A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE NĀTYADARPAŅA AS A WORK OF DRAMATIC SCIENCE.

The chapter dealing with the ND's relation to the earlier works on Dramaturgy clearly suggests the fact that Rāmacandra and Gūnacandra are highly indebted to some of the earlier works on dramaturgy such as the NS, the Abhi, the DR, and the KS. At the same time it is quite easy to see that there is nothing wrong about it. Any new writer on a subject must equip himself with the knowledge of the earlier works on the subject. His writing should reveal his familiarity with all the important works before him, in the absence of which the work would lack in comparative excellence, depth of criticism and worthy contribution. Moreover, in a subject like this where the writer is expected to examine the different views dispassionately, weigh them, and arrange them systematically it is all the more necessary for a writer to go critically through the earlier works and accept what is worth accepting. Again, in a scientific subject where the writer is required to state clearly the facts and figures there is not much scope for a new writer to exhibit his creative or rather imaginative genius so far as the matter is concerned and
consequently there is bound to be a reproduction of the ideas and views presented by the earlier writers.

In fact, after the encyclopaedic work of Bharata which treats of all the topics concerning drama there was very little scope for a later writer to add anything new or substantial apart from adding some minor details. DhanaśŚayā in all his meekness plainly confesses this fact in the beginning of his work. But this does not mean that after the edition of an authoritative work there is no scope left for the later writers. Hemacandra brings out this point very ably and emphatically in his Pramāṇānīmaṇḍī. At the very outset, while explaining the purpose of his work and answering the narrow-minded critics who doubt the genuineness of a writer's work whose subject-matter has already been dealt with by his predecessors, Hemacandra pointedly asks if there were no Sūtras even before Panini, Piṅgala, Kanāda, Aksapaśā and others. It is not true that Panini was the first to compose the aphorisms of grammar, nor was Kanāda the first to compose the aphorisms of Indian Logic. There were a number of other writers who had already written on their respective subjects and Panini and others did make full use of them. What these writers did was to collect whatever material was already there,

1. Aparam lakṣaṇa kah kartumīśe - Dr I, 4.
arrange it systematically and put it in a new form. Similarly, even in dramaturgy was there nothing written on the subject before Bharata, the highest authority on the science of drama? Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya does refer to Nāṭasūtras before Bharata. Bharata himself refers to the previous authorities in the form of 'Atra ślokāḥ', 'Atra Āryaḥ', 'Anuvāsyaśālokāya', etc. But does anybody argue, continues Hemacandra, on the basis of the same data that the works of Bharata, Pāṇini and others are not original and therefore are useless? He ingeniously remarks that these sciences are without any definite beginning in time but they appear to grow even new according as they are delivered in abridged or amplified forms and as such are said to be the handiwork of this or that person. Rājasekhara also in his Kavyamimansa categorically states "There cannot be a poet who is not a thief; there cannot be a merchant who is not a thief; but he alone prospers who knows how to conceal (the theft)."

Even the greatest of our poets and dramatists like Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti had to resort to the earlier works like the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mābh. for the plot of their works.

2. Nāstyaacaurabh kavijanah Nāstyaacau ro vañigjanah;
   Sa nandati vīna vācyam yo jañāti nighbhuṁ, - KM, p. 61.
As a rule, any piece of literature does betray to some extent the influence of the earlier works which the writer has studied, and still the piece receives a warm welcome from the learned Saḥridayas. Thus originality consists not in pure invention but in the final shape which the writer gives to the material he handles. In fact, Sāstra was recognised as a common property and what a new writer on Sāstra had to do was to pour new wine into the old bottle.

Therefore the authors of the ND can easily be pardoned when they draw a few words or a sentence here and there which they would have found to be striking and significant. Still however it becomes apparently almost intolerable when we find them drawing lines after lines from their predecessors without acknowledging their debt. It indicates that the authors of the ND are not ashamed of copying verbatim when they feel that whatever has been stated earlier is quite alright and needs no rectification. It may still however be pointed out that this type of plagiarism is not unique. Most of the later writers on Poetics and Dramatics unhesitatingly borrow from their predecessors. The authors of the ND therefore need not be blamed on this account.

1. Cf. Ta eva padavīnyāsanā ta evārthavibhūtayaḥ; Tathāpi kāvyāṁ bhāti navyaṁ grassanakausalāt.
The fact appears still more natural when we hear in mind that our authors were Jaina monks and the purpose of the these monks in writing such works was not to establish some new theory but to gather together what was good in the different works, arrange it into a systematic whole, and make it available to the common people for their benefit and enrichment of knowledge.

Thus we cannot blame the authors of the ND for drawing amply upon the earlier sources. On the contrary, a writer who has not carefully studied the previous authorities is likely to betray his ignorance and lack of erudition.

What the authors of the ND have done therefore is that they have consulted the earlier authorities and placed their views systematically in a simple and clear manner. At the same time it should be clearly pointed out that the authors of the ND have never followed any authority blindly. They have the courage to express their views boldly and explicitly even though they differ from the majority of the learned rhetoricians. The boldness with which they have expounded the theory of the dual nature of kāsa defying almost all the celebrated authorities including even their learned preceptor cannot but be appreciated even though one may not agree with the theory as such. With all their reverence for the ancient authorities on dramaturgy they have not hesitated criticising
even the most learned of them whenever and wherever the authors of the ND found them to be mistaken. They criticise even Bharata of course without mentioning him by name. They also criticise Abhinavagupta for deriving the word Nataka from the root 'Nat,' which, they held, was not correct. They have twice criticised Dhananjaya for disregarding the old tradition of the Vṛddhas.

They criticise Sāṅkuka who does not recognize a low type of hero in Prahasana, Bhāna, etc., and at the same time recognizes Viṭa and others as the hero. They also criticise Mammata on a few occasions. Why to talk of others, they have differed at more places than one even with their revered teacher, Hemacandra for whom they have very great respect which is evident from the homage they pay to him in the concluding verses of the ND. They are proud of calling themselves as pupils of Hemacandra but are not prepared to follow him blindly. They have criticized even the views which are held

1. e.g., Bharata's restricting of Bhṛatī especially to Karuṇa and Bhīhatra only. This point has been discussed in the chapter VIII of the thesis.
2. Vide, ibid, ND & Abhi.
3. Vide, ibid, chapter VIII (ND & DR).
4. Sāṅkukas tvadhēmaprakṛter nāyakatvasamānicchan... viṭāder nāyakatvam pratipādayan kathamupādeyabh syāt. ND, p. 133.
5. Vide-Ch. VIII of the thesis: ND & KP.
by Hemacandra. This clearly reflects their undaunted spirit of freedom of thought and expression. Ramacandra was a lover of freedom. His pride and fearlessness are reflected in his plays and poems. He believed in original creation and not in treading the trodden path. Here of course, he could not be perfectly original and it is understandable. They have fully equipped themselves with the knowledge of the most of the works on dramaturgy that were available to them. They weigh the soundness of the earlier theories or views in the balance of reasoning. They test them on the touchstone of pure logic, and if they find them to be untenable they reject them outright.

Thus they are endowed with the true critical faculty which is highly essential for a writer on a scientific subject like this. They know what to accept and what not to accept.

The authors of the ND have criticized some of the great dramatists for their flaws. They have criticized Bhavabhūti for employing Kais'ki abundantly in his Malatīmādhava even though it is a Prakaraṇa. His Mahāvīraracita also has been criticised

1. For details, vide chapter VIII of the Thesis (ND & KS).
2. It is not possible to give any special credit to our authors for this because in most of the under-mentioned cases they are not original but have reproduced the criticism of the earlier authorities such as the Dhv., the KP, the Abhi, etc.
3. ND, p. 120.
for the statement of Rāma, viz., "I am going to untie the
Kaṅkāna" when the heroic sentiment had been raised to a high
pitch. Kālidāsa too has been criticised for the description
of the amorous dalliance between Umā and Saṅkara in his
Kumārasambhava. Even his Rativilāpa where there is a lengthy
description of Rāti's lamentations has not escaped criticism.
The ND, following the earlier rhetoricians, criticises the
Venī, for its love-scene between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī at
the time of war. The RTN too has been criticised for Ratnāvalī
being lost sight of at the advent of Bābhramyā in Act IV.

The authors of the ND hold original views on certain vital
topics such as, the number of Rasas, the nature of Rasas,
the number of Rūpakas, etc. It has been already pointed out
how the view that an actor also may experience Rasa may be
called as authors' own view. They do not believe in the
nineteen limbs of Pārvārṣiga calling them futile and meant
for deceiving the faithful innocent men. The ND does not believe
in the types of prologue but what Bharata, Dhanabījaya and others

1. ND, p. 174.
2. ND, p. 174.
3. ND, p. 175.
5. ND, p. 175.
6. ND admits of nine principal Rasas and believes that there
can be still more such as Jaulya, Sneha, Vyasana, Duṣkha
Sūkha, etc. (ND, p. 163).
consider as types are called "the ways of introducing the characters". The different sub-divisions of Vṛttis also do not seem to have been accepted by the ND.

**STYLE**

In the concluding verses the authors evaluate their work in these words:

"The labours that we have put in composing the work can never be appreciated by the 'literary thieves' who acquire fame by borrowing words and ideas that belong to others.

"The Sūtras and the Vṛtti are neither too brief nor too elaborate. The words used are just enough to convey the intended sense. Let the learned themselves judge them.

"Like the three-fold current of the Ganges our writing exhibits our proficiency in the three sciences, viz., Grammar, Logic and Poetics.

"If the learned desire to know the true nature of the Rūpakas they should resort to (lit. hold) this stainless

---

1. This point has not been discussed here as it has been elaborately treated in the course of textual study (chapter V.).
It is evident that the authors claim that—

(i) The Sūtras and the commentary upon them are neither too elaborate nor too brief. Words that are used are just enough to convey the intended sense.

(ii) The work reveals their proficiency in grammar, Logic and Poetics.

(iii) They have put in very hard labour in composing the work.

(iv) The work presents a clear and realistic picture of the nature and form of the Rūpakas.

Their first claim can very well be said to be justifiable. Our authors firmly believe in propriety (Aucitya) and have tried their best to maintain it throughout by making the full use of their power of judgment neither being so brief as to be obscure and incomprehensible nor being so elaborate as to be lengthy and verbose.


2. For the ND's views on Aucitya vide, Appendix D.
Their second claim is also equally justified. Their proficiency in poetics is beyond any shadow of doubt when we look at the masterly way in which the topics are treated. Their claim to the knowledge of grammar is also legitimate. Their knowledge of logic is suggested by their systematic representation, logical reasoning, and clarity of expression. That they were well-versed in logic is evident also from their Dravyālaṃkāra, a work on Jaina Nyāya.

Their next claim includes two things (i) originality, (ii) labour. As regards their originality we have already discussed how far they are original and how far they are indebted to their predecessors. The foregoing discussion shows that, in spite of the flashes of originality that they show on certain occasions it will not be correct to say that the authors are completely original specially in view of the fact that they have drawn so abundantly from their predecessors although it has been already pointed out that the subject does not admit of much originality. Hence the authors are not perfectly justified in claiming originality. But that they

1. This point is discussed at length later on.
2. The authors of the ND do not appear to claim perfect originality. What they claim is this: they have not simply reproduced the earlier authorities as some of the writers do but have fully digested and assimilated their views and then presented them in their own words.
have put in very hard labour in writing the work is quite evident. The great number of dramas (and poems) cited as illustrations and of theorists who have been mentioned directly by name or indirectly under the words 'Kecit', 'Anye', etc. and whose works they appear to have carefully studied, clearly suggest that they have taken sufficient pains to equip themselves with the knowledge of the earlier literature.  

Thus the above claim is partially justified.

The internal study of the text will undoubtedly convince the reader of the fact that the authors are fairly justified in their final claim. They have fully succeeded in representing a clear picture of the subject without being too brief or too elaborate. The style is as dignified as the subject itself.

The chief characteristics of the ND's style are simplicity of language and lucidity with which the topics are treated. In a work like this which deals with a dry, heavy and scientific subject the language too naturally assumes a similar form. The medium of expressing complex ideas also tends to be complex and the writer has to resort at times, to heavy and often clumsy constructions and a beginner cannot grasp the sense

1. Also Cf. ND, p. 23, verse 2.
without considerable effort on his part. Sometimes a writer indulges into a heavy style to exhibit his pedantry. But it must be pointed out to the credit of our authors that they have been uniformly simple. They do not believe in writing in a pompous, bombastic, and grandiloquent style. The exposition of all topics is as simple and lucid as it could ever be.

In order to make the treatment simpler the authors of the ND refrain from introducing new technical words which demand explanation and are likely to create confusion in the mind of a beginner, unless their knowledge is indispensable. Only such words as Sandhis, Avasthās, Rasa, Bhāva, Vṛtti, etc. which a student of rhetorics must be conversant with, being so commonly used by the other writers on dramaturgy. While many of the technical terms such as Arthaprakṛti, Arthopakṣepaka, Naṭyokti, Uparūpaka, etc. seem to be deliberately avoided, as the words themselves demand explanation for their proper understanding. At times, a simpler term is used in place of a technical one. Instead of Ādhikārika Vṛttā—the term which is mentioned by the NS as well as the DR—the ND says Mukhya Vṛttā which is extremely simple and the reader is saved the trouble of understanding the word Ādhikārika. Similarly words like Kathodghata and Pravṛttaka and Prayogātisaya which are the divisions of Prastāvana and which are mentioned by most of the writers on dramaturgy beginning from Bharata are scrupulously omitted by describing them as modes of introducing the main
This simplicity is the result of the fact that the authors have very clear notions about what they write. They have fully mastered the subject of dramaturgy having read all available literature on the subject including the actual dramatic compositions. Consequently nowhere do we find any confusion of thought, doubt or ambiguity in the statements.

One of the most pleasant features of the ND is the copious examples that the authors have quoted from a very wide range of Sanskrit works some of which are not extant. The total number of works quoted are over sixty and the aggregate number of illustrations quoted amounts up to three hundred. The authors of the ND seem to know it well that one example is apt to save ten lines of explanation. It is true that our authors have very often depended upon the Abhi. or the DR while quoting the examples, nevertheless on many occasions they have totally discarded the traditional illustrations and have offered different ones, very often from the works of Rāmacandra, one of the authors himself. Here we find the poetic genius combining with the critical faculty.

At places the authors give more illustrations than one in order to elucidate one single point, e.g., while discussing Vajra the ND has offered as many as four illustrations. Here also the first illustration is usually taken from some well-known work while the succeeding one from Rāmacandra's own work.
While discussing especially the limbs of Sandhi and those of Vithi the ND has quoted a number of illustrations. In this respect it appears to surpass any other work on dramaturgy including the DR.

Another commendable feature about the ND is that it gives very apt and charming analogies, in order to corroborate a point. These analogies are so natural and convincing that the writers are perfectly successful in bringing the point home to the reader, e.g., in order to establish that even an actor may also experience Rasa authors of the ND give a couple of analogies. A harlot, they state, while participating in amorous dalliance with a view to obtaining money may herself experience, at times, supreme delight. A songster too while trying to entertain others may himself be entertained on some occasions. How telling and apt these analogies are.

Where-ever possible the ND explains an abstract idea with concrete examples, e.g., trying to explain the states that we experience in literature which are of general nature the ND illustrates the point by the story of love between Rama and Sita. When we see Rama making love to Sita we understand Rama and Sita as man and woman and not as historical personages or as incarnations of Visnu and Laksmi respectively, as in that case it is impossible to be one with their sentiment.

1. ND, p. 160.
The ND also supplies us casually with epigrammatic generalisations, such as 'Sreyāsai bahuvighānāt bhavanti'; 'Great men being obstructed by impediments strive harder', 'A mango fruit with no juice even though ripe causes agitation', etc.¹

These lend poetic charm to this scientific work.

The authors of the ND seem to have a fascination for etymological explanation. Whenever and wherever an etymological explanation is possible they never let go the opportunity. Thus we find that all of the twelve Rūpakas have been etymologically explained. Similarly most of the Vithyaṅgas, Avasthā, Arthaprakṛtis, Sandhi, Abhinaya, Sandhyaṅgas, etc. have been etymologized², even though many of the etymologies can be easily traced to one source or the other.

Some of these etymologies appear to be novel and striking, e.g., the etymology of the word 'Vidūsaka' viz.; he particularly (vi) spoils (Dūs) the work such as Sandhi by Vigraha and vice versa, or he makes the hero forget separation (Vismāreyati) by entertaining him³.

¹ For more instances vide Appendix C of the thesis.
² For a detailed list of all the etymologies in the ND vide Appendix A of the thesis.
³ ND, p. 199.
The zeal and accuracy regarding etymology is expressly evident from the authors criticism of Abhinavagupta for deriving the word 'Nāṭaka' from the root 'Nāṭ.'

The authors of the ND have a similar fondness for grammar. They have studied grammar intensively and have perfect mastery over it. Very often when an etymology of a word is given they explain the grammatical formation of the same. They explain what Pratyaya has been applied, in what sense, and under what circumstances. They, at times, even quote the aphorisms of grammar, e.g., some of the Vṛttis and Brhadārāvās are grammatically explained. Here they seem to have usually followed the grammar of Hemacandra which is evident from the fact that, while explaining the grammatical formation of the word Vācika the authors have quoted the actual Sūtra from Hemacandra’s grammar. Similarly, while explaining the formation of Ārabhaṭī an aphorism is quoted. Thus the authors of the ND are fully justified when they claim that their work indicates their proficiency in grammar, logic and poetics (Here

1. Rāmacandra’s proficiency in grammar is also suggested by his commentary (Haima-bhadravṛttisīyāsa) on the grammar of Hemacandra.
2. Grammatical references in the ND have been dealt with in details in Appendix B.
3. ND p. 188.
4. What Vāmanācārya said about Mammaṭa, viz., ‘Ayam khalu mameṭo’ vagatāsvastraḥdrdayo ‘pi mukhyatāya vaiyaśkarapāḥ’ is equally applicable to our authors also.
the authors have put grammar first which may be significant and so as to reveal their high regard/reverence for the science of grammar.

So far as the Ḫarīkās are concerned the authors of the ND have maintained aphoristic brevity. In the Ḫarīkās they do not indulge into scholastic discussions, explanations, elucidations, etc. They record bare definitions very precisely and that is why they have succeeded in giving a complete treatment of the subject in only two hundred and seven Anuṣṭubh verses. Every word in a Ḫarīkā has been significantly and deliberately used after careful consideration and so cannot be overlooked. The authors bring out the special significance of particular words in the Ḫarīkās in their commentary¹.

The commentary, on the other hand, is written in the usual style. Here too simplicity is the guiding principle. No where have the authors of the ND made any attempt to exhibit their pedantry by entering into lengthy, elaborate, and scholastic discussions which are often found in other works of this type. The commentary is uniformly lucid. Usually the commentators take up every word from the Karikā and explain it. They take care to bring out the importance of significant words, as we have already seen, at the same time they do not waste

¹ For instance, Cf. the commentary over the first benedictory verse which carries two meanings.
The treatment of the subject as a whole is highly systematic. Topics are treated in their natural order one by one. The ND takes up only those topics which are vitally connected with the science of drama. If we examine the topics treated by the ND it will not be far to see that the writing of the authors is always to the point. There are no digressions or unnecessary discussions. The work is primarily meant to serve as a guide to a budding dramatist and hence only those topics have been included which chiefly concern a dramatist and hence topics like types of theatres, building of theatres, costumes, etc. which are treated at length by the NS of Bharata have been omitted by the ND.

Authors of the ND are also logical in their reasoning. Even when it would not be possible for us to agree with the line of thought that they present we cannot but appreciate the arguments that are put forward in support of their view. As for instance, how clearly, systematically and logically like an efficient pleader they have put forward the case of the dual nature of Rasa.

1. In selection of topics the ND may be said to have followed the DR.
Moreover, the authors never want us to accept anything blindly. They clearly explain the reasons wherever possible, e.g., a divine being should not figure as a hero in a Nāṭaka or a Prakarana. In fact, this is an ordinance from the earlier authorities like Bharata and has got to be followed and a writer need not explain why. Still however the authors of the ND try to account for the above rule in a rational manner. They also explain why the Nāṭaka should depict the life of a past king and not the contemporary one. Similarly, the absence of the Garbha and Vimaraṇa in Vyāyoga is also logically explained.

The instances cited above go to prove that our authors do not accept blindly nor do they expect others to accept their views blindly. They believe in logical reasoning.

The authors of the ND refrain from indulging into needless divisions and sub-divisions, which is typical of Sanskrit theorists. Some of the divisions are purely academic and have no concrete instances illustrating the

1. Cf. Devatānāṁ durupādasyaḥpyārthaśeṣoṣaḥmātrata eva
   siddhir iti taccaitamaṣaṣākyānustānātvat na martyānāṁ
   upadesāyogyam......ND, p. 27.
2. Cf. Vartamāne ca netari tatkalapradhāya rasahānib
   syāt, pūrvamahāpurasacariteṣu ca asraddhānām syāt.
   - ND, p. 27.
3. ND, p. 123.
particular type. This defect, if at all it be a defect, has been severely criticised by the western scholars. It is creditable to our authors that they do not show any special aptitude for such divisions. As far as possible they have done away with needless divisions and sub-divisions. Thus they do not enter into divisions of Prastavani or sub-divisions of each of the four Vyttis (Kalākī, Sātvatī, Arabhatī and Bhāratī), etc. Here they seem to strike a new note so far as all the theorists have reproduced the divisions and sub-divisions as given by Bharata.

Nevertheless our authors could not afford to keep away completely from such divisions as divisions also have an important place in the treatment of scientific subjects like this which requires an analytical study and thus our authors also give theoretical divisions following the earlier authorities. Thus the ND has given four varieties of Nāṭikā and twenty one varieties of Prakarana. But here the ND has simply followed its predecessors. But that the ND is not much interested in such divisions is also clear from the treatment of Āṅgika type of Abhinaya where the different types

1. Cf. A.B. Keith: "It is an essential defect of Indian theory in all its aspects that it tends to divisions which are needless and confusing." Samskrit Drama p. 329.
of movements of limbs are not even mentioned by name but are simply suggested by the word "and others". 

The authors of the ND have laid considerable stress on the importance of Rasa in drama. Rasa is the soul of drama and all literature. In the introductory verses they have warned the so-called poets who indulge simply in the play of words and are negligent about Rasa. A poem embellished with the figures of speech but devoid of Rasa does not please the heart like a woman well-ornamented but of ugly form. This suggests that the authors of the ND have truly grasped the finer spirit of literature. Another important principle on which our authors have put equal emphasis is that of Aucitya or Propriety. It is a principle which pervades all the aspects of life as well as literature.

On a critical study of the text of the ND it should be clear that the simple, lucid, and exhaustive way in which all the relevant topics regarding dramaturgy are discussed, the boldness with which the authors have put forward some of their

1. Cf. "There the movement of the head is of thirteen types such as Akampita, Kampita, etc; that of the eye is of thirty six types such as Kānta, Bhayānaka, etc." and so on. ND, Ep. 189-90.
2. ND III, 21.
3. For details see Appendix D.
views, the profuse illustrations quoted from a number of Sanskrit plays (some of which are Rāmacandra's own) clearly show the ND to be a work of considerable merit in spite of its indebtedness to its predecessors.

If we compare the ND with other works on dramaturgy we can easily perceive that the ND has a unique place among the works on dramaturgy. So far as the ND and the NS are concerned there is no doubt that like all other writers on dramaturgy, the authors of the ND also are highly indebted to this great work. Nevertheless the NS is a sort of encyclopaedia. It treats of all topics relating to drama. It includes many topics which do not directly concern a dramatist. A dramatist, for instance, is not much concerned with the construction of a theatre, the minute details about the religious ceremony called Purvaranga, the mythological origin of drama etc. Thus the sphere of the NS is too vast, as a result of which the treatment of the NS becomes rather diffuse.

Hence a work which is written strictly from the point of view of a playwright was a long-felt need. This need seems to have been first supplied by Dhanañjaya. His attempt/highly appreciated by the dramatists and critics and as a result the DR won very wide popularity. Still the DR had its own
limitations. Dhananjaya in his zest to be brief and pointed led the brevity to such an extent that he often became incomprehensible.

With a few exceptions the poeticians usually neglected this subject for the fear of their work being too lengthy and those also who treated it were too brief. Hemacandra, for instance, does treat of dramaturgy in his KS but the treatment is so brief and scanty that our authors were not satisfied with it. In fact, Hemacandra could not afford to give a very detailed treatment in his KS as the work primarily dealt with poetics.

The authors of the ND probably undertook composing their Nāṭyadarpana with a view to supplying the long-felt want and surpassing the Daśarūpaka of Dhananjaya which even with the help of the commentary Avaloka remains at places unintelligible and also supplementing the chapter on Dramaturgy of their preceptor Acārya Hemacandra.

There can be no two opinions about the fact that our authors have achieved commendable success in their effort. This work was the outcome of deep and extensive study\(^1\) of all the great works on dramaturgy and the actual dramas. "How can those writers", ask the authors of the ND, "who attain

\(^1\) ND p. 23.
reputation simply by transferring the words and ideas which really belong to others on their own name realise the pains which we have undertaken.\(^1\)

While comparing the ND and the DR it has been made clear as to how the former surpasses the latter from the point of view of style, treatment, etc. The clarity and simplicity of expression, and abundance of examples give the ND a positive superiority over the latter.

One of the great advantages which the authors of the ND had was that they had before them most of the important works in dramaturgy like the NS, the DR, the Abhi, the SP, etc. They were at liberty to make the fullest use of the learning and pedantry of their predecessors and they have not missed the opportunity to do so. They do not remain satisfied by pointing out their own view only but they mention the views of others under 'Anye' 'Kecit' etc. Thus the work is important also because it combines and preserves in itself the various views that were current in the days of our authors.

The ND is important from another point of view also. The ND has drawn illustrations from more than sixty plays, a majority of which still remains unpublished and several of

---

\(^1\) ND, p. 215.
these are known only by name only. Its references to the Devīcandragupta, the Svapna-vasavadatta and others are highly significant from the historical point of view. The ND therefore is of considerable service in bringing to light some of the plays which have almost sunk into oblivion. Dr. Raghavan therefore rightly expresses his sense of gratitude and admiration for the work (ND) which contains 'rich wealth of material'.

It will not be an exaggeration to state that some of the writers on dramaturgy as well as poetics have saved a number of literary compositions from being utterly lost for good, by citing some portion of them to illustrate certain points.

It is rather strange that some of the eminent modern scholars of high repute should have ignored the ND. Dr. Keith in his 'Sanskrit Drama' makes no mention of this work in his list of works dealing with dramaturgy. But this is probably

---

1. Social Play in Sanskrit, p. 12. Also Cf. M. Krishnamachariar, 'It (ND) is valuable in literary history for its quotations from various works of great merit, now lost to us'.— History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, p. 644.

2. For details about the references to other works refer to Appendix E of the Thesis.
due to the fact that the work was published a few years later
than the Sanskrit Drama and so naturally Keith had no
knowledge of the work. Dr. P.V. Kane casually refers to this
work in the 'Index of authors and works' to 'The History
of Sanskrit Poetics'. "The examples are more profuse than
Dāsarūpakāvaloka. Dilates upon 12 varieties of Rūpakas and
many Uparūpakas...... His references to Deviandragupta
are of great historical value". But apart from this we
get little information about this work. It is difficult
to understand how this learned and great authority on poetics
should have neglected this work which as we have seen is one
of the few important works which treat of dramaturgy alone.
Dr. Kane is not perfectly justified when he remarks, "The
Sāhityadarpana.. forms, together with the Nātyasāstra of
Bharata and the Dāsarūpa of Dhananājaya, a triumvirate in the
domain of the Sanskrit Drama" as he ignores here the
legitimate claims of the ND. We have already seen by the
comparative study how the ND surpasses the DR in several
respects. It naturally surpasses the SD in the treatment
of dramaturgy as the latter is primarily a work on
poetics and not independently a work on dramaturgy,
where too it hardly betrays any originality but has
mostly drawn upon the DR with Avaloka and the NS². So far

1. H.S.P., p. 401.
2. Cf. Keith-Sanskrit Drama, p. 294; also P.V. Kane-
   H.S.P., p. 292.
as a full and thorough treatment in a simple, lucid style with profuse illustrations is concerned, the ND does carry a palm of superiority over either of the two works.

The above discussion will show that the ND is a work of considerable merit in spite of its indebtedness to its predecessors. The graceful simplicity with which all the topics are treated deserves appreciation. The exhaustive and unbiased treatment of the various topics concerning dramaturgy makes it an important handbook for any budding playwright. The work is free from diffuseness and bewildering vastness that we find in the NS, as well as from the aphoristic brevity of the DR which often renders it unintelligible.

It did deserve an important place among the works dealing with dramaturgy. But unfortunately the work happened to be the composition of Jaina writers and the history of ancient India reveals that the non-brahmanical writers have not been much taken note of by the Brahmanical orthodox writers due to their sectarian prejudices.

In fact, the Jainas have rendered appreciable service to Sanskrit literature by contributing their best to the different branches of knowledge such as grammar, rhetorics, dramaturgy, vocabulary, metrics, erotics, art, architecture,
mathematics, medicine, politics, ethics, religion, etc.¹

Good many works have been written on the subject of poetics, viz., Kāvyāmīśāsana of Hemacandra, Vāgbhaṭālāmāṅkāra, Kāvyāmīśāsana, Alaṅkārāsthodadhī, Vāgbhaṭāśa Kāvyāmīśāsana, Alaṅkāracintāmaṇi, Vakroktiprakāśikā and many others. Jainas have also written commentaries on non-Jaina works on poetics.²

There must have been some attempts by the Jaina writers on the subject of dramaturgy also when they have written so much they on poetics but are not known still. The first and the foremost Jaina work found until now treating entirely and independently of the science of drama is the ND. No independent work on dramaturgy is found later also. Therefore the ND is certainly a unique contribution of the Jaina writers to the subject of dramaturgy.

1. For details vide Jaina Sanskrita Sahityano Itihāsa part-I. R.W. Frazer believes that Jainas had considerable effect on Dravidian literature of the south. He writes, "It was through the fostering care of the Jainas that the south first seems to have been inspired with new ideals, and its literature enriched with new forms of literature". Literary History of India, p. 310. Also vide Winternitz M.- A History of Indian Literature Vol. 2 p, 546.

2. The Jaina monks had a special advantage over others, viz., they had renounced the world and so they were free from the worries of life and consequently could devote their entire life to learning, reading and writing and thereby render yeoman's service to literature.
It is a matter of satisfaction that the ND has started
drawing the attention of the modern scholars. Dr. V. Raghavan
pays a glorious tribute to Rāmacandra when he states that we
are so thankful to him for the ND and the wealth of its
material. Prof. B.J. Sandesara also praises him as a
voluminous writer. Dr. Gupta pays a similar tribute for the
courage with which the authors have maintained their views
which were opposed to the well-established tradition. Prof.
D.R. Mankad has quoted very often the view of these authors
while discussing the types of Rūpakas and Uparūpakas in his
'The Types of Sanskrit Drama'.

Most of the modern scholars seem to have been attracted
by the ND on account of its peculiar views regarding the nature
of Rasa. Prof. K. Sahal has discussed the views of the ND
about the unpleasantness of the several Rasas. R. Gupta also
praises him for the same.

But the real contribution of the ND lies not only in the
glimpses of original thinking that we find here and there
but it is the simple, lucid, systematic and comprehensive
treatment of all the important and relevant topics concerning
dramaturgy which a dramatist must know that gives the work a
unique place among all the works dealing with the subject of
dramaturgy.

2. Psychological Studies in Rasa, p. 68.