CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1. Origin and Development of Sanskrit Drama

Nāṭaka is one of the ten varieties of rūpakas enumerated in Nāṭyaśāstra (2 c. AD) by Bharata. It is considered to be a model for other varieties of dramatic composition. The other varieties of rūpaka are distinguished chiefly by the enumeration of their points of divergence from Nāṭaka.

According to Indian tradition, drama is an imitation of the actions and conduct of the people. But mere imitation is not sufficient to give pleasure and so there are several other factors also which distinguish the drama from other forms of literature. It can be staged by the actors. It is divided into acts that are neither too long nor too short the action of which has to undergo several stages to reach climax. The plot of the drama must be drawn from the Itihāsas, the hero should be a noble character and the action should lead to the realisation of rasa by the spectators.
Origin of Sanskrit Drama:

The history of dramatic presentation can be traced back to the time of Vedas. There has been a lot of controversy regarding the origin of Sanskrit drama. Scholars have put forward different views regarding the same.

a. Divine Origin:

Bharata in the first chapter of NS traces the origin of drama to Brahma. According to him, The gods prayed to Brahma to give them an 'audio – visual plaything' in order to give instruction to the people of Jambudvīpa who by this time had undergone high moral degradation. As the instruction imparted through Vedas does not cover all the varṇas, they wanted a new device that would cover all the Varṇas – Sārvavarnikam. The creator took the requisite words from the Rgveda, portions relating to music and songs from Sāmaveda, quality of acting from the Yajurveda and the elements of rasas from the Atharvaveda and thus created a fifth veda called Nāṭyaveda, then Nāṭyaveda was given to Bharata and he bought it to the earth. Bharata taught his hundred sons the
lessons of performance. They enacted the five ever dramas in, the festival of Indra. Later the damsels were created to play the role of female character Siva added element of dance and Viṣṇu contributed the four Vṛttis. This theory of divine origin is supported by Kālidāsa.

b. Secular Theories:

Prof. A. B. Keith in his *Indian Drama* has enumerated different secular theories tracing the origin of drama from puppet shows and shadow plays that were prevalent among the rural masses of ancient times. He mainly relies on the literal meaning of the word “Sutradhāra”- bearer of the string. Scholars like Weber has taken troubles to find out Hellenic influence in the development of Sanskrit theatre.

It can be concluded that the theatre in India developed through various stages. During these stages it blended in itself several elements including that of desī-local folk aspects that existed at that time.
Major Types of Rūpakas:

Bharata was conversant with ten kinds of rūpakas, and his divisions and descriptions remained authoritative for later theorists. He left the question of Uparūpakas to his disciples like Kohala. The Agnīpurāṇa mentions seventeen minor kinds of dramas in addition to the ten rūpakas. The Daśarūpakas gives details about nāṭika. The Bhāvaprakāśaṇa gives an elaborate description of twenty kinds of minor dramas which are styled uparūpakas. The Sāhityadarpaṇa describes eighteen uparūpakas.

The chief point of distinction between rūpaka and uparūpaka is that Āṅgikābhinnaya - bodily gestures have prime importance in the presentation of Uparūpakas, music and dance playing the dominant role. But in Rūpaka emphasize into the Sātvikābhinnayas. The Bhāvaprakāśana very clearly says that rūpakas were rasātmaka (dependent on sentiment) and uparūpakas were bhāvātmaka (dependent on emotion). It calls uparūpakas as nṛtyabhedaḥ (Species of nṛtya) and rūpakas as nāṭyabhedaḥ (species of nāṭya). The distinction that nāṭya is Vākyārthābhhinayātmaka and nṛtya is Padārthābhhinayātmaka also puts to the same principle.
Rūpaka - the general term in Sanskrit to denote the dramatic performance give stress to the visual aspects.

\[ \text{Avasthānukṛtirnātyam rūpam dṛṣṭyatayocyate} \]

\[ \text{Rūpakam tatsamāropāt dasādhaiva rasāśrayam} \]

The ten types of rūpakas are known as Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Bhāna, Prahasana, Dima, Vyāyoga, Samavakāra, Vithi, Aṅka, and Thāmāga. The classification in to different varieties rests chiefly on the element of subject matter, hero and sentiment, but also the dramatic mode and the structure. Among these the nāṭaka form of rūpakas is regarded as the best and it is supposed to propagate Dharma, Artha and Kāma consistent with each other.

According to Bharata, Drama is the imitation of the action of the three worlds, the action of Gods, Kings, Ṛsis and the like. All the four Vṛttis namely, Bhārati, Sātvati, Ārabhaṭi and Kaiśiki should be in their proper places in a nāṭaka consisting of five to ten acts. An act normally narrates events of not more than one day. According to Daśarūpaka, in a nāṭaka the hero should be endowed with attractive qualities of the type known as the self-
controlled and exalted (dhirodhātta) and should be glorious, desirous of winning fame, very energetic, a preserver of the three vedas (trayī) a ruler of the world of renowned lineage. The story is narrated in five elements of acting corresponding to the five dramatic stages and should be divided into five junctures (Sandhis) and these junctures should again be divided into 64 sub-divisions. The Patāka, Prakari and Viṣkambhaka should be employed. One sentiment, either the heroic or the erotic, is to the made the principal sentiment, all others being made subordinate. The marvelous sentiment should be employed only towards the end.

II. Sanskrit Dramas of Kerala Origin:

The contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit literature is vast in bulk and varied in content. It comprises all branches of learning both general like Kāvyā, Nāṭaka, Campu, Alaṅkara and technical like the different Darśanas Mimāmsa, Vedānta, Tantra, Gaṇita, Silpa and Sangīta. It is strange that many of the Sanskrit works of Kerala are still not well known to other states. During the period of 8th and 9th centuries there is a stagnation in the development of
dramatic literature in the national level; but in Kerala, that period marked a renaissance in the field of dramatic literature as well as in almost all branches of Sanskrit learning. The existence of a large number of principalities and the literary patronage of Kerala princes were the factors that where responsible for the production of Sanskrit dramas in Kerala.

Contribution of Kerala to the Sanskrit theatre can be studied under three heads—early works up to the 10th century, medieval up to the 18th century and modern up to the 20th century.

By the discovery of thirteen dramas ascribed to Bhāsa, Late Ganapati Sastri contributed his share to the Kerala Sanskrit literature. Out of these six, Madhyamavyāyoga, Pañcarātra, Dūtavakya, Dūtaghatolkaca, Karṇabhāra and Īrubhaṅga are based on Mahābhārata, Pratima and Abhiṣeka on Rāmāyaṇa. Bālacarita on Harivamśa, Pratijñāyugandharāyaṇa and Śvānāśavadatta on Vatsarāya and Vāsavadatta. Bhāsa's date can be determined in between 450 – 370 B. C. There are some scholars who hold that these dramas were the earliest from Kerala. Though these dramas were discovered from Kerala, they
originated in the north. They might have came to Kerala during the 12th-13th centuries when the Kūṭiyāṭam mode of presentation began to flourish here. The two Prahasanas - Mattavilāsa and Bhagavadajjukīya might have been the earliest specimens from the south. They are referred to in the Mamandur inscriptions. Great philosopher Śrī Śankarāchārya of 788 – 820 A. D was an eminent Kerala Sanskrit writer. He is the author of 111 works. Śakthibhadra of 9th century might have been the earliest dramatist from Kerala and he is supposed to be a contemporary of Śrī Śankarācārya. He was the author of two well known dramas ie. Aścaryacūḍāmaṇi and Unmādavāsavadatta. The latter is available only in references.

From the prologue to the Aścaryacūḍāmaṇi of Śaktibhadra one understands that Kerala did not produce any Sanskrit drama before that time and that it was a wonder that a play is produced in the south. But this notion does not seem to be safe. The prologue shows that it uttered when the play was performed in the north. Then only one can wonder about a production from the south. In that case, it means that this is the first play known to the north from the south. Anyhow Pro. Winternitz, view that
$Aṣcaryacāḍamaṇi$ was not intended to be enacted on the stage\textsuperscript{17}, cannot be accepted as there is little evidence to prove it. Moreover this is one of the most successful productions on the Kūṭiyāṭam stage. Nilakaṇṭha of $9^{th}$ century was the author of a famous Vyāyoga $Kalyāṇasaugandhika$. This is a small which has tremendously influence the Kerala stage.

Royal Dramatist Kulasēkhara Varma, who probably flourished in $10^{th}$ centuries A. D. was the author of $Tapaṭīsamavāraṇa$ and $Subhadrādhanāṇjaya$\textsuperscript{18}. The $Tapaṭīsamvāraṇa$ is a drama in six acts based on the story of the love between Tāpati, the daughter of sun god and Samvaraṇa the King of Hastinapura. The $subhadrādhanāṇjaya$ describes in five acts the well known story of Arjuna's abduction of Subhadra from Dvāraka.

The literary merits of the two plays are such that they deserve a place among the classification of dramas in Sanskrit literature. Both had been popular with the Cākyars and were usually staged in the local theatre. The composition of these dramas
marked an epoch in the history of Kerala classical theatre. Kulaśekhara was not merely a poet; he was the dramatist with a good dramatic sense. He was a good actor too. He acted the role of each character and asked his friend to write down the details. The acting manual thus composed is known as Vyākhya, perhaps the only one of its kind in Sanskrit.

No Sanskrit drama of Kerala origin written in the next two centuries is known to us. Ravivarman Kulaśekhara of 1266 - 1315 was the author of a famous drama Pradyuṃnābhuyudaya in five acts, he claims proficiency in music also. The story of the drama is drawn from the Harivamsa. It describes how Pradyumna killed Vajrānābha and married his daughter Prabhāvati. Pūrṇasaraswati of 14th century was the author of 12 works out of which the drama Kamalinirājahamsa is very popular among scholars. It is a unique work as it characters are taken from nature. It is written in five acts and describes the love between Rājahamsa, the king of swans and Kamalini, a lotus of the pampa lake and their subsequent marriage.

In the 15th century A. D., Prince Rāmavarman wrote the
drama *Candrikākalāpīḍa* is an imitation of Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra*. During the Middle Ages, the court of the zamorins of Calicut was the most important centre of Sanskrit studies in Kerala. An early ruler of his dynasty instituted an annual convocation of scholars and poets for *Sastraic* discussion, the most meritorious among them being awarded the title of Bhaṭṭa. Manavikrama, the Zamorin gathered eighteen poets in Sanskrit and inspired Malayalam poet Pūnām recognized only as an arakāvi (half poet). Among them, according to tradition nine were members of the Payyur family including Rṣi and his son Parameśwara, five were the Nampūtiris from the village of Tiruvēgappura and the rest were Uddāṇḍa Ṣāstrī Nārāyanan Nampūtiri of cennās and Dāmodara Bhaṭṭa of Kākkaṇāseri. During this period of great literary activities in the court of King Mānavikrama he wrote a commentary called *Vikramīya* on Murari's *Anaragharāghava*. The famous Bhaṭṭatiris of Payyūr stood out prominently in this constellation of Poet and Scholars and they specialized in Mīmāṃsā literature. They are referred to in respectful terms by Uddāṇḍa Ṣāstrī, the author of fair work including the drama *Mallikāmārutha* and Kakkаṇāseri Dāmodara Bhaṭṭa, was the author the *Vasumatiśvikrama* a drama in seven acts. It
describes the marriage of Vikrama with Vasumati; the daughter of his minister Marigai Accan. Uddandasastrī and Dāmodara Bhaṭṭa have Praised Mānavikrama of Kozhikode in their work.

In 15th and 16th centuries a number of Bhānas were composed in Kerala. Nārayana Nampūtiri of Mahiṣamaṅgalam wrote the Mahiṣamaṅgalam Bhāṇa. Pūrṇapurusārthacandrodaya was an allegorical drama composed by an anonymous person, some scholars assign him to the 15th century A.D. and others place him in the 18th century A.D. The drama composed in five acts and describes the marriage of King Daśasva with Ānandakalpavalli. This seems to be the only allegorical play produced in Kerala.

In the 16th century Divākara Kavi, flourished under the patronage of a Mānaveda of Calicut wrote the play Lakshmīmanaveda. It describes the story of the marriage of Rājalakshmi with Mānaveda. Bālakavi author of the two dramas Ratnaketūdaya and Rāmavarmavilāsa, came to Kerala in search of literary patronage and enjoyed the patronage of King Rāmavarman of Cochin. In the Ratnaketūdaya drama describes
in five acts and it deal with the marriage of Ratnaketu with Līlāvati.
In this work King Rāmavarma is mentioned with great respect. In
other work- Rāmavarmanvilāsa describes in five acts, the story of
King Rāmavarmman of Cochin. (the poet's own patron). The date
and identity of Bālakavi and the poet patron there has been some
controversy. According to some Scholars fix the date of
Bālakavi was a contemporary and rival of Uddāṇḍa Śāstri the au-
thor of Mallikāmārūta.28

Another drama, Indumatiṭīrāghava was a play popular in
Kerala in the 17th century. It deals with Ajā's marriage with
Indumati. M. Krishnamacarier assigns the work to Kākkaśseri.29
In that century Nīlakanṭha of the well-known family of Kūdallur,
wrote a drama named Kamalinīkalahamsa. The play contains six
acts and it deals with the story of love between Kamalini and
Kalāhamsa. Srīdhara, a Brahmana under the patronage of the King
Devaṇārayaṇa wrote the play Laksminīdevanārayaṇa in five acts
with his patron King Devaṇārayaṇa as its hero. Rāmapāṇivāda of
1700-1760 author of 32 works including Candrikāvīthi,
Madanaketūcaritaprahasana, Līlavati viṇī and the Nāṭaka
Sitārāghava which is a drama in seven acts dealing with the well-known Rāma story. From the prologue, it is evident that the play was intended to be staged at the Murajapa festival instituted by Maṭṭāṇḍavarman himself. It has got an important place among the Rāma Plays in Sanskrit.

18th century was a golden age of Kerala Sanskrit dramas. There were many dramatists in Kerala during this period. Among these, Krishnadasa, author of Kalāvatikāmarūpa- describes the story of the marriage of Kalāvathī and Kāmarūpa, son of Kāmaketu who was the King of Kāśī. M. Krishnamacarier assigns it to the end of the 18th century. Ranganātha author of Damayantīkālyāṇa is a drama dealing with the well-known story of Nala and Damayanti. This drama was staged on the occasion of the spring festival at Sucindram temple. The Kumarīvilāsita written by Sudarśana is a short play describing the holy deeds of Goddess Durga. Śrīdhara, author of Lakshmīdevanārāyanīyam, Ratikara, author of Śṛngāramatībhāṇa, Īśvaraśarmā author of Śṛngārasudārṇāgabhaṇa, Padmanābhan Nampūtiri author of Candrikājanamejaya were prominent figures.
Sri. Manavikrama Ettan Tampuran of Calicut of this century had composed 40 works out of which three were dramas ie. *Odānavaṇēśvaravijaya, Lakshmīkalyāṇa* and *Samskritalakshmīkalyāṇa* Nāṭaka, which is a translation of a Malayalam social drama by K.C. Kesavapillai. Sri. Kodungallur Kunjikkuttan Tampuran of this period had written 20 works out of 4 were Sanskrit dramas ie. *Subhadrāharaṇavyāyoga, Jarasandhavadhavyāyoga, Kirātārjunīvyāyoga* and *Apahūravarmacaritavyāyoga*. Sri Koccunni Tampuran of Kodungallur of this period has composed 20 works out of *Anāṅgajīvanabhāṇa* and *Viṭarājaviśvā bhāṇa* have attracted the scholars. Sri. Dāmodaran Nampūtiri of Kāruttappāra (1846 – 1898) has written *Akshayapātavyāyoga, Kulaśekharavijayanāṭaka* and *Mandāramalikāvīthī*. Koccunni Tampuran of Kodungallur (1858 – 1926) was the author of two Bhāṇas: *Anāṅgajīvana* and *Viṭarājaviśvā*.

Two dramas *Rukmiṇīpariṇaya* and *Śrṅgarasudhākaraabhāṇa* were composed by Rāmavarma Asvati Tirunāl (1756 – 1794), *Ṣnuṣāvijaya* by Sundararaja (1841 – 1904)’ Kaivalya
Vallīparaṇāya of Rāmaswāmy Sāstri (1824 – 1926) were also prominent works.

*Rasasadanabhāṇa* is one drama among 17 works of Vidvān Godavarmayuvarāja of Kodungallur (1800 – 1851), *Srṅgāramaṇijarībhāṇa* of Kerala Varma Va.lijakoi Tampurān (1845 – 1915), *Srṅgāratilakabhāṇa* of Mutukurissī Bhāskaran Nampūtiri, *Srṅgārasarvasvabhāṇa* of Ananatanārāyaṇa of Coravana and *Rasarainākarabhāṇa* of Paṭṭattu Kunjan Nambiar (1805 – 1875) was important Bhāṇas of the period. *Rasikaraṇijana* and *Vaidarbhavāsudeva* of Sundararaja Ayyankar of Ilavattoor (1841 – 1904) were the dramas among his 20 works. *Rukmiṇīharana* of Rāmavarmakunjunni Raja, *Rasikabhūshanaḥabhāṇa* of Katattanāttu Udayavarma Thampuran, *Rasikarainabhāṇa, Samanvaya, Raksāpuruṣaka* and *Yogollāsita* of Attoor Krishna Piṣaroṭi (1875 – 1964) ³¹. *Rasavilāsabhāṇa* of Pandalam Kerala Varma Thampuran (1879 – 1919) were also some of the dramatic works of this period which attracted the attention of the scholars.
Sri. V. Krishnan Thampi (1890-1938) was the author of 10 works out of which 7 were dramas i.e., Vyajyotsna, Lalita, Pratikriya, Peitkasanyasi, Padauka patabhishekam, Draupadivijaya and Dharmaasyasukshmagati.

Sudhadrarjunam was a drama of Karamana Keśava Sāstri (1864-1934) who was written 14 works. Krītikābhāna of Ramavarman Thampuran of Pandalam (1874-1941), Kalavatikamarupa of Krishnadasa, Vicāradhāra of E. V. Raman Namputiri, Lakṣmīdevanārāyaniyam of Sridhara, Sandhya of Srikrishna Sarma, Vasulakshmikalyāṇa of Venkitasubrahmaṇya Dikṣita were popular dramas of 19th century, which resembles a drama of the same title by Sadāśiva Dīkṣita. In five acts it deals with the story of the marriage of King Rāmavarman with Vasulakṣmī a Princes of Sindhu. Pramāṇavada vyākhyāya of Valiya Godavarma Tampuran of Kodungallur, Naṅgathanaṭaka of Sridevi Tampuratti, Cidambaranāṭaka of Kuttamattu brothers, Candrikāyanamejaya of Kulikkaṭṭu Namputiri, Kaumudi Somam of Krishna Sastri, Arjunavijayam of Vallattol, Gairvanivijayam of A. R. Rajaraja Varma, Padmāvatīnāṭaka of Rāmavarma.
Tampuran of Kattaṅṇādu were also popular during this period. Alabdakarmīya of K. R. Nair, Ānandacarita of K. Balarama Panicker, Damayantīpariṇāyam of Mṛtyunjaya Svami, Damayatī kalvāṇa of Ranganatha, Savitrī of Nilakaṇṭha Śāstri, Yaduvirodaya of Sankaran Namboodiri, Rasaṅkurabhāṇa of Muriyil Narayanan Nampiar and Meghodaya of Subbarāma Paṭṭar were the modern Sanskrit Dramas. Yayātīcarita, a musical drama, and Bhramarakāhalī Bhāṇa of Prabhākarācārya also were popular during the 20th century.

The above survey indicates that good number of dramas were composed in Kerala, and the tradition still continues. But many of them cannot be considered above average. They follow a set pattern written by court poets for presentation during some festival, eulogises the poets patron, the theme being the love of the king to some princes. Dramatic excellence when compared to the great classics is also euglisible. But the very fact that dramas were composed and were rare and relished even during this century shows the continuance a tradition, which is most in other parts of the country. The kings patronised the scholars and they inturn spend their time reading, writing and commenting on San
skrit works. The plays were also staged. Even Allegorical plays were staged during temple festivals.

III. The Kerala Stage

The Sanskrit theatre has a glorious history in India. Staging of dramas was a regular feature in festivals. Great dramas of Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti etc. were composed for this purpose. Rāmāvāṇa, Mahābhārata and Harivamsa give glimpses of the dramatic activity during that period. The Kuṭṭānīmata of Dāmodaraguptā deals in detail with the staging of the first act of Ratnāvali of Harṣa. This shows the mode of dramatic representation at about 7th and 8th centuries. Saradātanaya in his Bhāvaprakāsana says that he wrote the book after seeing thirteen different kinds of dramas presented by Divākara, from whom he learnt the Nātyaveda.

The growth and development of Kerala Sanskrit dramas are related to the growth of the Kerala stage. In Kerala, the art of acting Sanskrit dramas is known as Kūṭiyāṭṭam and the theatre where it is staged is called 'Kūttambalam'. Kūṭiyāṭṭam is perhaps
the only surviving relic of the ancient mode of enacting Sanskrit dramas. The rules of dramaturgy prescribed by Bharatha are followed in Kūṭiyāṭṭam. The dramas are staged by professional actors called 'Cākkiyars' who generally take male roles. A section of 'Ampalavāsis' - temple servants is permitted to take part in the staging of Kūṭiyāṭṭam. They are the Cākkiyārs, the Nambyārs and their women, Naṅgyars. The Naṅgyars generally take female roles. The female members of the Cākyār community are called 'Illottama'. A Naṅgyar the wife of the Nambyār sings songs and plays the cymbal to keep the Tāla. The Nambyār beats the drum called 'Mizhāvu'. There were eighteen families of Cākyārs and they preserved this mode of acting. The main thrust in Kūṭiyāṭṭam is for the fourfold acting- Āṅgikā, Vācikā, Sāttvikā and Āhārya.

A rich variety of dances and dance dramas are prevalent in Kerala. Of these the most approximate to Kūṭiyāṭṭam and perhaps the oldest is Muṭiyettu. The most popular theme in Muṭiyettu is Dārikāvadha connected with the Kāli cult. Bhagavati pāṭṭu, Tīyatṭu, Pāṇa pāṭṭu and Kaṇiyār kāli are some other dances connected with the Kāli cult. These local dances have contributed to some extent to the shaping of Kūṭiyāṭṭam.
On the authority of *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* of Saktibhadra it can be seen that there was a flourishing stage in Kerala at that time. In *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*, all acts are named in the end separately, and the acts more or less from a separate unit in themselves. As such it can be taken as a drama written for the Kerala stage as it existed at that time. Kūṭiyāṭṭam has certainly contributed much towards the cultural progress of Kerala. It has been given rise to some important movements both in the field of art and literature. The use of the local language while enacting Sanskrit drama has raised the importance of Malayalam. The royal dramatist Kulaśekhara reformed the Kerala stage and introduced new elements in it. The *Vyaṅgyavyākhya*, a commentary on his two dramas deals in detail with their staging attributes the introduction of Vidūṣaka to the genius of Tolan, friend of the royal dramatist Kulaśekhara (11 c. AD) the acting manual and the stage manual (*Āṭṭapraṅkāra* and *Kramadīpika*) are attributed to his authorship. But it is not accepted by all.

The actors in Kūṭiyāṭṭam enjoyed absolute freedom of speech on the stage and they often criticized unsparingly even the nobles and princes with telling allusions and personal references.
The Nañgyārs helped the Cākkiyārs by sounding the cymbals and singing the Sanskrit verses which were to be enacted. Generally these performances went on for many days ranging from six to eighteen, or even twenty and usually these performances were staged between evening and midnight.

Kūṭiyāṭṭam was conducted only in the precincts of temples and hence it is regarded as a religious art. The place where it is staged is called ‘Kūttampalam’. Almost all the big temples in Kerala (Trichur, Irinjalakuda, Perumanom, Haripad etc.) have this theatre in their percents. There was a tradition that every new play should be staged in the theatre of the Taliparampu temple. Only after this, the play was allowed to be staged in other temples.

Kūttu appears to be one of the earliest arts practiced by Cākyars modeled upon the old suta’s narrations, amplified with explanations and illustrations. It is of three types: 1. Prabandham Kūttu, 2. Nañgyār Kūttu and 3. Kūṭiyāṭṭam.
Prabandham Kūttu:-

The art of narrating the story by Cākyar in known as Prabandham Kūttu. It contains a lot of wit and humour. The story is taken from puranas. Many new prabandhas were composed for this purpose. Mīzhāvu is the only instrument used for music. Vacikābhīnaya is important in presentation, gestures are also used along with vacikābhīnaya.

Naṅgyār Kūttu: -

This is a monoact by a Naṅgyār. The story of Sree Krishna forms the main subject for Naṅgyar Kūttu. It is a part of the Nirvahaṇa of Kalpalatika, the servant maid of Subhadra in the praveśaka to the second act of Subhadrādhanjaya.

Kūtiyaṭṭam:-

The term Kūtiyaṭṭam denotes joined or combined acting. Acting in the performance of Nirvahaṇa is solo. But when the text begins there will be more characters and hence the acting becomes
joined one. The female roles are played by the Nañgyars. The lamp is lighted with oil and wicks with two wicks facing the actor and the third facing the audiences. The Mizhāvu is the instrument used for music. The Nañgyār sings the Akkitta invoke the deities Gañapati, Saraswati and Śiva. The next item is ‘Nambyāruṭe Tamil’ which is a summary of the story to be enacted and it is recited by the Nambyār. Then comes ‘Araṅgutaḷi’ or cleansing the stage by sprinkling water, which is done by the Nambyār. After this he recites the maṅgaḷa sloka which introduces the story. A curtain is held by two persons standing infront of the stage. The male characters come and stand behind the curtain. The Mizhāvu is played and the actor makes his entry while the curtain is gradually lowered and ultimately removed.

The popularity of Kutiyattam is gradually declining. Several reasons can be assigned for this. The mode of dressing the method of presentation etc., remain the same as when they were introduced. Another factor is that this art form has been restricted to the Chakkyar Nambyar caste as a part of their religious duties. More over from time to time many extraneous factors were
allowed to come in and as a result the importance of the story proper was neglected. Thus after the preliminaries are over, sometimes only one or two verses or lines were enacted each day.

The Kūṭiyāṭṭam marks an important milestone in the development of the Kerala stage. Being one of the most highly developed and ancient arts, it has influenced various other parts such as Kūttu, Tullal, Pāṭhaka and Kathakali.

**Presentation of Sanskrit Plays- Two Streams:**

There were two streams for the presentation of Sanskrit dramas on the Kerala Stage- one on the Kūṭiyāṭṭam style and the other the ordinary way. Kūṭiyāṭṭam style of acting according to some scholars was a deviation from the tradition of Bharata. The introduction of regional language, expansion of role of Vidūṣaka etc. were objects of criticism. Natāṅkuša a fifteen century critique dramaturgy represents the view of the detractors. The anonymous author has identified four defects in the presentation of a Sanskrit play in Kūṭiyāṭṭam style. They are:-
1. addition of incidents left out by the author
2. omission of what the poet has described
3. unnecessary elaboration of things suggested
4. contraction of the things elaborated

The two streams in the history of Sanskrit theatre in Kerala deserve to be studied closely.

**These are two streams:-**

The actors inherit and ancient tradition. Their practices are governed by the injunctions contained in it. It is not proper for anyone to cast doubts on it. VI-7 38.

This is the stand of actors. Acting is kuladharma to them. Elder actors are preceptors, the stage manuals prepared by them are transmitted from generation to generation. As the author of *Nataṅkuśa* repeatedly refers to them as Ācāryas let us call, for the sake of convenience, this tradition as Ācāryamata.

The position of their antagonists is this- the drama also
springs from a tradition, the actor should respect that tradition, which no doubt, is anterior to his own tradition.

As sage Bharata is their source, let us call it Munimata. The conflict in Natāṅkusa is thus between Munimata and Acaryamata. The genesis of it was their Kulaśekhara. He cleverly managed by accommodating both the prekṣaka and the nānāloka in his scheme of performance. His successors failed to emulate his example.

All the Sanskrit dramas were not presented on the Kuṭiyāṭam stage. The cākyārs selected only a few dramas. These were the dramas used for Kuṭiyāṭam. According to oral tradition many dramas have been popular on the stage, the total number of acts prepared for the stage being seventy two. But some of them are not in use now. A list is given below:

1. Śrīkṛṣṇacarita
2. Ṛṇmadavāsavadatta
3. Śākuntala

These three are traditionally reported to be popular. We have
no evidence. A reference in *Naṭāḥkusa* indicates that *Sākuntala* was not used by Cākyārs.

1. Dūtavākya
2. Karṇabhāra
3. Īrubaṅga
4. Paṇcarātra
5. Avimāraka
6. Mahānāṭaka
7. Pratīṇjayaugandharāyana
8. Bālacarita
9. Cārudatta

These nine were once popular; but now not used by Cākyārs.

1. Subhānādrādhanaṅjaya
2. Tapaṅśamvaraṇa
3. Nāgūnanda
4. Mattavilāsa
5. Pratima
6. Kalyāṇasaugandhika
There were many other Sanskrit dramas composed by the poets from time to time. Pūrṇasaraswaty wrote *Kamalinīrājahamsa* to present it in the festival at Trissur. *Śīrṣapāpa* of Sundaraśāstri was presented on the festival at Tripunithura temple. The present case *Ratnaketūdaya* and *Rāmavarmavilāsa* according to Ulloor was intended to be staged in the festival at Trissur Śiva temple. Now the problem is – How these plays were presented, in the Kūṭiyāṭṭam style or in any other method. Definitely it was not in the Kūṭiyāṭṭam style. The Cākyars did not use it. We do not get Āṭṭaprakāram for these plays also.

It has to be assumed that there was a tradition of presenting classical dramas, different from the one in the Kūṭiyāṭṭam style. The details are not available now. *Ratnaketūdaya* was presented
in this way. It is doubtful whether there were subsequent representations.

IV. Royal Patronage To Sanskrit Literature By Kochi State

Kerala might have come under influence of Sanskrit much earlier than the beginning of the Malayalam era. There is no evidence to prove as to when exactly the relation started.

The etymology and the exact significance of the term Kerala is still a matter of controversy among scholars, most probably it is related to the term Cera by which the country was known in ancient Tamil Literature. The term Kerala appears in the second Edict of Asoka, in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali and in other Sanskrit works. Classical writers of the west like Pliny also mentioned Kerala.

It seems that the Mīmāmsa scholar, Bhavadāsa (2nd A. D) and the famous astronomer of India, Bhaskarācharya (6th A. D) are natives of Kerala. But Bhavadāsa is known only through citations. Avantisundarikathā of Daṇḍin (7th A. D) refers to great
Sanskrit scholars like Maṭṛdatta, the poet who wrote some commentaries and his father Bhavarāta who commented on some Kalpasūtra. The great Mīmāṁsa teacher Prabhākara is claimed by tradition to have been a son of Kerala.

The Great Advaita Philosopher, Sankarācharya (7th A. D) is accepted to have been born at Kālaṭi in central Kerala and the first dramatist of south zone, Saktibhadra are believed to be contemporaries. This period marks the golden age of dramatic literature in Kerala. According to Krishna Chaitanya, Aścaryacūḍāmaṇi is the first drama from the south related to the Rāmāyaṇa Story 44. Mattavilāsaprahasana of the Pallava King Mahendra Vikrama (6th A. D) was known to Kerala at that time. Mukundamāla, one of the finest specimens of devotional poetry, by the Saintly Kulasekhara Alvar (9th A. D) was very much popular in Kerala during this period. King Kulaśekhara (10th A. D to 11th A. D) enriched Kerala by his two dramas and their stage manuals.

All these show that Sanskrit language and literature, though familiar to Kerala from very ancient period, flourished in the state
by about 6th A.D. It had a continuous and luxurious growth in all branches for the next three or four centuries. As in the other parts of India, in Kerala too, the great language and its literature flourished mostly under royal patronage. The existence of large number of principalities and local chieftains formed the base for rich patronage to Sanskrit literature. The literary patronage of Kerala princes attracted not only scholars and poets of Kerala, but also of neighbouring states. Many of them visited and spent considerable part of their life in this country. The royal patronage of Kulašekhara also helped the development of the stage in Kerala. Many of the Kulašekharas of Mahodayapuram were not only great patrons of literature, they were also accomplished scholars who made original contributions to Sanskrit literature. Another royal dramatist, Ravivarma Kulašekhara also contributed much to Sanskrit literature. In his court flourished two well known poets Samudrabanda and Kavibhūṣaṇa.

A brief survey is attempted here of the history of royal patronage in the state.
Dynastic History of the Kochi State:

The Kings of Kochi trace their origin to the perumals of Mahodayapuram. After the decline of the Cera Empire, it came to be associated with that of Perumpatappu Svarūpam. The first king of Kochi was the son of the sister of the last Perumāl. The dynasty is called Perumpatappusvarūpam or Balya country. The Balya country and its capital Bhutivahini described in Mayūrasandeśa. The Balya country is identified with the Perumpadappu principality, the modern Kochi family and Bhūtivāhini with Vellarappilli, the seat of the Perumpadappu family for a long time.

Virarāghavacarita (13th A. D), Sūkasandeśa, Unnīvārīcaritā and Sīvavilāsa (all 14th A. D) state that Mahodayaputram is the capital of Perumpatappu Kingdom. The capital was shifted to Kochi by the end of 14th A D. By 16th AD the Portuguese had established relations with Kochi. They were followed by the Dutch in 1658. Later it came under the British rule.
The last ruler of this state was the scholar King Parīśkit Rāma Varma. Kochi ceased to exist as a separate state consequent on the integration of Kochi and Travancore in 1948, and it became the central part of Kerala after the formation of the state of Kerala in November 1956.

Royal Patronage of Kochi State:

Nārāyaṇa Kavi, (910th A. D) the author of Śitāharana, a Yamakakāvyya lived under the patronage of Manukuladitya, probably a King of Kochi State. This is the earliest work written under Kochi Royal Family. However, Dr. Kunjunni Raja has a different opinion. Dr. Kunjunni Raja’s view is that earliest work to be produced under Kochi Family’s patronage is a Bhāṇa, called Viśanidra (14th A. D) of unknown authorship. Author’s patron is supposed to be prince Rāmavarman of Mahodayapuram, son of Queen Lakshmi. Dr. Raja says that the author’s patron Rāmavarma and the hero of Śivavilāsa Kāvya of Dāmodaragupta are the same person because he is also a son of Lakshmi. So the Bhāṇa written before the shifting of the capital to Kochi from Cragannore may belong to 14th A. D.
Next important ruler of the Kochi family is the Vira Keralavarman who ruled over Kochi from 1561 to 1565. He patronized Nilakantha the author of Tenkailanathamodhayam a Malayalam Champa. His Successor (1565 – 1601) Rama Varma patronized the Mazhamangalam family and Mukkola Nilakanthan Nampitiri and the Bālakavi. The beautiful Kavya Rāsakrīda is written by King Rāmavarma.

In Gosree Geneology, King Rāma Varma is called Keśava Rāma Varma Bālakavi wrote two dramas and a commentary on Yogavāsistha. At the instance of the King he wrote the play Rānaketūdaya. The poet, in another play Rāmavartmavilāsa has chosen his patron as the hero. Bālakavi’s native place is North Arcot District in Tamil Nadu.

Sankaran Nambūtiri, the famous astrologer and author of several Jyothisha works in Malayalam, Nārayana Nambūtiri the author of well known Mahishamaṅgalabhāṣa (Sanskrit) and Bhāyanaishadhacampu (Malayalam) and Parameswaran Nambūtiri
the author of *Asaucadipika* – all the three are members of Mazhamangalam family. The *Mahishamaṅgalambhāṇa* is one of the most popular Sanskrit Bhāṇas of Kerala.\(^{53}\)

Vedāntācārya (16th A.D) was patronized by King Rāvi Varma of Kochi. His work is a commentary on *Kāvyapraṅkaśa* called *Kāvyapraṅkasottjeṇīni*. All the verses given in the commentary of 10thullāsa are in praise of King Ravi Varma of Kochi. So this section is called *Ravirājaśobhūṣāṇa*.

Next ruler of the Kochi State, Rāma Varma (1805 – 1809) was a follower of Madhva School of Vedānta and wrote a Stotra work called *Pūrṇatrayīśastuti* about the deity of Tripunithura Temple. After that Virakerala Varma was the (1809 to 1828) ruler of Kochi. He was also a follower of Madhva School and used his influence to popularise it in the state. He wrote many Āṭṭakathas for Kathakali. Stotra works like *Purṇatrayaisṣṭataka* and *Daśāvathāraśloka*. Vira Kerala attracted several scholars and poets to his court. Vira Kerala Varma’s sister, Subhadra, also known as Ikku Amma Thampurāṭṭi, was a profound scholar. She
wrote many Stotra Kāvyas. The poets, Arur Mādhavan Aṭītiri, Krishnan Karta of Cerānallur, Nārāyaṇan Nampūtiri of Ilayiṭam, Bhāskara of Mutukkuriśiśi were patronized by the King Vīra Kerala Varma. Queen Subhadra brought Madhavan Aṭītiri to Tripunithura for the education of Rāmavarman Yuvaraja of Kochi. Uttaranaśādhiyacarita or the Uttaranaishada was written under the patronage of the King. He lived in the early half of 19th century. Krishnan Karta wrote Stotra Kavya, Citpuresastuti on the deity of the temple at Chittur near Ernakulam.

Narayana lived between 1770 and 1840 A. D and wrote Uṣāparṇavas Campu. Bhaskara of Mutukkurisi wrote Sṛngāralilatilaka Bhāṅga under the patronage of Vīra Kerala Varma.

Rāma Varma Mahārāja of Kochi (1851 to 1931) is popularly known as Rājarṣi Tampuran. He was a great patron of Sanskrit learning. He established a Sanskrit Pathaśāla at Tripunithura in the name of his teacher, Seśāchārya, which later developed as the present Sanskrit College. Sābdikatilakan Ayyaśastrikal, Sahṛdayatilakam Ramapiṣaroti, Tārkikatilakan Manthiṭṭa Kunju Namputiri were three gems in his court. The greatest contribution
of the Kochi Royal family to the present century is Parīkṣit Mahārāja. His versatile genius embraced all the branches of Sanskrit learning. *Subodhini* – a work on *Nyāyaśāstra* is considered to be his masterpiece.

The two scholar kings, Rājarṣi and Parīkṣit were mainly responsible for making Tripunithura centre for Sanskrit learning. The Śāstra Sadas started by the former in 1926 was a common platform for the Scholars from different parts of the country to test their erudition and enrich their scholarship. The king honoured them with the titles of Paṇḍita, Rāja and Sāhityanipuṇa. The annual Sadas still continues in the Sanskrit College.

A galaxy of scholars was encouraged by the Royal patrons. Included among them are, Rājarṣi Rāmavarma, Rāma Piṣāroti, Ananta Nārāyana Śāstri and Acyuta Poduvāl and Rāma Varma Parīkṣitt Tampurān.

Their works

Rājarṣi Rāmavarma: *Bālabodanam* and

*Vedāntaparibhasaḥasamgraha*. 
Rāma Piṣāroṭi: Commentaries on Śākuntala,
Mālavikāgnimitra, Vikramorvasīya,
Ratnāvali, Sukasandesā, Daśūpaka,
Kuvalayananda, Dinakāriyam.

AnanthaNārāyaṇa Sāstri: Maṇīmanjuṣa, Navapuspamāla,
Vākyatatva, Tarkasāra, Bālarāmāyaṇa,
Meghasandesavimarṣa, Commentaries
on Bhagavatgīta, Devimāhātmya,
Nārāyanīya, critic works of Hukaumudi,
and Saṁkhyaṇārika.

Acyuta Poduvāl: Vilāpa Saptaśati, Sripariksitcaritam
and Mātrvilāpam.

Rāmavarma Parīkṣit: Bhavadīpika, Subodhini,
Tampurān: Jalavadhradanishhayatwavicarh,
Uttara Naṁsadhiya Vyākhyaṇam,
Stothrāṇi, Bhagavannamakaumudi,
Daḷṇgal and four short campus
namely prahlādacarita,
Amarīṣacaritam, Sukanyācaritam
and Radhāmādhavam.
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Bālakavi is the author of two dramas, R.K. and R.V.V. From the epilogue to the R.K. it is known that Balakavi was a native of Mulladrum in North Arcot district in Tamil Nadu. He was the son of Kālahasti and grandson of Mallikārjuna, who were great scholars and his forebears were the poet yauvanabhārati and Somanātha.

Yoabhaśyauvanabhāratīkavivarācchrisomanāthātmajā

Cchandogahṣahi mallikārjunakavirdhvanyāḥ putā yatpituḥ

Soyam bālakavi sudhārdṛkavitābhākkālahastyātmajāḥ

Prakhyāto bhuvī kasya na śrutipatham śreyonidhīgārhatayēḥ.

He comes to Kerala in search of literary patronage and he became the court poet of Rāmavarma of Cochin Royal family. He received encouragement from Kṛṣṇamanipī who was the disciple of Rāghavapāṇḍita and the preceptor of King Rāmavarman. He wrote the play Rānaketūdaya at the instance of his patron. In Rāmavarmavilāsa, he has chosen his patron as the hero.
The date and identity of the poet and his patron have been a subject of controversy among scholars. Neelakaṇṭadīkṣita in his prologue to the Drama Naḷacarita states that Appayya Dīkṣita was a younger contemporary of Bālakavi. S. K. Ramanatha Sastrī, in his introduction to sphoṭasidhi opines that Bālakavi was a contemporary and rival of Udaṇḍaśāstri. According to the tradition record by the editor of Ratnakeṭiidda Bālakavi was a court poet of Māṇavikrama of Calicut, but from the works we know that he was in the Court of Rāmavarma of Kochin. If this is accepted Bālakavi can be assigned to 16th century A. D.

The alleged tradition is making him a contemporary of Udaṇḍaśāstri.

Appadikṣita kimityatistutim varṇayāṁibhavato vadānyatāṁ
Sopi kalpatarurarthalipsaṁvārdeśagṛāmasaram pratikṣate

However scholars like Dr. Kunjunni Raja do not take it seriously. Dr. Kunjunni Raja identifies Bālakavi's teacher, Kṛṣṇamaṇi, with Kṛṣṇa, the author of Uttararāmacarita and
Rāsakrīda. No other works of Bālakavi is extant to us besides these two plays. However, Vatakkumkūr Rājarājavarma is of the opinion that Bālakavi has also written a commentary on Yogavāsiṣṭha and a kavya titled Rāsakrīdosstava. But he has not produced any evidence to prove it.

Prof. K. Rāmapiṣaroṭi in his glimpses at Kochin history says that the dramatist belonged to the pre-Portuguese period since there is no evidence to Europe in both R.K. and R.I.V. The absence of any reference to Portuguese cannot be considered a reason to take his date back to Portuguese period. The fact is that the theme or content did not warrant such reference. Ullur S. Paramesvara Iyer in his Kerala sāhitya Caritram says that he belonged to 16th century based on Cidambaram inscription dated 1576 A.D. From the above information it can be concluded that Bālakavi belongs to about 16th century.
IDENTITY OF THE PATRON

In the prologue to *Rāmavarma-vilāsa*, it is stated that king Rāmavarman was born to his mother by the grace of the goddess of Valayapura (ūraka)².

*Tasya tavanmaha-rājasya janani prathamā virajananīnām
purā cira-mapatīyavānācayāvalayapuravāsinīm
bhagavai-mārādhitavātī*

It is further said that the king went on pilgrimage after entrusting his kingdom to the crown prince Godavarman. It is mentioned that the king visited Rāmesvara, Śrīraṅga and Cidambara. From the annuals of Kochin it is known that there was a king Vīrakeralavarman ruling over Kochi from A.D. 1561 and that he was succeeded by Rāmavarman who ruled till 1601⁹. Ullur S. Parameśvara Iyyer in his introduction to *Tenkailanāthodayam campu* of Nīlakanṭha says that the last three kings of Kochin are Vīra Keralavarman, Rāmavarman and Godavarman¹⁰. From historical records we know that one
Veerakerala Varman ruled over Kochi from 1561 to 1565 A.D. and that he was succeeded by Rāmavarman who ruled till 1601 A.D.

Veṭṭassery Nīlakanṭhan Nambūtiri of Mukkola who commented on the Tripurādahana and the Saurikāthodaya of Vāsudeva have refereed to Rājarāja and Rāmavarman as the kings of Kochin and to Godavarman as helping the latter in the administration of the country. This Rāmavarma may be identifying with the patron of Bālakavi.

Ramesan Tampuran in Gosree Genology says that the beautiful kavya Rāsakreeda is written by the king. Rāmavarma is also referred to as constructing a beautiful palace to the north of the temple at Trissur. During his rule in 1567 the Jews settled in Kochin and developed the Jews town, which is near the palace. He gave land to Thirumala devaswam and permitted the Konganies to settle down at Mattānchery. In 1599 the Metropolite of to Goa, Don Alexis De Menesa came to Kochin and the Synod of Diamper took place.
In the west gopura of Cidambam temple, there is an inscription of one Rāmavarman born under the asterism Svāti dated 1498. Dhaṛti, Margāḷi, 12th day recording a royal grant of 33 taligai for Anandatanḍava Perumāl Nayana. 14

Matṛdatta, the author of Kāmasandesā speaks of a Rāmavarma of twice in the poem. The king is said to have abolished the toll system in regard to the river Kaveri. 15

Yairāśulkam sakalajagātāmasti yatra prabhūtam
Tatrasthārṇṇpatipsubhirbhujyamānām helena
māṭakṣoṇivalabhīdakhilairāṇanaipūnyacuṇcuh
Durvāram yat prasamitakatham nirame rāmavarmā. 16

This historical incident is not found recorded in the history of Cochi. Some arrangements regarding tolls made between the king of Kochi and the Portuguese about 80 years after the advent of the latter in Kochi are mentioned in the Historical records. 16

However from the opinion of the above scholars Balakavis patron may be the Rāmavarma of 16th century.
The Inscription At Cidambaram Temple is Given Below
(Samasta kerala Sahitya Parishat Traimäsika- Ullūr)
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1. Rāmavarmavilāsa

Contents

Rāmavarmavilāsa is another drama of Bālakavi. It opens with a prologue as usual. In the interlude Kāveri informs her friend Kanaka that king Rāmavarman of Kochin is going on a pilgrimage along with his forces after entrusting his official duties to his brother Godavarman. Kanakā fears that the King will have to contend with several obstacles on the way. Kāveri allays her fears by expatiating at length the prowess of the king. Soon their conversation turns round to princess Rasacandrika, the daughter of the Vidhyādhara Ratnapīḍa, who due to a curse is staying in neighbouring country. Kāveri wonders whether an alliance can be forged between the two. They then devise a plan to effect a meeting between the king and the princess. In order to achieve this objective they decide to appear before the king in the form of beautiful parrots.

The Vīdūṣaka after having woken up from his sleep, performs the morning oblations. Hearing the brahmin’s blessing he goes to meet his royal friend whom he confronts sitting on the confluence of the rivers.
Kanakā and Kāveri. He overhears the King confessing to his minister, Vaiṅanikā that his mind is filled with love. At this moment the Vidūṣaka enters and the king greets him in the customary way:

The King receives him and requests him to be seated. The Vidūṣaka does so and having overheard the word 'mother' in the king's description of Kāveri asks him about the relative merits of a child's stay in its mother's womb and lap. The King replies that according to experts on the Sāga of life a child's stay in its mother's womb is painful as it has to remain within a restricted place in the midst of worms inside the abdomen. The Vidūṣaka hearing this reply agrees with this view.

The King, meanwhile bids his minister and attendants to leave his presence and to take rest. He too, goes with the Vidusaka to take rest. They see the beautiful scenery around and are attracted to it. They soon espy a beautiful forest. While the King is admiring its beauty, the Vidūṣaka shows him a pair of beautiful
birds perched up on a tree. The King is attracted by the colour of the parrots and he concludes that they may be pets of somebody living in that forest. As they watch through the bushes, they behold a beautiful damsel. They also see beside her another maid whom they surmise to be her friend. The two maidens are seen pursuing the parrots taking steps warily and slowly. With a view to watching their activities and also eavesdropping to their conversation the King and his Vidūṣaka take their respective positions behind the bushes.

Princess Rasacandrika and maid Kumudini find it difficult to capture the birds. The maid seeing the birds eat the Matulunga fruit and the breasts of her mistress made bare due to the sliding away of the upper cloth, mischievously tells her mistress that the birds would come to her mistaking her breasts for Īḍāṁā fruits. The princess swiftly covers up her breasts and requests Kumudini to keep quiet lest the birds fly away. The King feels enthralled by the sight of the princess's breast. Kumudini tells her mistress that the birds seem to be confiding something to each other after looking at them. The princess shows signs to her to remain silent and extends her hands in a bid to capture the parrots. But to her great disappointment she fails.
Meanwhile, the two birds begin to talk, to their surprise. One of them requests the princess not to extend her hand for capturing them lest it gets wounded by thorny creepers. The princess seeks pardon from them for her rash action. The birds then disclose to the princess that they are responsible for attracting her. On being asked about their identity and whereabouts.

One of the birds tells her that her name is Kalamañjari while that of her friend is Kuñālā and that they are living in the country of Sahyapāda. The princess then asks Kalamañjari whether she was proficient in any art. The latter replies that she is capable of giving ambrosia and she also has the power to bestow hundreds of forms to anybody. Further she can grant any boon sought by women and that there is nothing impossible for her to get in the mortal and other worlds.

Kumudini then asks Kalamañjari to bring before them a suitable bridegroom for her mistress. Kalamañjari agrees and by her magical power brings King Rāmavarma before the princess and her maid surprised beyond measure at the mysterious way in
which they have been brought together. Kumudini and Kalāmañjari greet the King and request him to take his seat in the bower of creepers. The King does so along with others.

The King and the princess are struck with love at the sight of each other. The Vidiṣaka using pun on the word ‘dvijāti’ remarks that King and the two birds belong to one and the same category. The vidiṣaka challenges Kalāmañjari to give the name of his royal friend. Kalāmañjari correctly spells out the name of the king to his dismay.

Kumudini hearing the name of the king remarks that it is well known given in her country. The King desires to know the native place of the princess and her maid Kalāmañjari tells him that they hail from the country of the Vidhyādharas, situated high in the Himalayas. She also tells him that the princess is the daughter of the Vidhyādhara King, Ratnapiṭa. The Vidiṣaka remarks that such beauty can rarely be found in mortals. The princess feels bashful. Kumudini requests her mistress to take leave of the King, as it is time for their departure.
The voice of Cakorika is heard informing the princess that her father is anxiously waiting to see her. The princess gets ready to go but she is saddened at the thought of leaving her lover. She proceeds to the palace with a heavy heart. The King lingers for some time, lost in the thought of his beloved. Later the King goes to perform mid-day worship with the Vidūṣaka.

Second Act

The second act begins with the entry of a messenger by name Sārangiṅka. He has been sent by Godavarman from Cochin to deliver a message and a jewel necklace to King Rāmavarman. He sees the King in his camp and finds him in a thoughtful mood.

The King is afflicted with pangs of love. The Vidūṣaka tries to comfort him in order to alleviate his agony. As soon as he meets the King, he confides to him something in his ears. Immediately the King goes with him. Sārangiṅka, who is waiting for an audience, finds it an ideal occasion to meet the sovereign. He presents a letter to the King. The King receives it and reads it.
The message says that the Kingdom is fairing well and that the Pandya King has presented a jewel necklace as a token of his appreciation for assisting him. The King, after reading the letter dismisses sarangīka and the Chamberlain from his presence. He hands over casket containing the necklace to the Vidūṣaka and then goes on a walk.

The beautiful scenery, which the forest presents, excites the King's passion. The Vidūṣaka is worried over his friend's disconsolation and he takes him to the bower having cooling materials. But they prove to be of no avail. The King's condition worsens and he almost faints. The Vidūṣaka is at his wit end to receive his friend and he quickly places the necklace on his neck. The King regains his consciousness and stretches his hand saying that his beloved has clasped him by his neck. The Vidūṣaka, who is happy at his friend regaining consciousness, brings home the fact that it is only a jewel necklace.

Now Kalamañjari appears before the King. She enquires about his illness. The Vidūṣaka narrates how his friend has be
come love sick after seeing the princess. Kalamañjari too, gives them an account of the pangs of love suffered by the princess. She then informs him about the purpose of her visit namely to get a memento from him for presenting to the princess. The King asks for his friends' suggestion. The Vidūšaka advises to give the jewel necklace as a token of his love. Later, the Vidūšaka searches for it and informs the King that the necklace is missing. The Vidūšaka searches for it and to his great dismay finds it missing. He anxiously informs his friend that the necklace is missing. The King is equally bewildered at its mysterious disappearance. Kalāmājari, who is nearby, says with a smile that it has gone to its proper destination. The Vidūšaka is astonished at the way in which the necklace has gone to the princess.

Kalamañjari also informs the King that a demon named Piṅgalakṣa, through his friend had approached Ratnapīḍa for the hand of his daughter and that the Vidyādharan King turned down the request. The King is afraid that he might do any harm to the princess. He requests the Goddess to protect his beloved from danger. Kalamañjari assures him that she would protect his sweet
heart at all costs. They ask her to bring about a meeting of the couple. Kalāmañjari agrees and asks the King to come to the hermitage of Agastya at the forth coming 14th day of new moon phase where she would bring the princess. The King feels happy. Kalāmañjari takes leave. The King with the Vidusaka retires to the palace.

Third Act

The third act has a Praveśaka in which the maid, Jyotsnikā informs her friend Cakorikā that the princess has gone to the hermitage of Agastya and that Kalāmañjari has been describing to her the qualities of Kerala emporor. Just then demon Piṅgalākṣa appears. He has come to the sanctuary of Sage Agastya to see Rasacandrika and he is anxious to know her whereabouts. With the idea of getting information from the Vidūṣaka, he takes the form of King Rāmavarman and meets him. Gārgyavana takes him to be his royal friend and inadvertently discloses the place of rendezvous. The two then proceed to the abode of Sage Agastya. The demon is unable to enter the Sanctuary because of the power
of the penance of the Sage. The demon tells him that he will wait till he comes back from the hermitage. No sooner does the Vidyāśaka go to the hermitage than the demon disappears. On entering the hermitage, he is surprised to find his friend inside it and mistaking him to be the guise assumed by some demon he runs away in fear.

The King is anxiously waiting for his beloved. He hears the music of Veena coming from the interior of the Sanctuary and at once presumes that his beloved has come. He therefore goes deep in to the Sanctuary and is happy to find the princess along with Kuśala and Kumudini. The princess is simultaneously singing and playing on the Veena. The King hears it and is delighted by its melody. Kumudini requests her mistress not to strain herself, as she is unwell. So the princess stops singing and hands over the lute to her maid. On Kumudini’s enquiry whether the King has come, Kuśala replies in affirmative. The princess over whelmed with emotion sheds tears. The King feels happy to find that the princess is really in love with him. He then appears before them.
The princess feels bashful and tries to withdraw herself from his view. Kumudini gives a hint to him to come near his beloved. He goes near her and lifts her with his hands. Flush with shyness, she manages to come out of his hold and feigns anger towards her friend. The King pacifies her.

Meanwhile the pathetic voice of the Vidūṣaka is heard crying out for help as he is being manhandled by the demon. The King arms himself and prepares to go to the aid of his friend. But the Vidūṣaka soon appears before him. He narrates the details of his encounter with the demon. Kuśala tells them the identity of the demon and the purpose for which he has come. The princess becomes afraid. Kumudini comforts her not to entertain any fear, as long as her valiant lover is at her side. Now the voice of the demon is heard, dissuading the king from accepting the hand of the Vidyādhara princess. The king assures his beloved, not to have any fear on account of the demon. Kumudini informs the King that the time for their departure has come. The King reluctantly agrees to their departure. The princess goes back to her palace. The King again beset with doubts as to whether he
would be able to attain his beloved. The Vidūṣaka assures him that he would ever long be united with the princess.

Fourth Act:

In the interlude to the fourth act, through a conversation between Kumudini and Kalamaṇjari, the marriage of the King Rāmavārman with Rasacandrika according to the Gandharva system is announced. Besides, the King's return to his city and his beloved's visit to her native country after the lapse of her curse are mentioned. The King takes rest in his palace after his tiresome tour. The crown prince goes to meet him and is warmly received. After presenting the sword, he shows the King the painting on the walls of the palace done by eminent artists illustrating his pilgrimage to Cidāmbara, Śrīraṅga and Kāñci etc. The King speaks very highly of the paintings and congratulates his nephew. The sound of the bell is heard proclaiming the beginning of the first part of the night. The crown princess takes leave. The King and Vidūṣaka retire to the palace.
With the advent of night the King is disconcerted. He blames the moon for burning him by his hot rays. Now Rasachandrika with her friend Kumudini comes from the skies to meet the King. The King feels glad on seeing his beloved and he welcomes her. All of them sit in the couch. The Vidūśaka feeling sleepy, takes leave. Kumudini also quietly slips away. The couple, left alone spends the night happily admiring the moon and the moonlit garden, at that time. the voice of the Gārgyāyana is heard saying that he is being kicked by somebody. The King hearing it concludes that his friend might be talking in his sleep. But Rasachandrika is agitated as they are watching with anxiety. The Kings first wife, Queen Chandraleka suddenly arrives with her maid. No sooner does Chandraleka sees the King than Rasachandrika disappears by her magical power. The King greets her and tries to express his love. The queen feigns anger and disregarding his protestations of love accuses him of infidelity. The Kings reply does not satisfy her. When he tries to touch her hands, she forbids him and prepares to go.
By dawn the Vīdūṣaka comes to meet the King. He is surprised to see the angry face of the queen. Without paying heed to the king's appeals, the queen in a huff goes accompanied by her maid. The King tells his friend that his left eye is throbbing and that he does not know what bad things it forecasts. The Vīdūṣaka also shares his misgivings. At the end of the act the King goes to meet the queen accompanied by the Vīdūṣaka.

Fifth Act

In the interlude to the fifth act, it is stated that the King with the Vīdūṣaka is resting in a garden. Thoughts of his beloved overwhelm him. The Vīdūṣaka is bewildered on seeing his friend's condition. The King desires to draw a painting of his beloved and the Vīdūṣaka goes to bring the painting materials. Meanwhile, the King unable to bear the agony falls into a swoon. After sometime, he gets relieved and he sees to his delight Kalāmaṇjari and Kanakā. Standing before him, Kalamaṇjari informs him that the Vidhyādhara Emperor Ratnapīḍa, on coming to know, of Candralekha's anger, has sent through her a crest jewel capable of removing all traces
of anger and bitterness in human beings. She then presents crest jewel to the King, who gladly receives it. The King informs them that, the queen is going to offer him over and that he intends to meet her at that time. Kalāmañjari approves his idea. Meanwhile the Sound of the finding anklets is heard and Rasachandrika accompanied by her maid arrives. The Vidūṣakas requests to exert her powers to restore cordiality between the King and queen. Kalāmañjari agrees and she goes with the Vidūṣaka. The King requests Rasachandrika and her maid to go invisibly to the mango tree near the palace of worship. The princess agrees to this suggestion and accordingly goes with her maid. The King also goes with the Vidūṣaka to the place of worship and the two watches the queen hiding themselves behind the bushes. Kalāmañjari and Kanakā also arrive at the place Chandralekhā has decided to offer worship. They then greet the queen who is touched by their cordiality. Kalāmanjari then reveals to her the purpose of their errand. She tells that she has been sent by Ratnapīḍa, who on coming to know of marriage his daughter Rasacandrika with the Kerala King gave her a musical composition to be handed over to them.
The substance is that he has considers Chandralekhā as his eldest daughter and Rasacandrikā comes only after her. He then requests Chandralekhā to be friendly to her sister. The queen expresses her willingness to abide by the request. Kalāmaṇjari by her magical powers brings the King, the Vidusaka Rasacadrika and her maid before Chandralekha. As directed by Kalāmaṇjari, Chandralekha embraces Rasacandrika. The river goddesses then instructs the two queens to remain friendly to each other. After blessing the king and his wives, Kalāmaṇjari accompanied by Kanaka disappears. The epilogue is as follows:

"Rajānah pālayantu Kṣitivalayamidam nūmārjanayuktah
Prthvi sasyābhīrupūrṇā phalatu bahuphalam vṛṣtyah santu
vivak.

Vidvadgehaṣu vāṁ viharantu ramayā sakhyamaptā drdhīvaḥ
Sāṁbhorbhaktirnāṇāṁ bhavatu caranayoh santatam
caṇḍramaṇaileḥ"
"May the King, who follow the righteous path protect the earth. May the earth be full of fruit bearing plants. May there be rain on the earth. May learning flourish along with wealth in the homes of the learned. May people always be devoted to the feet of Sambhu, who has the moon on his crest" 9.

Rāmavarmavilāsa - An evaluation:

As a drama RIT does not deserve much credit. It is of an ordinary type. The story of love of a king to a Vidyadhara girl. The poet has Mālavikāgnimitra and Ratnāvali as his model. The attainment of love also does not pose much problem. The queen is easily pacified: the demon also does not come to the level of a formidable foe. The dramatist does not seem to be inclined to develop these characters and villains or counter heroes. His intuition is only on the development of mutual love between the two and their final union.

The hero comes under the category of Dhiroḍatā, though
in the play his role is that of a dhīrālajīta. The heroine, though of agandharva pareśage, is described as possessing feminine charm. She comes under the Mugdha Nāyikā as Mālavīkā and Rathāvali.

There is no scope for historical references even though the hero is a ruling king. His arrangement for his brother to occupy the thrown in his absence as also the gratitude of the Pāṇḍya king may have historical reference, but they are not of any significance. The play also does not throw much light to the character of the king. All the observations are of a general nature applicable to all the scenes coming under the particular category.

Two things deserve special mention: one. the direction and style of the poet. Any verse can be illustrated to show the poetic beauty. two. The poets' ability to create dramatic situations. How conveniently the dramatic make arrangements for the first meeting of the hero and heroine. He has also introduced super natural elements, which also go a long way in creating an atmosphere conducive for the development of the plot. The transformation of the two maids to the form of parrots is a telling example.

On the whole the play is panegyric, good to be read and relished. It is doubtful whether it will be a success on the stage.
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*Ratnaketūdaya* is a drama in five acts describing the love between Prince Rataketu of Malava dynasty and Līlāvati, daughter of King Jayasena.

I Act

The drama begins with three benedictory verses in praise of Lord Śiva. This is followed by the entry of the stage manager who introduces the play to the audience.

In the mixed interlude of the Act I the Vaitālika Kājakanta informs Viśāvatī that Ratnaketu, King of Mālava has arrived at Manipur after his Digvijaya. He had accepted the invitation of Jayasena, the King of Niṣadhas. He also informs her that Ratnaketu has agreed to stay in Manipura for sometime at the instance of his father’s bosom friend. He further discloses to her that a festival is being celebrated in the temple of Śarva Siddhikari by Jayasena to secure the grace of the Goddess, in the matter of selecting a
suitable bridegroom for his daughter Lilavati. He also reveals to her that, the Goddess while granting Jayasena's wish to have a daughter had decreed that he should give the daughter in marriage only to bridegroom chosen by her.

An Announcement of the chamberlain of the King Malava is heard that the King is visiting the temple of Sarvasiddhikari.

The first act opens with the King Ratnaketu immersed in thoughts. The past events revealed as though through a flashback. He has seen the Princess during his visit to the temple and is smitten with love. He is soon reminded of his friend Kasīyapa. The King tells him that he entered the temple and after worshipping the goddess, he went to the citramaṇḍapa to take rests. He then painted a picture of the goddess in a corner of the wall. The Princess, who came for worship, was shown his painting, by one of her maids and she admired it. He was attracted by the unparalleled beauty and charm of the Princess. He also reveals to Kasīyapa that one of her maids had requested him to inscribe his name below the painting and that he
had obliged her. The Princess repeatedly read the letters with delight and left him with difficulty, as she was summoned to the palace to see the anchorite Prabhāvati, who had returned after performing a long penance in Mahākāla, with a view of attaining mastery over the mantras. He further informs him that, before she left for the palace, one of her maids came and requested him to preserve his beautiful painting.

Kāśyapa tells the King that he would not be able to forget Lilavati. But the King remarks that his love was one-sided and that it was because of his partiality that he (Kāśyapa) interpreted it otherwise. Kāśyapa disagrees with him.

The King tells him that he is affected both in body and mind, by the pangs of love. Kāśyapa suggests sending his confidant to meet the Princess. The King says that it is very difficult to meet the Princess. His friend then suggests contacting Prabhāvati, a close acquaintance of the Princess. At that time the sound of the conch is heard and the Vidūṣaka remarks that it is a good omen. The King smiles on hearing his friend’s remark and tells him that is midday.
The second Act opens with a praveśaka. The Princess is suffering from pangs of love and one of her maids by name Hariṇiṇī has gone to fetch cooling materials. On the way she meets Médhāvīni, a disciple of Prabhāvati. From their conversation it is known that the Princess has fallen in love with Ratnāketa and that Prabhavatī has gone to meet her.

Prabhāvati is conversing with Lilavati and her maid Kalāvati and Kalajahamsika. Prabhāvati narrates the details of her meeting with Ratnāketa. She saw the King disconsolate and on being asked the reason for it, his friend showed him a portrait. Lilavati is anxious to know the name of the person represented. Prabhavati tells them that the picture is of the Princess. Hearing these words Lilavati becomes bashful. The anchorite further informs them that she gave a touching account of the condition of Lilavati to the King and that she assured him of his union with her. The maids remark with surprise that Prabhāvati’s description of Lilavati is true and they show her the flower bed of the Princess. They
further describe the sufferings undergone by their mistress and request her to bring about the union of the two using her supernatural powers. Prabhāvati assures them of her help.

The anchorite informs them that King has given her a crest-jewel with a message to be delivered to Līlavati. Līlavati feels happy on receiving it. Prabhāvati then gives the message in which the King says that he is constantly thinking of her and that by presenting the crest-jewel which he has Maṇiśkarṇa, after defeating him in the course of his digvijays, he has obtained from a Vidyādhara named really offered her his own heart. The maids are impressed by the valour of the King.

At that time, Medhāvini reminded her mistress that the time for worship has come. Prabhāvati seeing that it was noon hastens to go. Before she takes leave of the Princess, she asks her disciple about the state of affairs in the palace. Medhāvini replies that the King has gone to the temple of Śrīva Śidhi Kari. Prabhāvati asks the maids to bring Līlavati to the temple, and accompanied by Medhāvini he goes to the temple.
The Princess and her two maids continue to stay in the Maṇḍapa. The second maid teases the Princess about the proposed alliance with the King of Mālava. The maids assure her that the goddess would certainly permit it. The Second Act ends with Princess proceeding with her maids to the temple.

III Act

The Third Act opens with the entry of the Chamberlain who is going to meet the King Ratnaketu to deliver a letter from his minister Bhadrasarman in Hemapura. He sees the King resting with Kasyapa on a platform.

The King is lost in thoughts of his beloved Kasyapa realizes the cause of his friends' gloom and he tries to cheer up his spirits by reminding him of the statement of Prabhāvati. The King says that he does not believe the words of the Prabhāvati since she might have spoken them with a view to please him. At that time the Chamberline presents himself with a letter to the King. The King takes and reads it. In the letter Bhadrasarman has
requested his master to hurry back to his city, Hemapura as according to reports, the King of Kaliṅga was planning to invade it, with a view to releasing his son who is kept in prison. The King asks his Chamberline to make arrangements for his journey.

The King in the meanwhile worries about the prospect of leaving Maṇipura without achieving his object namely, winning the hand of Līlāvatī. Kāśiyapa remains him of the instruction of Prabhāvatī and soon they come to the garden where they see Līlāvatī sitting with her maids. They hide themselves to over hear the conversation.

Līlāvatī is afflicted by love and the maidens take pity on her. Kalāvatī asks as to why the King who is reported by the anchorite to be keeping her portrait by his side, would have drawn it merely to exhibit his skill in painting.

Both the maids look at each other and Kalāvatī jocularly says that her lover is coming. Līlavati looks around and finding no one remarks that she has been hoodwinked by her friends. She would be glad to give back the crest jewel to the King since she believes that its proper place is in his court.
Līlavatī tells her maids that her right eye is throbbing indicating trouble. Then they perceive in the sky, a flash of light which soon turns out to be the chariot of a Vidhyādharma called Maṇikarṇa. Who wants to get back the crest-jewel, which King Ratnaketu has forcefully taken from him. He is delighted by the prospect of not only getting back his crest-jewel but also a handsome maiden. He comes down and tries to kidnap Līlavatī. The Princess and her maids are stricken with fear and they cry out for help. The King hearing their shrieks, rushes towards her with his bow. Her warns the Vidhyādharma not to touch the maids reminding him of the powers of his mighty bow. He faces the Vidhyādharma. Maṇikarṇa asks the King to return the crest-jewel or to fight with him. The King prefers to fight. Prabhāvati assures Līlavatī that her lover would emerge victorious in the fight. The King inflicts a crushing defeat on his enemy. The maids expressed their gratitude for saving them from the Vidhyādharma.

The King describes the beauty of the Princess. Prabhāvati asks him to rescue his beloved from her sufferings Kāśyapa asks
the anchorite whether Jayasena would be willing to give his daughter in marriage to his friend. She replies that he is not only agreeable, but considers himself most fortunate in getting a bridegroom in Ratnaketu, the king of Niṣadha. He is worried only about Sarvasiddhikari. Prabhāvati assures that the goddess would only be happy in having a good bridegroom in Ratnaketu.

At that time, the voice of Jayasena is heard warning that if anybody dared to abduct his daughter, he would be punished. On hearing these words, the maids request the anchorite to take the Princess to the presence of her father. Prabhāvati agrees and she goes with the Princess. The King Ratnaketu expresses his anguish at the sudden departure of his beloved. Kāśyapa then suggests that they should meet Jayasena before they go to Hemapura. The King agrees.

IV Act

The fourth act opens with Prabhāvati commencing her journey from Maṇipura to Hemapura. The King of Maṇipura has
asked her to convey to King Ratnaketu that the goddess has expressed her agreement to the marriage of his daughter to the Ratnaketu by appearing in his dream. She makes the journey through the air with the help of her magical powers. She reaches the palace and meets King Ratnaketu. The Chamberlain tries to divert the King’s mind by pointing to presence of the gardeners. The King asks the Chamberline to why Kāśyapa has not yet brought the portrait. He replies that he was robbed of the portrait.

Kāśyapa remarks that he believes that Srva Siddhikari has approved him as the bridegroom of Līlāvati, Prabhāvati informs that the King of Niṣhadas has decided to gives his daughter in marriage to him after getting the consent of the goddess.

Further Jayasena has invited him to Maṇipura to celebrate the marriage. The King is happy to hear the news and makes arrangements for his Journey.

V Act

The fifth act opens with a description of the festive appearance of Maṇipura on the eve of the royal marriage.
After the marriage Ratnaketu is sitting in the garden, with his wife. Prabhāvatī comes accompanied by Kaḻahamsikā. She conveys to him the desire of Jayasena to give his Kingdom to him and retire to the forest. Kāsaṇa also comes to meet the King and he express his happiness.

Prabhāvatī blesses them, the play ends/usual epilogue praying for the well being of the people.
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Treatment of Rasa:

The Rasa is the most important element in Kavya. Indian dramatist gives importance in delineating rasas through dramas. Main sentiment in a nāṭaka must be heroic or erotic, but all the sentiments may be delineated as secondary.

The principal sentiment in R.K. is śṛṅgāra and others are secondary. The sutradhara praises the sṛṅgara rasa as rasottara in his introduction. According to him śṛṅgāra excels all other rasas. It is equal to the enjoyment of the blissful state of the supreme (Brahmānda). The dramatist himself expresses his preference to that sentiment as is evident from the verse in the beginning of the drama.

\[ \text{Yasyānātmanaṁajopī bhagavānṛtya svayam divyate} \]
\[ \text{Sevanteyamanāratam casudṛṣṭah sanyaktāvedyāntarah} \]
\[ \text{yam brahmānaṁhavapramodalaharīṣadhyāncamācakṣate} \]
\[ \text{Soyam sarvasatīthhūrvijayate sṛṅgāra eko rasah} \]
The Śṛṇgāra sentiment is of two kinds:—love in union and love in separation. Bharata has mentioned ten conditions of the persons separated from beloved ones.

Bālakavi is at his best while delineating the mutual love of the Hero and Heroine. In the first act, the seed of love germinates the hero and heroine see each other in the citramanḍapā, in the temple of Sarvasiddhikari. Then they undergo pangs of love. This type of Vipralambha śṛṇgāra is known as Pūrvarāga, which has ten types. It steadily grows in intensity. Hero expresses his anguish, his five sense organs are clamouring for to enjoy her.

*Mugdhāṅgi madhurādharām mṛdugiram*  
campeyagandhānanā—
Mastokastanakorakadvayabharastokāvanamṛkṣaṃ  
Tūmācikṣiṣate vivāsati muhuḥ śusrūṣate kim vadā—
Myājigrāsati cāliiṅgaspate ṛime ha hantā paṁcendriyī
dsūtānāśūtaḥ pacchākṣiṣasriṣṭiḥ.

Here the Vipralambha Śṛṇgāra as it first stage:—Abhilaśa. The ālambanavibhāva is the hero. The Uddipanavibhāvas are the
various beautiful objects he sees around him such as the moon, cooing of the cuckoo etc... The anubhāva is the desire of his recollection of his beloved.

Līlāvati is also comes to the same stage of Abhilāṣa is evident from the verse described by her maid.

Santāpaṁ janayanti candrakīrṇādāvopamaṁ candanam
Bābindvānanikūnjaṁ nivasatissajyaddhārāgrhe
Śayyā puspamayi niśasahacarī nidrāpravidrīv maṁ
Sammūrcchānti sumantavyāā. sāvārdajalārdprā-nilah

The ālambanavibhāva is the heroine. The uddīpanavibhāvas are the moon, the gentle breeze etc... The vyabhicārībhāvas are her sorrow, fainting etc...

The vipralambha śṛgāra runs its second stage namely Cinta. The Chamberlían described conditions of the hero in the third act.
Vahankṣāmakṣāmanāt vapuratitarām dhusarataram
Kṣipanbhūyāṅ śvāsam kṣitivilikhanavyāptakaraḥ
Daśāṁ prāptahṣocyaṁ ciravanavihāraṇāvinīm
Vāśāṁ dhyāyanvanyāḥ kalabhāva vāriniyamitaḥ

The ālambanavibhāva is the hero. The vibhāva is the enchanting scenery of the garden. Anubhāvas are his sighing, restlessness etc. The vyabhicāribhāvas are his contemplation.

The hero is further seen wailing and longing for his beloved. In the next act a temporary union is effected. The union lasts only for a brief period owning two incidents. Here the sambhoga śṛṅgāra is followed by vipralamba. The first incident is the fight between the hero and vidyādhara. Here there are touches of the sentiments Vīra and Bhayānaka. The battle is described.

Kupyaadbhogīśphāṭāśīyamarasāramuk’āghātajātaspulīṅga-
Śṛṅgāraḥ vidyottivitajavapavanoddhūtadhūliṅghāśaiḥ
Proccebhapraśramāpracaalajāloḍharāsāramāvīśvāgraṁ
Vāyūptaṁ
Sadṛṣyovipāḍhaiyādidadadhinādhamukhainumukhaśa
The ālambanavibhāva is the anchorite. Uddīpanavibhāvas are the fiery arrows and driving dusty winds. The vyabhicāribhāvas are the fear and wonder generated by in the minds of Līlāvati and her friends.

After the battle the hero and heroine separated. The hero returns to his kingdom Hemapura to protect it and the heroine is goes to meet her father. So in the fourth act, there is further resume of the love is separation. The poet describes the pangs of love in the fourth act. Here Vipralambha śṛṅgara is in its third stage Śṛṅga:

_Hantāj _smarāmi _madhuroṣṭhī, _tāvādharoṣṭham
_Hantāj _smarāmi _rucirāṇgi, _tavāṅgamaṅgam._

Here the ālambanavibhāva is the hero. The Uddipanabhāvas are the redness of the Palāśa bud and the sweet smell of Gandhaphal, which are respectively attributed to the lips and body of his beloved and the Vyabhicāribhāvas are the heroes recollection.
The hero then tells his friend that the name Lilavati is a
mistaken to his beloved.

Garapatanapūrvān bhūyasaśā śāmavādān
Parītharaṇamāpi tvam kim na hiśvātii
Kulidamagaṇayitvā sa tadevānātihāna-
Skhalanamavadadhāna vakti vāmāni vaddvāh

Here the hero is in the fourth stage of love is separation
namely guṇakathana.

Maṇipatanavavaye srajanā bahū śaandiharagāṁi, supṣyā
Namsāpyahamanarpayāmi te kucaśambhopari komalāmmāṁ

To alleviate hero’s agony, a portrait of his beloved brought
before him. He is so greatly delighted by it that he garlands and
addresses it. Here the hero is in the fifth stage of love in
separation. Udvega

But the hero is no more allowed to undergo the next stages
of the pangs of separation. In fifth act the lovers are united, the
marriage of the hero and heroine takes place. From the above
analysis it is seen that the dramatist has developed the sentiment in consistent and regular manner.

There is a beautiful description of the crest jwell (cūḍamaṇi) placed in the hands of Līlavatī. Vidūṣaka says it seems that “she holds in her hand your very life in the pretext of this crest jwell. For this the king replies- No she holds my heart in her hand. There by ordering it not to move any where else ¹¹.

Ālaktaiāmre karapallavesyā-
Ścūḍāmaṇerasya nirikṣanena
Tānyatra kutrāpi caleti tanyā
Maṇve gṛhītam hṛdayam mamaiva

Here the poet has beautifully used the image of crestjwell to depict the sentiment of loves. The crestjwell in this drama as a special significance like the Aṅgulīya in Uttararāmacarita or Śakaṭa in Mṛccakaṭika or Mudra in Mudrārākṣasā. The cūḍamaṇi in R. K. plays a pivotal role in the development of the theme. It reminds one of cūḍamaṇi of Rāmayaṇa well portrayed by Saktibhadra in his Aścaryacūḍamaṇi. It seems that Bālakavi got
the inspiration from Saktibhadra to make the crest jewel a symbol of love.

King Ratnaketu defeats the vidyādhara and takes cūḍāmaṇi from him. He then gives it to Lilāvatī as a token of valour of Ratnaketu as also of his love to Lilavati. This is beautifully brought out when he rescues Lilāvatī from the attack of Vidyādhara, who comes to claim cūḍāmaṇi. He defeats the Vidyādhara and saves Lilavati from him. This gives an opportunity for Lilavati to be more committed to the King.

Similarly while describing the Anubhāvas he comes very near to Kālidāsa. Many situations in R. K. can be quoted to illustrate this. The reaction of Lilavati on seeing the King and her reluctance to part from that place is beautifully described in the first act.\footnote{\textit{Parāvṛtiya vyājātpavanavāśatovirudva sā\textsuperscript{13}}}

\textbf{Drśā vičikṣobhaccaśālītaśītravāravacā}

\textbf{Ṣunāth paśyanti māṁ saha mama hṛda saṁstavaṁatā}

\textbf{Pravṛtti prasthātum prasṛtinayanā padmavadanaḥ}\footnote{17}
The situation is quiet comparable to the state of Śākuntala while she returns with Gātikā after the first meeting with Dvīhyanta

Darbhāṅgureṇā caraṇahkṣatā eṅvakāṅde
Tamī sāhū kancideva padāni garvā
Āśūvīyavatadā ca vimocayantī
Śākhasu valkalamasaktamapi drumaṇṣ
d

Again while describing the exquisite beauty of Līlāvatī the poet is at his best. Brahma could not create her because he is a sage (muni) even in the three worlds there is none similar to the creation of Brahma. Kāma also can’t be her creator because he has to learn a knew for such a work. She is the very embodiment of love drawn from the ocean of love.

Sā sṛṣṭa na caturmukhena muninā satyaṁmanoharmi
Srṣṭyaṁ jagairaye pi vannā
No kāmena ca nītanābhhyāsanataṣṭilpanu tallabhyate
Śrīgārāmbhumidheḥ svayaṁ samudita śrīreva -
kācuparā
The first two lines resemble Kālidāsa while describing Urvaśī. Kālidāsa says that Brahma who is involved in the recital of the Vedas cannot be the creator of such a beautiful form.

\begin{quote}
Asyaḥ sargavidhau prajāpatirahhucandro nu 
kāmthiprabhah\[5pt]
Śṛṅgarakarasah svayam nu madano mūso nu 
purākaparoh\[5pt]
Veśabhivyāraṇḍah katham nu viyayavāyata 
kauṭihulan\[5pt]
Nirmāṇam prabhavanmanoharamulam rūpaṃ 
purāno muniḥ \[15pt]\end{quote}

Brahma is qualified as muni by Kālidāsa. Bālakavi also uses the same phrase an idea. So Bālakavi can't claim anything of his own in this part. But the later part especially her birth from the ocean of love gives in new twist to the whole description. It is generally from the imagination of the poet.

Bālakavi has the same skill and proficiency while delineating other rasas. The description of his fight with
Vidyādhara is an example for virarasa. Other sentiments like Vira, Bhayānaka and Karuṇa have also been well delineated and they aid the development of the main sentiments Śrīgāra.

FIGURES OF SPEECH

The poet has a beautiful style and diction at his command. While describing Śrīgāra the style is simple and elegant. But in Vīra the style is vigorous. He profusely uses the Arthālankaras. But never crosses the limit prescribed by Ānandavardhana. Ānandavardhana has identified the role of Alankara in poetry were the prominent in to rasa. The Alankara should enhance the beauty of the sentiment portrayed. It should be striking and easily communicative. Bālakavi is very much fond of using Ullekhā. The following description of Lilavatī can be cited as an example.

Saundarvasya dhruvamavasitissaukumarīrasya simā
Śrīgārasvommatrabhinavā yauvanasya prātiśtha
Mādhurvasvādhikaraṇamāya manmathasyāvalambho
Maṇimayābharaṇamathavā mediniṁandalasya
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Lilavati is the abode of beauty (saundaryam), the boundary of charm, the height of love, incarnation of youthfulness, she is support of manmatha, the ornament to my desire or she is the ornament of whole world.

His use of Dr̥štānta is also interesting. The attitude of king Ratnaketu towards women of the Harem after seeing Lilavati is described thus:

Śr̥i
Mandotkaṇṭhasmi kṛṣṇamādirāṣṭāhamavaṁvalaiḥāsu
Madhukara iva vikasantyā mallikāyā sāmpramaṇam kamaliniṣū
disinterested to meet women in the Harem like a Bee
disinterested to Lotus after meeting the budding Jasmine. Here
the expression echoes the sentiments of Dushyanta after seeing
Sakuntala. The Hamsapadhika accused him of the change in
his attitude. The only difference is that there it is the mango
flower, here that is Jasmine.

Any how this Dr̥štānta sheds much light to the mind of
Ratnaketu. Thus portraying his love towards the heroine.
Bālakāra is very much fond of alliterations especially repetition of words. For example

Shūna, sūtham, śīramadhuram vāri saihātmajīvāh
Kūla kūr, madhmadaraṇātakākilāḥ puṣparāṇāḥ
Madhu, madhava, bharabhaṭārayāraṇi madharaṇi
Devadāsi
Durā ṛṣi vacām vacasām colabhūmēḥ prabhāvāḥ

The following verse is an example for his diction

Gāvē gantī, mahamadhurimagarvamrataraśīn
Nāṭkāṭāśī, kṣatrayasāḥ puṃskokilayaṁ
Dantī dantī prajñavatāharim darsāyan svāṁ prīyāyaṁ
Prīyā prīyā śīkha madhu tatpitaśeṣam svayāka.

Here we get the repetition of ‘gatvā’ as also ‘tvā’ in alternate line. ‘gatvā’ also the repetition of ‘ādāya’ and ‘prītāḥ’ in the second and forth lines.
METRES

In the use of metres Bālakavi shows appreciable skill and mastery. R.K. consists of two hundred and eighty-three slokas. More than twenty different metres are employed in this play.

Bālakavi is adept in handling of the metre śikharī. In this metre there is a beautiful sloka which describes the condition of the king Rattaketu.

vanansyāmavāsanā napūrattarāṃ dhūsaraśarāṇ

Kṣayamudrīvan śāsaṃ kṣitvilākhanavyāpyakaraṇāḥ

Dasāṃ praptāsvacōvāṃ cūrvanavīhārapraṇāvāṇīṃ

Rasāṃ dhvāvacanhāya kalabhaiva vārīnyamatāḥ ॥

"His body appears emaciated and very pale. Sighing again and again, he is engaged in doodling over the earth. He looks like a wild elephant caught in the waters thinking of his sad mate who is fond of roaming about in the forest". Here the majesty and depth of metre is visible.

Among frequently used metres are Vasantatilaka.
Rathoddhata. Upagati. Ārya. Viyogini. Dṛutavijñambhita are also
used by the poet

R.K begins with three benedictory verse in Śṛghdharā metre.

In the first verse the poet gives a beautiful description of
the mutual glances of Śiva and Pārvati at the time of their
marriage.

Śānandadvanammarāsciramabhilaśūnyonya samyogalābhah
dotkṣhaṃhasvairavikṣayavodhikarahavirdhumabhūmodgameṣu
Savtulya pūrvavatapasvāsaraṣrābhūtyanuvānavartīyā
Pānvadvīṣūyōḥ parṇayanavidhau aṣṭisambhivedalōḥ 23

"May the play of the mutual glances of the primeval couple,
at the time of their marriage, which were exchanged by them
eagerly and secretly out of their satisfaction in their long awaited
union, which is but the science of non-dualism in delight, which
were bashful owing to the recollection of the past story of the
destruction of Kāma and which were obstructed by the smoke
emitting from the sacrificial fire protect you"

In the fourth act there is colorful description of the last quarter of night in Mandākranta metre.

\[ \text{Prāvnāndi prāṇadati paṭahodvārasāṁśvarāṇām} \\
\text{Harmeṣumīlālyā kaṭakaḷa kopi kāpottavatā} \\
\text{Girayanti kvaṇyaunayagirāṁ kāṁmaḥ khaṇḍhitāṇāṁ} \\
\text{Janainādandhādhanaragṛhadvāra kantāvanāte} \]

"The sound of the drum in the precincts of the gates of gods marks the nāndi of the morning. In the white mansions some doves are producing the murmur. The lovers reconstruct the conciliatory words spoken by faithless lovers. The sleepy gate keepers move about in the houses of the rich."

Balakavi uses giti metre for describing the merits of a poem.

\[ \text{Ubbayāhhiyeva pumsāmullaso bhṛṣamudettihṛdayeṣu} \\
\text{Navanavarasahharitābhirvanitābhiḥ satkaveśca kavyabhiḥ} \]
"People are enjoyed by two things by the beautiful poems of great poets and by enchanted girls".

It is interesting to note that the poet is well versed in Prakṛt also. He used even Śārṅgāvukiḍītā metre in prakṛṭ.

Nyāyātoraṇamallavīhagahāṇa racchā mahābhōiṇo
Pāṇḍaddhāavijjalo suruita ṁr̥ṣaṇīmūdā
eMurtāraamanḍhalivalamo moundū vīśaṇinduṇo
Kidhālotuñvalahalanauarā kaṇṭirahuvūrāharā 26

The translation of the above is given as follows:-

Nyāyātoraṇamaḷyavīcī gahana ratīvā mahābhoginaḥ
Prāvanadḥvanīvidyutah surucira prāsadaṇītakah
Muktāvakamandalivalayo mugdā vīśaṇendavaḥ
Kṛdhālotupahālikanagacaraḥ kaṇṭairathorvidharaḥ

Bālakavi shows amazing ease in his writing the poetry. No doubt he is a gifted poet.
Treatment of Sandhis

To understand the treatment of Sandhis in the Sanskrit drama, it is necessary to know what are Itivṛtta, Arthaprakṛti and Avasthā. Itivṛtta is the Subject matter of the play. It is called the body of the drama. Itivṛtta is two-fold nature. Adhikarika and Prāsaṅgika Prāsaṅgika is subdivided in Patāka (an episode) and Prakāri (a mere incident). Patāka is continuous in nature where as Prakāri is of short duration.

Nature of Arthaprakṛtis:

The object to be attained is called Kārya. These which help in the attainment are Arthaprakṛtis. They are five in number. Bīja, Bindu, Patāka, Prakāri and Karya.

These five Arthaprakṛtis are interpreted by many theorists as the means of final attainment of the ends of the hero.

Arthaprakṛṭitavaḥ kāryasya siddhihetavaḥ.
This interpretation generally agrees with the nature and definitions of the first four Arthaprakṛtis. The Bīja is called \( \text{tadhetuḥ} \). Bindu is called \( \text{avicchedakāraṇam} \). Patāka is pradhānasya upakārakam vṛttam and prakari is parārthayaiva kevalam.

**Nature of Avasthās**

Avastha-s are mental condition of the character expressed through various actions. All the actions are motivated by an urge to achieve his goal. This urge is born of anticipation - autsukya, a longing or desire for the fruit of action. Ārambha, Yatna, Praptysā, Niyatāpti and phalāgama are called the five stages in the development of the action.

According to this theory. Avastha-s combine with the corresponding constituents to form a Sandhi - Accordingly it can be seen that

\( \text{Bīja} + \text{Ārambha} \) goes to make - Mukhasandhi

\( \text{Bindu} + \text{Yatna} \) - Pratimukhasandhi
Patakā - Praptyāśa - Garbhasandhi
Prakari - Niyatāpti - Vimarśasandhi
Karya - Phalāgama - Nirvahaṇasandhi

The plot is the creation of the poet. The play is introduced through the device called Pravṛttaka when the assistant describes the spring season, a voice behind the scenes sings a verse. Though the verse is directly in praise of Cupid, it is suggestive of Ratnaketu and his triumph over the world.

The plot of the play has to be analyzed on the basis of the intention of the hero. Thus the principle and subordinate plots have to be identified on the basis of the Karya.

The title Ratnaketuḍaya implies that the story ends in Nayakodaya. The hero attains two things: one, victory over his enemies and two, object of love, that is Līlavatī. Of these two, which is the principal and which is the subordinate.

In the opening lines itself the poet makes it clear that the
principal sentiment delineated here is Śṛṅgāra. Hence the theme revolves round the love of Ratnaketu and Lilavati. The King's victory over his enemies enhances his valour and thus adds charm to the principal sentiment of love.

In the first act there is a misraviskambha. The news that Ratnaketu stays at manipura as the guest of Jayasena and the forthcoming festival in the shire of Sarvasiddhikari are mentioned in this Viṣkamba and the bija of the play is thus seen in the optimism expressed by Viṇavati. Ratnaketu who possessed virtuous qualities and a charming demeanour would be a suitable bridegroom to Lilavati.

The hero and heroine meet with each other at the temple of goddess. After worshiping the goddess the king takes rest in the citramandapa and paints a picture of the goddess in a corner of the wall. The princess and one of her maids admire it and her maid's request him to inscribe his name below the painting and he obliges readily. The princess repeatedly read the letters, with delight and leaves him. Thus is the first act the germination of
love can be discerned. It is the Ārambha. Thus the mukhasandhi commences in the first act of the drama.

In the II act one can find the further development of love. Both the hero and heroine are undergoing pangs of love. During the conversation between the king and anchorite prabhāvati — she assures the king of his union with Līlāvati. This is the bindu. To alleviate heroine's agony, the hero sends a crest jewel, which he had obtained from a vidyadhara, after defeating him in the course of his digvīgaya. The heroine is relieved of her agony to great extent after the receipt of the momento. This is the Prayatna. In this act both bindu and Prayatna is incorporated and this is the Pratimukhasandhi.

Garcīsandhi commences at the beginning of the third act. There are several troubles, which obstruct the union of the hero and heroine. The heroine goes to meet her father and hero returns to his city Hemapura to protect it from the invaders Kaliṅgas. The news of an intending invasion of the country makes the hero leave the station. This incident is the Pataka of the play. The Vidyadhara
comes to abduct the heroine, but the hero drives him away. He then meets the heroine and yet they are not in position remain together. This is the Prakari. The hero is worried about blessing of the goddess Sarvasiddhikari. This is the praptanyasa. The Garbhasandhi comes to a close by the end of the third act.

The hero is undergoing the severe pangs of separation. Prabhavati brings him happy tidings that the goddess has agreed to his marrying Līlavati. This is the Niyatāpti and the hero leaves manipura to marry the princess and this act thus gives the Vimarsa sandhi.

Act V depicts the consummation of love of the hero and heroine. Their marriage takes place in this act. The hero besides getting the hand of Līlavatī the hero also receives the kingdom of Niśadha. Thus by attainment of Kārya and the resultant Phalāgama one gets the NirvahaṇaSandhi of the play.

An analysis of the structure of the Ratnaketudaya reveals the following facts The story is of a simple nature having only
one object that is the fulfillment of love. The main sentiment of the play is Śṛṅgāra supported by Vīra. As such, it is devoid of the complexity usually seen in many other Sanskrit dramas. In short the theme has unity of purpose has also unity of emotion.

At the same time a closer examination will show that the construction has some weakness inherent in it.

1. The main theme is the love between the hero and heroine, but unlike in other Sanskrit dramas there is no serious objection from anywhere for their union. The only disturbing incidents are the letter from the minister pointing to an impending war and a temporary departure from Lilavati. But this is quite natural since the king is on his way of his Digvijaya. Thus absence of the factors obstructing the attainment of the object is the weakness of Garbāsnadhi.

2. Prabhāvatī is a peculiar character with extra ordinary magical powers. The magical powers of Prabhāvatī are of no use of to the king though she offers her help to the kings by her magical powers. But this should have been relevant had the course of love been objected by some curse or by the influence of super natural powers.
The long description in the act IV of Kanchi, Chidambaram, Madura etc. gives us valuable information regarding the socio-religious conditions of that age. But from an aesthetic point of view they do not have any bearing on the delineation of the principal sentiment. On the other hand they block so to say the flow of the development of the plot.

DESCRIPTION OF HISTORICAL PLACES

Ratnaketūdaya gives the description of some places, which are historically important. One is Kochi the capital of his patron Rāmavarma. Bālakavi travelled through different places and finally reached Kerala. Kerala is full of spices like Cardomom, Arecanut trees and Coconut trees. The Kochi is just like Amarāvati.

parimaḥbahuṁtājanāṅgavallīpinaddhakramukanikanakarāṇaṁ
keralanāvvasa
agāhiṣṭa ca punaraparāmarāvatiṁma kocciṁ kṛtābhidhānāṁ
raṭadhanīṁ
Cola desa

Ratnaketu passes through Coladesa. The poet describes cola desa as follows in R.K.

\[
\text{Sthāne sthāne Śīramadhurāṁ vāri sahyātmajāyāḥ} \\
\text{Kūle kūle mādhumadaraṇatkokilāḥ puspavāḥ} \\
\text{Madhye madhye bhavabhayaharam mandiram} \\
\text{devatānām} \\
\text{Dure dure vasati vacasam colabhumeḥ prabhavah}
\]

Cidambaram

The famous Cidambaram temple and deity Siva is described as below in R.K.

\[
\text{Nyastodastāmghripadnam kvanitampanthulakoṭikoṭirakoṭi} \\
\text{läṅgadgaṅgātaranīgaṁ}
\]
karaḍhamarukadhimārkārānūkāratavatvāni

valṣṣāyāgḥṛṣṭmāgraṇī vallavālēkapadām lamhamānākṣhamalam

Nityam nṛtvanāgatayāmiha kimapi mahaṁśīthate citsabhāyām
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CHAPTER VI
AN EVALUATION

Bālakavi was proficient with the works of his predecessors. Their influence is visible in his works. It seems that he had chosen Kālidasa as his model. Many situations and descriptions echo his close affinity to the work of Kālidasa.

In Śākuntala, Śākuntala and her friends are frightened by the bees. They cried for help. The king revealed himself to interfere.

Kahi paurave vasumāti
Śāsati sāśitār durvinātānām –
Avamācaratvāv ādayam
Asthāna na tapasvīkanyakāsu!!!

The third act of R. K. has its seen that resembles the situation in Śākuntala. Lilavati and her friends were attacked by the Vidyādhara. They are frightened and called for help. The king enters with the following verse.
Here the epithets of the women and also of the king are of much similar to the words of Duṣyanta.

Bālakavi was also quiet familiar with the dramas of Kulaśekhara. Some of the scenes described in R. K. betray this influence. In Subhadrādhiṇjaya there is an interesting scene where in a Vidūṣaka runs to watch they rays of the sun mistaking its as water. This scene of Mṛgatṛṣṇa is elaborately enacted by the cakyars on the Kerala stage. Perhaps the poet’s familiarity with the scene have prompted him to describe the midday sun in the following line

_Dhavaiveṇi maricem pratisaliladhivyā tamivas’ā madīyā_
_Meghacchāvādhvagānām kṣaṇamupakurute seva sāṅkalpiki me_
But here the poet has ably connected the mrgatrsna to his present state of mind. The effort of the deer is futile. Similar in the case of my desire to be united with Leelavati.

In the portrayal of Kañcuki also the Balakavi follows his predecessors Kañcuki enters in the beginning of the third act with the long soliloquy, in which he laments that serving the master is a very difficult job, especially when one is of old age.

Nūṣṭā khalu jīvikā sevakānām
Aveṣatāh punarasmākām
Nīhātavyam bhavanodare niyamivattatāpi naïvāsīko
Kartavyam guru karma
kālaharaṇādapyāpatennigrāhaḥ
These verses are illustrations of the poet's descriptive ability. It has been noted that Kalidasa also gives a similar picture of Kancuki in the fifth act of \textit{Sakuntala}.

The Bālakavi is quiet familiar with all the classical Sanskrit dramatists and he frequently betray signs of their influence in his work. It seems that his familiarity with the thirteen Trivandrum place attributed to Bhāsa is less, though they were very popular on the Kerala state before its discovery by Gaṇapati Sastri in 1908.

In the introduction of the \textit{R.K.}, it is stated that Bālakavi is a
great poet and hails from a family traditionally devoted to scholastic pursuits. It is not known whether R.K. is his first work. There is no trace of any composition prior to this. But it has to be assumed that R.K. was a latter production. The poet wrote R.K. at a comparatively young age when the memories of his ancestral home at Coladesa were fresh in his mind. The descriptions of Cidambaram and cola countries supports this view. The work was actually written immediately on his arrival to Kerala. The Pariparsvika curiously asks how he came to Kerala.

\[\text{pāripārvikāḥ-katham dūradeśasthitasya kaveḥ maharājārāmaravarmaprasādasamāśūdanaṃ} \]
\[\text{Sūtradhāraḥ-} \text{ṣṭḥu tāvat sa kila kaviraseyām} \]
\[\text{Sañcaraṇ bhūidadhūtrim saha sakhibhirapūrvvālokakautū} \]
\[\text{Hātena parimalabahalalainagavallīpinaddhakratvamukaka} \]
\[\text{Nīkarakeraṇ keralānāviveśal}^8. \]

He come to the Kochin palace. Here the sutradhara gives a graphic description of the palace and assembly hall in which the king was seated like the sun in the sumeru mountain. He then
describes king Rāmavarma in two verses:

\[ \text{VidhākāraśvamāṇīŚārikavijayaśrikalpavālī }
\]
\[ \text{Ramavacayasānagāḍāśūramāṇīśvastagāraśāla }
\]
\[ \text{Saundarvadṛaviṇāughakogavasate saujanyaratnamahdhe }
\]
\[ \text{Dhīragrasara ramavarmanmpate jīvah sahasram samaiḥ } \]

On the orders of the king he wrote Ratnaketūdaya drama. It is quiet natural that the story is of a king of Malava. Bālakavi came into closer association with his patron. Then he chooses him as the hero for his next.

\[ \text{Ramakītṛaparivṛdhhamakṣīmutnaratnapradīpa }
\]
\[ \text{Śrīṣṭīrajaśālavanapadoḍapadapraṣvasāmrājyabhirah }
\]
\[ \text{Susrūsharvaścintamanirayamanāśūmāṇi nistulakṣatradhāmno }
\]
\[ \text{Disyā dīṣṭēḥ purastadravikulatatilako ramavarnākṣiśindraḥ } \]

On the orders of the king he wrote Ratnaketūdaya drama. It is quiet natural that the story is of a king of Malava. Bālakavi came into closer association with his patron. Then he chooses
him as the hero for his next work R.K. Thus has to be considered as the maiden work of an young poet.

Though R.K. in the work of an young artist it shows the genius of a mature poet in delineating Rasa and portraying the dramatic characters.
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The Sūtradhāra says that R.K. is a rare production of theatre. "Kathakalīdayam nāma apūrvaṁ nāṭakam". What is intended by apūrvam is that is "a new" composition. Apūrva can also denote that this is a rare piece, not an ordinary type of Nāṭaka. But this interpretation is not necessary. Since there is nothing extra-ordinary in this play to attribute such a high appellation.

Bālakavi is quiet conversant with the conventions of theatre. The Sūtradhāra's observations regarding the four fold mode of abhinaya and of the melody prove this. His reverential references to Bharata show his erudition in Nātyasāstra.

Abhinavyavidām ṛṣṭirlagnabhīṁī catyaṣṭaye Drṣṭirlagnabhīṁī catyaṣṭaye
Srutabhirāgaśāntanāṁ ca gītvivecane
Vatāś ca kathāgateṣvam vastuprayogavidāṁ manah
Kimaparamīḥa svāṁme kṣemaṁkaro bharatamuni
The actor Raṅgaketu is addressed as "Murdhabhishikta". There is not much novelty is in them we have in Sanskrit stories of this kind in abundance. Mālavikāgnimitra, Priyadarśika, Ratnāvati are some of the examples. In such plays the plot revolves round the love of a king towards a new girl that came across him accidently. The hero with the help of the gesture devices means for union with her. The main obstruction is created by the queen and other wives in the Harem. Some now the hero manages to pacify all of them and with their permission attains the objects of his love. This is the standard theme in such plays which is repeated in R.K. Here the obstruction is for feeble. The queen easily succumbs to the desire of the hero. The introduction of Vidyādhara is intended to provide some moments of terror to deviating from the monotony of the continued description of love. The poet tries to introduced some supernatural elements through Prabhāvati. But it does not affect the natural flow of the theme.

Inspite of the tall claims of the Sūtradhara, the abundance of verses leaves one to doubt as to whether the play has ever
been enacted on the stage. Any how it might not have been a success on the stage, mainly because there are very few dramatic moments in the play. The general tone of the play is narrative. The story is revealed not through dramatic situations, but through the conversation of the character. Hence this is a drama oriented only on the vacika. Nothing comes unexpected in course of the development of the plot. Everything goes on smoothly. In the 17th and 18th centuries many dramas were composed in Kerala. *Vasumatikalyanā, Sītanveśana* etc. are some of them there were also plays of Rāmaṇīvāda. Besides a large number of Bhāṇa also came to be composed during this period none of them except perhaps the Bhāṇas were successful on the stage. The reason is obvious. There was a strong popular theatre for presentation of the classical sanskrit dramas. The Kūtiyaṭṭam theatre was mainly actor oriented. It had discarded the text of the dramatist and instead depended on the stage manuals and acting manuals prepared by the actors themselves. A situation came where in the script of the dramatist became irrelevant to stage practitioners. Even the plays of Kālidāsa could not with stand this onslaught.
Bhāsa, Saṅkīṭibhadra, Nīlakaṇṭa and Kulaśekhara could survive. Many others were relegated to the background from the centre stage. Among scores of such dramas we can include R.K. also. The popularity of the play in Kerala is mainly due to the patronage extended to it by Kochin royal family.

*R.K.* is a fine specimen of literary text with high artistic excellence a drama to be read and relished and not to be performed.
THE EDITION

It is for the first time that an attempt is made to bring out a
critical edition of Rāmakaṇṭhayā of Bālakavi. The text was printed
ones from Sreevidya press, Kumbhakonam, but copies are not
available now. The present edition is made by collating two Manu-
scripts one is from the Grantha library attached to Government
Sanskrit college, Tripunithura and the other from Saraswathi Mahal
library, Tanjore. The details of the manuscripts are given as fol-
lows.-

I. Manuscript Number- 10697
   Saraswathy Mahal library,
   Tanjore.
   Serial number- 57
   Transcript full scape pages-78(incomplete)
   Script- Devanagari
First page

श्री गणपति नमः। रक्षकैरुद्यं नाटकं प्रारम्भते। प्रथमोऽसः। .........................
जयाय निरंतरेण धार्पि प्रतिनिधित्वते। रक्षकैरुद्यं तद्दीरीयं असुकर। परिषदः। सूत्रधार:-- हत
किम्।.....................जयस्य ......... काणाम्। तत्रह्रोधङ्गति-प्रतिगमंदो विधाय।
प्रत्यागतः: पार्थ निरस्त्रं निजनेन सख्या सम्मानितो वसति सम्रान्ति नातिवर्तुरै॥

...........................................................
हात्: करणतश्चूनमसमांत्रुनेथे वा गभिष्यति। वा। तत्सूचित: पाण्डवर्ग:। किं च अपूर्ववस्तुपरारो
परिषदभिनवेशः कथं ...........अत। सूत्रधार:-- (विचारं) नानिन्धेतत। असिः खल्वसदृशः
रक्षकैरुद्यं॥

Last page

राजा इह सहेज सभागतो विद्या..............व्यतिकरेष्ठ वय्यूष्यः। केतिरञ्जायते।........
वीणामान: विद्वृक्कः।२। करं गदिदोहिष्ठेऽन न ओसोणंहं अरे। (सर्व: सकौतुकं विद्वृकः
पश्यति।..सख्यों।....।......शा जेति।)

एतावत्वर्त्तं मानुकायं प्रद्रश्यते। इदं पुस्तकं तांशापूर्वस्थापराजकीय
-श्रीसरस्वतीशालास्थलाथंक्ष्ण-प्रथंकास्तुपुस्तकानुसारं कविगोविन्दार्थं
विलिखितम्। शुभमस्त।।अस्स्य वर्षान्नम्बर १०६९१७-पत्रसंख्या ६८ (२००६ वर्ष जनवरी ते
८.)
2. Number- 402  148
Grandha library,
Government Sanskrit College,
Tripunithura
Transcript- Ordinary demmi 1/4 size
pp.223
Script- Malayalam (complete)
The critical edition is based on Tripunithura Manuscripts. The reading of the two text differs each other. The variant readings in the printed text which follows the Kumbhakonam Manuscript are given in the foot notes. The variant readings in printed text are given in the foot notes as P.T. The Tripunithura Manuscript contains the following details in the beginning:

Three benedictory verses and an elaborate discription of Kochin palace and Kerala. An additional verse is seen in this Manuscript after Bharatavakya. The Tanjore Manuscript begins with the following sentence अध्याय निर्जलिप्यांचति प्रतिविवाल्लो |... and abruptly ends in the fourth act. There are no comentaries available for the text. Both the Manuscripts do not contain Sanskrit equivalents for the Prakrt. Tanjore manuscript is also find blank here and there.