false dream he tried to attack the king:

"रजार बरुङ्गवरीये दुपरिया भाट-पानी खाइ उठि चोतालर रदकाचलिति रद ले बहि आछिल, ऐते उपरेदि एजाक महना चराइ उरि गत। महनाजाकर महना एटाइ राणीर मुखत पूरीपोत्सर्ग करि गत। ........... महनाइ कते 'सम्पदेिो। लोकर कथा सूनि जि आकाशत उरि फुरा चराइको शामिति दिव.

(c) KHUHUṬIA SĀRMĀ PANḌIT AND BHUMUK BAHUĀ:

Although both of them are insignificant characters in the 'Jaymati Kunwari' and the 'Belimar' respectively, yet they produce humour through their dialogues. Both of them criticise the main characters and try to attract the attention of the audience. Khuhuṭia is completely an Assamese Brahmin. He is very clever. He pretended that he dreamt certain incidents and on the basis of his false dream he tried to attack the king:

"गात बिष, काकालत बिष। रेखदेखि नोमर चोला कापोर नहले फटकरे ढांगा लगि परे। एकेद मोर चिरर्गीया सरीर, तार ओपरते ढांगा लगि काह-कफ हले आरु मोक मैर बाँलर दुपत पुलिबलेिे ले जाब लागिब। 120"

+++ +++ +++

"जहरमल बाबुर गोलात भाटीर परा सुन्दर गरहर चिंड आहिचे, मोक देखुळाइल। तभधुकार। आदमीन बा दहसेिे मोले पटियाई दिवले जागणन बानुक बे आहिजे। दामोह अपरुस फिनु बेचौ। अपरुस भान बस्तुर बोजा सरह हबइ। भान मानुहले बेचौ दामर बस्तु, नरम मानुहले कम दामर बस्तु। 121"

---

120 ibid, p-1054.
121 ibid, p-1054.
Pandit taunted at the king through a description of his imaginary dreaming as the king put Jaymati to tortures. But unintelligent king could not understand it; and asked him to sing. There was a humour on the king in the song:

"सोपर शलमाछ तुबुढाइ सारिले,
बगली अति शियान,
हात पौँजि लै ढेकीयापतीयाक
हाँहाँ चोरे बिहे विधान।" 123

In the song Gadāpānī has been described as the Dhekiāpatiā Bāgh (Royal Bengal Tiger) and the person who punished him ie. La’rā Rajā, as the 'Hanh Chor' (a thief of hens). In the character of Khuhūṭiā, the reflection of Shakespeare's Fool or the Clown can be seen.

(c) BHUMUK BAHUĀ (Belimar):

Bhumuk is another humourous character in the 'Belimar'. In his conversation, there is humourous expression:

"मई देखिछो मातबोर डाढ–चुलिर निचिना।" 124

122 ibid, p-1169.
123 ibid, p-1170.
124 ibid, p-1185.
Bhumuk criticised the activities of Badan Barphukan, and the customs of Bengalis at Calcutta and showed that Assamese culture is better than the Bengali counterpart.

(e) Some other insignificant characters like Nenāi, Litik and others in the Jaymati Kunwarī.

There was no coherence in the speeches of Nenāi Chamuā. But he was expert in 'making'. For such eloquence he was able to earn favour of persons like Buragohain:

"एडबोर मरण-जीवन कथा। ऐने कथात बहुवालि करिले बर टान हय
देउँता। १२५"

Litik had no personality of his own. But he approved what Nenāi said or talked about: नहयौ फि एका? १२६

Komal was a typical Assamese 'Laguā' (a servant) in the house of Buragohainī. He threatened the 'Fakir' to break his waist rather than welcoming him. When he could not do so due to Buragohaini, he expressed his mind.

"हो ल। किन्तू तड़ दिनौ एडबर आहिले, धरि ककाल जोरात मार शोधाम।
आइडेउता करबाते थाकिब। आइदेउताक फाँकि दि चल पाइछ हबल। १२७"

---

125. ibid, p-1165.
126. ibid, p-1164
127. ibid, p-1161.
Kehoram Gayan in the ‘Nomal’ was a flatterer, who always praised the Satradhikar. He flattered the Adhikar who believed that Bengali dramas were better than the Assamese ones:

“বড়লা নাট্য বর তেজ। অংকোয়া নাট্যে নিচিনাতো আর সি মেরমেরীয়া নহে।”

The watchman (Paharedar) and magistrate (Hakim) also did some mischief in the Nomal. When Naharphutukā wanted to go inside the Satra, they asked for bribes: “হাকিম– কি আনিছ ?”

As Nāharphutukā was not in a position to bring any bribe, he offered the ‘Pithaguri’ (Powdered rice) which he brought to take on the way to them. But they insulted him:

“ঘেঁ কর। তোর পিঠাগুরি কোনেও নাখায। পাই-পাই কিবা আছে জন্দি উলিয়া।”

5.2:4 THE SECONDARY FEMALE CHARACTERS IN THE DRAMAS OF BEZBAROĀ:

(A) ḌĀLIMĪ (Jaymatī Kunwarī):

Of all the secondary characters in the dramas of Bezbaroā, his imaginary creation, Ḍālīmī is the most attractive and unique one. In the ‘Jaymatī Kunwarī’, Ḍālimī has been depicted as beautiful and mobile like a butterfly in the forest of Naga hills. She was handsome like a dreamgirl. Her beauty and loveliness has been depicted as follows:

\[\text{footnotes:} 128\text{ ibid, p-1047.} \\
129\text{ ibid, p-1043.} \\
130\text{ ibid, p-1043.} \]
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Dalimi was in love with the banished Gadāpāni. Her love was not worldly but divine one:

"वर्क्षियर त्रूची दे डालिमी प्रकृति-जीयारी, सरल अथव सहजत धीमध्यना। डालिमी लारा -बूढार पार्थक्य नुकुजे, समय परिक्षती नामाने आरु मानव जगत आरु प्रकृति जगत व्यवधान नाजाने। डालिमीर चरित्र सम्बसाधारण नगा बा नागिनीर सरलता विद्यमान यदिउ साधारण नागिनीर परा ताई बहुत आगबढ़ा। ¹³²"

Bezbaroa depicted the character of Dalimi, who was born and brought up in the midst of nature with love and affection, in such a way as if she was a goddess:

"डालिमी एटा स्वर्गीय मंगलमयी शक्ति-मरतर बाछकबनीया सोन्दर्यरुपत धानिका लैँडे हि....... मुते आमि एके कथाते कल्पते गले डालिमी हैंग्रू गुड (कल्याण) आरु good कल्याण सुन्दर हे बड़ लागिव। मंगलमय हे बड़ लागिव आरु evil counter act करौने लागिव आरु एड़ good हैं गुड सत्य; एड़ जे चिरकल्याण eternal good इयेइ डालिमीर आत्मा बुलि मण्ड

¹³². Asomiyā Nāya Sāhitya, Satyendra Nāth Sārmā, p-221.
Dalimi did not speak in her mother tongue. She spoke in pure Assamese. There was a poetical sense in her. She was very brave; and therefore, she was able to chase the persons who attacked Gadāpāni with her bow and arrows.

(B) RAJMJĀTĀ:

Rajmātā is an ideal Assamese mother in the ‘Jaymatī Kunwarī’. She was a devotee of the Lord. She was afraid that God would punish her son for his misdeeds. She memorised almost everything of the Ramayana and the Mahabharata. When she got the news that Jaymati was taken to the court and was insulted, she was afraid of the future and warned her son.

"mahābhāratā duryōdhana drōṣṭādeśik dhrārau ānī bhāyeke duśārasaṃ hātuvā daśa pāde
lau karaścchal. duśaśasna būk vṝṝtārau tēj pī bhīme sēi apamaṇa rōth
laścitā."134"

In the mind of Rajmātā, there was the thought of the good for her son and of keeping the glory of their dynasty always.

134. Bezbaroa Granthāwali, p-1147.
(C) PIJAU:

Pijau was the daughter of Badan Barphukan in the 'Belimar'. She was the wife of Oreshanath. She had womanly qualities like simplicity, soft-heartedness and sweetness in her. She was educated and helpful. There was devotion to her father in her. Therefore, she informed about the conspiracy of her father-in-law to her father:

"সকল মানুষ তোমার বিপঞ্চ। ঈশ্বর তোমার সপ্তহ হোক। সানহান হয়া, নতুনা স্বর্ণনাশ। 135"

Pijau suffered mentally very much when her father Badan tortured his own people with the help of the Burmese soldiers. When she got the news that secret killer assasinated her father, she was so worried that she lost her mental balance and committed suicide by jumping into water. There are some types of similarities between the life of Pijau and that of Ophelia in Shakespeare's Hamlet.

(D) MĀJU ĀIDEO:

Māju Āideo (Belimar) is the wife of Oreshanath Dhekiāl Phukan. She was very talkative and revengeful. But she used proverbs and sayings in her speech always:

"ফোপুঁজহী রদডই, এদোন ধানার পিঠা খূন্দি দেশখনকে জনায। 136"

---

135. ibid, p-1198.
136. ibid, p-1192.
In the character of Māju Aīdeo there is the depiction of enmity between co-wives:

“लेनियाइ लेनियाइ कब्रा के निरिखेकम मरम लगाबर बेलिका चाबि।
शैरिनीजनी कर परा आहिल जानो, मोर घरखन भाडिबले।”

(E) SUBHADRĀ:

The picture of quarrel between a mother-in-law and her dauther-in-law has been well depicted in the characters of Subhadrā, mother Deoram and Chandī, wife of Deoram in the ‘Litikāi’.

“सुभद्रा - कि भोरभोराइछ हय? तामोलर बटाटो खोजा काणत परिछे ने

चंडी - काणत नपरिबले किबा कालरी हैछो नेकि? कोनोवा यदि हवर

मन गैछे हजोक।”

(F) SAJTOLĀNI:

Sajtolāni (in the Litikāi) is a simple and easy going Assamese old woman.

\[\text{137 ibid, p-1192.}\]
\[\text{138 ibid, p-1192.}\]
\[\text{139 ibid, p-1025.}\]
Gajpuriani in the ‘Chakradhwaj Shingha’ is a quarrel some rural woman. She was beautiful and delightful. She distributed wine to her husband and his friends in their courtyard. It was a custom in Assam to take wine with tribal people together. In fact she wanted to love Priyarâm; and therefore, she served wine to him. She also wanted to control Priyarâm with the help of mantras. She gathered several things to apply ‘Bashikaran Mantra’ (Mantra for controlling others):

"जाओं सेंढ़ रद्धाई पाणजोपार तिन डाल शिपा आजियें तुलि थाओं।
काले पुंजा बाही मुखेरेर गआ आउनीपाणर गछर मकराजाल आनिम।
शानुकर चूणर चोकरा आछें।" ¹⁴⁰

She could not fulfil her desire because of her clever husband.

Tarbarî in the ‘Jaymati Kunwari’ was a faithful attendant of Jaymatî. When the soldiers of the king took Jaymatî away from home, then it was Tarbarî who looked after the two sons of Jaymatî. She refused the love of Pithu Chângmâi because he killed animals, which was his duty as a cooker:

"दिनौ हाँह पार कुकुरा छागली येचू येचू करे काटिब लागिछ, मरम धरम
काक बोले भु नेपाव।" ¹⁴¹

When Pithu Chângmâi killed one torturer of Jaymatî, for which he was also murdered, then Tarbarî showed her sympathy towards him. Her

¹⁴⁰. ibid, p-1102.
¹⁴¹. ibid, p-1139.
misunderstanding was cleared and she expressed her desire to get married with Pithu in their next life:

"तौर मोल आजिहे भालके चुजिलो। फटा कठात सोए आछिल। मोंक बिया करिबलै तौर हैंहाह आछिल। तौर आशा सिद्धि नहल। सिपुरित दुयोरो बिया हब निचिचय।" 142

(I) NICHALI:

Nichali (Nomal) was a simple and devoted Assamese woman. She wanted a good name and blessing from the Satrādhikār of Athiabari for her sixth son and sent her husband in this errand. The sending of a 'Gamochā' and a coin to the Adhikar showed her faith and devotion towards Guru:

"मई न गामोछ एखन बै थैछौं, ताके सिकीए एटोरे सैते ले जोवा।" 143

In this manner, Bezbaroa depicted the picture of common people of Assam in accordance with time and place.

5.3 A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CHARACTERS IN THE DRAMAS OF BHĀRTENDU AND BEZBAROA:

After going through the primary and secondary characters (both male and female) of the dramas of Bhārtendu and Bezbaroa, it is necessary to have a comparative study of them. In fact Bhārtendu wrote only farces, Bhans and Dramalogues and did not write any full drama. His dramatic writings were based on contemporary political, social and religious problems. On the other hand Bezbaroa wrote four farces, and three historical plays.

142 ibid, p-1174.
143 ibid, p-1041.
As such the character of both of them were the result of different circumstances. Their similarities and dissimilarities may be considered. Bhārtendu used some symbolic as well as some non-physical characters (personified characters) like Rog, Ālasya, Madirā, Andhakār etc. in his plays. Such personified characters are not available in Bezbaroā's plays. Bezbaroā in imitation of English plays created some characters only for producing humour; which is not found in the plays of Bhārtendu. Bhārtendu used mostly satire while Bezbaroā used humour more. But Satire is inherent in his humour.

The character 'Griddharāj' in Bhārtendu's 'Vaidīkī Hinsā Hinsā Na Bhawati' can be easily compared to Chandrakānta Singha in Bezbaroā's 'Belimār'. Both these two kings remained aloof from their royal duties and remained surrounded by flatterers and spent luxurious life. Both of the neglected their countries, Griddharāj was busy with women and wine and Chandrakānta was also not away from them. So, their weakness was exploited by their ministers.

Again similarities are found in between Chaupaṭṭa Rājā of Bhārtendu in the 'Andher Nagari' and king Chulikaphā of Bezbaroā in the 'Jaymatī Kunwari'. Both the kings are with bad ideas and intention. There was lack of own intelligence in them. Therefore they could not decide what was good and what was bad for them. As a result they fell in dangers. Chaupaṭṭa Rājā could not differentiate between justice and injustice and because of his own stupidity he met his tragic end. In the same manner, Chulikaphā also an idiot. He had no idea of justice and injustice. He did not care to do injustice at the instance of the flattery of the ministers. He made all the probable candidates for throne handicapped. He did not even care to torture a respectable woman of the royal family in an open place. It showed the lack of far sight and fore sight in him. The result was very dangerous, which his mother for told him.
In the case of Bhārtendu’s Rājā Śūryadev in the ‘Nīldevi’ and Lāchit Barphukan in Bezbaroā’s ‘Chakradhwaj Singha’ there are certain similarities. Both of them fought for their motherland like good Kshatriyas. Śūryadev, the king of Punjab fought against Ābdur Śhārīf Khān and Lāchit Barphukan against Rāmsingh, the commander of Aūrengzeb for their motherlands. Patriotism was full to the brim in their hearts. They made good examples of devotion to the motherland by fighting with valour and courage.

In the ‘Bhārat Jananī’ of Bhārtendu there are two English characters. One of them was the symbol of that class which wanted to destroy their own country and the other of that class who wanted welfare and progress of their motherland. In the same manner Lāchit Barphukan was such a patriot in Bezbaroā’s Chakradhwaj Singha who wanted welfare and development of his own country and who slaughtered his own maternal uncle for the sake of his motherland. On the otherhand, Badan Barphukan in the ‘Belimar’ was such a vital character who attacked his motherland with the help of the Burmese soldiers to fulfil his own nasty interest. As a result there was the fall of the Ahom kingdom in Assam and the British occupied Assam.

With Ghasīrām and Gobardhan Dās of the ‘Andher Nagari’ comparison may be made of Gajpurīā and Sindhirām of the ‘Charkradhwaj Singha’ and Bhumuk Bahuā of the ‘Belimar’. The minister in Bhārtendu’s ‘Vaidikī Hinsā Hinsā Na Bhawati’ can be compared with Satrām of Bezbaro’s ‘Belimar’. In the manner in which Rājā Śūryadev in the ‘Nīldevi’ killed twenty seven Yavanās with his arrow. Pithu Chāngmāi in the ‘Jaymati Kunwari’ killed the Jallad who tortured Jaymati with his dagger and met his own death. Mahanta of the ‘Andher Nagari’ can be compared with Borgohāin of the ‘Jaymati Kunwari’. Both of them were foresighted and could smell the danger before hand. Considering the economic policy of ‘Andher Nagari’ came to the conclusion that it was dangerous to live in the kingdom of foolish kings. Therefore he advised Gobardhan Dās to leave his country, but the latter did not obey the advice and fell into danger. In the same manner Borgohāin also
render good advice to king Chulikaphā. But against his advice Chulikaphā tortured Jaymatī, a respectable woman of the royal family in an open place. But Borgohain knew that the outcome would not be good.

The characters of Bhārtendu’s ‘Vaidikā Hinsā Hinsā Na Bhawati’ like the king. Purohit, Gandakidās, Sādhu, Dewān etc. may be compared with those in the ‘Nomal’ of Bezbaroa like the Satrādhikār, Hākim and Deoram of the ‘Litikāi’.

In the case of female characters in the dramas of Bhārtendu and Bezbaroa, there may be a good comparison. Nildevī in the ‘Nildevī’ and Jaymati of the ‘Jaymati kunwari’ may easily be compared. Both of them are devoted to their husband and are patriots. Nildevī is the character of an ideal Kshatriya woman, who was foresighted. She warned her husband against the corrupt ways of war of the Muslims. She also advised Prince Somdev not to fight with the Muslims in open fields. She entered into the fort of the Sharīf in guise of a dancing girl. Her killing of the Sharīf exposed her devotion to her husband and her motherland. Likewise Jaymati was also foresighted. Because when Chulikaphā wanted to wound all the probable princess, then she prayed her husband Gadāpāni to leave his country. She knew that Gadāpāni would not be able to fight against the king and unjustice alone. Even if he would declare war he could not be able to win. But a brave fighter like Gadāpāni was indispensable for the future of the country. Like Nildevī, Jaymati also was a patriot and diplomatic. Jaymati sacrificed her life like Nildevī who also did it for her motherland. In the same manner both of them regard the happiness of individual is inferior to collective happiness. The sacrifice of lives by both Nildevī and Jaymati was for the good of their motherland, and for the welfare of the society.

Bhārtendu personified Bhārat Janāti to inspire the people through reminding their past history. In fact the mother looks for the good of her children and shows the right path by rendering good advice. In the same
manner Rajmātā in the 'Chakradhwaj Singha' and Rajmātā in the 'Belimar' wanted to show the good way to their sons. Both the Rajmātās tried to bring their sons to the correct path. Both the Rajmātās and the 'Bhārat Janaṇi' inspired the people to do good to the country. Therefore emotional similarity is found in both of them.

There is a very beautiful depiction of the 'Parakiya Prem' (love after marriage) in the 'Śrī Chandrāwali'. Being allured by the love for Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Chandrāwali was impatient to win him. Although Bezbaroā did not write dramas on Kṛṣṇa, yet there are depictions of love in his dramas. There is a beautiful example of the 'Parakiya Prem' in Gajpuriānī of the 'Chakradhwaj Singha'. Although she was married, she loved Priyārām, son of Lāchit Borphukan. She feed Priyārām with love and affection and even she took the help of mantras to win over him. Bezbaroā also depicted love between Gadāpānī and Dālimi and Tarbari and Pithu (in the Jaymati Kunwari); and Rangdai and Chikarpati (Chikarpati-Nikarpati).

There is also similarity between Bhārtendu and Bezbaroā in the cases of depiction of aides to the heroines. For example, Lalitā in the 'Śrī Chandrāwali' and Tarbari in the 'Jaymati Kunwari' may be compared. Lalitā did everything to console her friend Chandrawali when she broke down in love with Kṛṣṇa. The same role had been played by Tarbari to console her mistress Jaymati. She took the charge of Jaymati's children where she was taken by the soldiers for punishment. There is a sense of sacrifice in both Lalitā and Tarbari.

Bhārtendu and Bezbaroā were the topmost dramatist of their time. Bhārtendu selected the then problems for the plot of his dramas while Bezbaroā made historical facts in addition to the social inconsistencies of the time. Therefore, due to differences in their view points, there may be difference in the characters also. From this point of view, Bhārtendu personified certain matters like Rog, Ālasya, Madirā, Andhakār, Bhārat
Janani etc. and showed some type of originality in his writing. But in case of Bezbaroa there is no personified character. He did not personify any emotion or non-corporal materials in his dramas.

Bhartendu depicted the personal difficulties in his ‘Prem Yogini’. But Bezbaroa did never depict anything of his personal life. Therefore there is no character like Ramchandra in Bezbaroa’s drama. Bezbaroa like Bhartendu was the devotee of Lord Krishna. Of course he did not write any play like that ‘Shri Chandrawali’ of Bhartendu. Bezbaroa, on the other hand, wrote dramas on folk tales and folk-faith. They are the ‘Litikai’ and the ‘Nomal’. Here his characters are fully Assamese. The virtues of love of guest, liberalism and simplicity of Assamese people are reflected in Bezbaroa’s characters like the Titai, Pachani, Naharphutuka etc.

Bezbaroa’s original and the unique creation is the character of Dalimi in the ‘Jaymati Kunwari’. In fact Dalimi is the foster daughter of Bezbaroa. Dalimi is not only a daughter of Naga hills but also a daughter of nature and beauty combined. Anybody and everybody may be blessed with her. There is no parallel to her in simplicity and faith, Practically speaking Dalimi is the concrete form of female beauty.

With the comparison of characters in the dramas of Bhartendu and Bezbaroa, it is clear that in spite of the differences in subject-matter and environment there is emotional similarity between Bhartendu and Bezbaroa which made their characters much similar. There is more similarity than differences in them.