Before we proceed to the chapter-wise study of the text of the ND it will not be out of place to give here a general introduction to the ND.

**The Early References to the ND:**

Aufrecht's catalogue refers to the work as Nātyadarpana. Peterson's report for the year 1892-95, on the other hand, mentions the work as Nāṭakadarpana.

There seem to have been more works than one with the same title as the quotations by the earlier commentators. From the Nātyadarpana are not found in the present work. Rāganātha, for instance, in his commentary on the Vikramorvaśīya quotes the authority of the Nātyadarpana with reference to the type of Nāndī in the Vikramorvaśīya but the quotation is not found in the ND. Similarly Bharatamallika in his commentary on the Bhaṭṭikāvya quotes the ND to describe Kāhala, a musical instrument, whereupon it can be inferred that there was a work with the title ND which treated of music also. Of course, the present work strictly confines itself to
Joint authorship is not a common phenomenon in the vast range of Sanskrit literature. There have been cases, of course not many, where an incomplete work is completed by the later persons but it is not so usual in ancient literature to come across two scholars jointly writing a work in spite of the fact that writing must have been a co-operative endeavour especially in the old days when the writing material was so scarce. The present ND is an outcome of such a joint effort.

It is difficult to comprehend what role Guṇacandra performed in writing this work. Still it appears that Rāmacandra had an upper hand in writing the ND and he must have sought the help of Guṇacandra in collecting the details about the various topics by carefully going through all the important critical literature that was available to them.

That Rāmacandra was proficient in the technique of Sanskrit drama is quite evident from the number of dramas that he has written. And so it is likely that Rāmacandra dominated in writing the work as it is also borne out by the fact that we find certain ideas or phrases in the ND to be

---

1. Prof. S.K. De refers to the above quotations from the ND and ascribes them to the ND of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra (H.S.P. Vol. I, pp. 308-9) but obviously he is mistaken.
very similar to those in some of the plays of Rāmacandra and that the authors of the Sūtra refer to the plays of Rāmacandra as Sūpakajās.

HĀTYADARPAŅA - ITS NATURE

The work Hātyadarpaṇa as the name suggests, treats of the science of drama. The title literally means "a mirror to the science of drama". The title is quite appropriate; just as a mirror gives a faithful and clear reflection of a particular object at hand, this work too reflects or sheds a flood of light on the science of drama. In a lucid and perspicuous style, the authors give a clear picture of the chief principles of dramaturgy, explaining the critical points and problems that naturally confound a novice.

The work consists of two parts: (i) Kārikās and (ii) Vṛtti in prose.

1. (a) पुरोपनातीताः केलाहृत कृतरिकौः।
    निष्कृतेकुंला तेन — — — —।
    प. 215, MM, I, 7

(b) सामन्यपौरी नाटकाविनिः। व्याख्याकरपृक्ष्ये मुख्याकालिनः करणा
    ये समस्याभितं विचारपूर्वके, न कपाल।
    MLV, p. 77.

रसाः पुरा: प्रभाः: — — — |
    ND, p. 175.

and
    नाथार्थंधन्येष्वे नारद्येष्वे नारायणां
    विद्यांसतु वर्णिन्याख्येतिः न गुः कपाल।
    MLV, p. 22, verse 6.

(c) न तथा ज्त्वैविनिः (नाथार्थंधन्येष्वे)
    नारायणाः (नाथार्थंधन्येष्वे) यथा सुः।
    विपचाककृतमभायम्
    मुख्यायामिति औरस्म।।
    MLV, p. 77, ND, p. 171.
(i) Karikās are in the form of Sūtras in Anuṣṭubh metre which give an outline of all the topics to be treated in the work and define the important principles in a nut-shell. There are 207 Karikās in all.

The Karikās are divided into four chapters. Each chapter is called 'Viveka'. The first is called Nāṭaka-nirṇaya, treating in full details the nature and form of Nāṭaka, one of the most important forms of drama or Rūpokos. It also enumerates and defines Nāṭaka, plot (vastu), five Avasthās (Āraṁbha, Yatna, Prāptyāśā, Niyatāśā and Phalāgama), five Arthapraṇātyas (Bīja, Bīdā, etc. ), five Sandhis (Mukha, Pratimukha, Gartha, Avamarṣa and Nirvahana ), five Arthopakṣeṇakas and 64 Sandhyaṅgas and with their treatment the chapter ends.

The second chapter discusses the form and nature of the remaining eleven types of dramas beginning with Prakaraṇa. The remaining types of dramas are Nāṭikā, Prakaraṇi, Vyāyoga, Samavakāra, Bhāna, Prahasana, Dima, Uṣṭamkā, Īhāmṛga and Vīthī. The chapter is consequently named as Prakaraṇa-dyeśodaśarūpenirṇaya i.e., the discussion and establishing of the eleven forms of drama - Prakaraṇa and others.

The third chapter is named Vyrtti - Rasa - Bhāvābhinaṇaya - Vicāra i.e., consideration of styles, sentiments, states and Gesticulation. First, the authors describe four vyrttis - Bhāratī, Sātvatī, Kaisikī and Ārabhatī. Then they define and explain Rasa and Anubhāvas. They also explain how contradictory sentiments can be accommodated and point out
the defects in Rasas. Then they explain the dominant states and the Resultant States.

The fourth chapter is named Sarva-rūpakāśadhāreṇaḷaṅkṣaṇa - nirṇaya. It is a sort of miscellany. It deals with general topics whose knowledge is useful while writing any type of play. It treats of all such topics as are common to all the twelve forms of drama. It treats of Ēṇḍī and Dhruvā first. Then follows the discussion of characters - males as well as females - and there are three grades of the characters, viz., upper, middle and lower. The authors of the ND enumerate the qualities of the hero. Then they give different types of heroines on the basis of their age, particular state of mind, etc. Then follows the enumeration of the qualities of a heroine. Then rules regarding the use of language (dialects) and modes of address for different characters are set forth.

Vṛtti or commentary (gloss) on these Kārikās forms the most important part of the work. In Kārikās we find the principles treated in a very brief manner, which are fully explained and illustrated in a very lucid manner in the Vṛtti. The greatness of the work lies not in the Kārikās which are mere reproductions of the earlier theorists like Bharata who have already defined and explained the above topics, but in the lucid and sufficiently exhaustive commentary. Here while explaining a point they also mention the views of other theorists in an impartial manner. They sometimes criticise them if they find them to be defective.
Out of all the four Vivekas, the commentary on the first is the largest and constitutes almost half of the whole text. More than half of this chapter is occupied by the Sandhyāṅgas.

The authors supply the commentary with profuse illustrations. The illustrations are meant to bring the abstract point home to the reader. They are borrowed from different authors, sometimes picked up from the earlier works on rhetorics, like Abhinavabharatl, Daśerūpaka etc.

At many places the authors give illustrations from Rāmacandra's own literary works, especially plays. Rāmacandra, over and above being a writer on dramaturgy, is a good poet and a competent dramatist. It is but natural that he cites illustrations from his own works which would go to make his works well-known and give the work an air of originality.¹

A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE ND:

The chapter is named Nātakanirṇaya as it chiefly concerns itself with the complete discussion of Nātaka, the first and the foremost of the twelve Rūpakas.

¹. In this respect Rāmacandra may be well compared with Jagannātha who also illustrates from his own works, being himself a great poet as well as a critic (of course the ND illustrates from other works also while Jagannātha does not).
The chapter begins with introductory verses. First verse is a sort of benedictory verse and is the same as the first one in Kārikās and the authors later on point out that the repetition of the verse in the Vṛtti is to denote that the authors of the Kārikās and the Vṛtti are the same. The verse praises the speech of the Jinas, which accomplishes the fourfold aim of human life and which controls the law permeating the universe in twelve forms.

Verse 2 proclaims the object of the work viz., to expound the natural characteristics of a drama, which are described after having studied so many plays written by great poets of the past and their own works.

Verse 3 points out the superiority of the drama to the other forms of literature such as Kathā, Ākhyāyikā etc. The path of Kathā is easy to tread being soft and smooth on account of figures of speech, while the path of drama is difficult to tread being full of manifold waves in the form of sentiments. The authors here seem to point out that the essence of drama is sentiment whose depiction requires a great skill on the part of the poet, while Kathās and such other forms of Sravya Kāvya are concerned with mere narration which is to be decorated by literary excellences such as figures which is comparatively easy to write.

1. cf. ND, p. 25, lines 14-15. Vs. 3 seems to echo the popular maxim
Kāvyesu nāyakam ramyam.
Verse 4 describes the qualities essential for a person who wants either to enact or compose dramas. A dramatist must be well-versed in songs, music and dancing - three of the most important elements of drama. He must also have studied the ways of the world. The persons who are devoid of these qualities can never produce great works.

(Verse 5) - He is a true poet who by his piece makes even mortal beings enjoyers of nectar.

Verses 6 and 7 bring out the importance of Rasa in Kāvya. However learned a man may be he cannot be a great poet unless he is successful in creating Rasa. "Those learned ones who are indifferent to nectar-like Rasa out of greed for striking words and meanings never deserve the title of great poets". Though possessed of figures like Pun and others, if not possessed of the Rasas that are charming, the language does not please our mind just as a lady ugly in form though with her person adorned by ornaments cannot please or attract the mind.

1. Even our great poet Kālidāsa in his Nīlāvīkāgnimitra recognizes the importance of this musical element in a drama and points out that this drama is divided into two-lāsya and Tāṇḍava-by Lord Ĵaṅkara. cf. Śāl. I, 4.

2. "Drama is imitation of life." Literature in general mirrorises life! So it is absolutely essential that the poet should know the ways of the world.

5. MD, I, p. 23 verse 6.
Verse 8 is in praise of Aucitya or propriety. A person desirous of being a poet but having no knowledge of propriety becomes a laughing stock of the wise irrespective of his being a penniless pauper or a wealthy monarch.

Then the authors praise the poetic talents in the subsequent four verses. Poetic talent is the soul of all lores and learning like charmingness of ladies. Even the knowers of all the three lores\(^1\) always aspire for it.\(^2\) Two things are always odious to an appreciative person — absence of breasts in the case of a lovely damsel and absence of poetry in the case of a learned man.\(^3\) Absence of poetic talent is a great blot for the learned. But to be a poet by plagiarising the works of others is the climax of infamy.\(^4\)

Finally the authors state that those who are devoid of poetic talents and still try to please the world are trying to climb a mountain having shut the two eyes.\(^5\)

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS:

These introductory verses are rather significant in the sense that they reveal our authors' attitude towards the essence of Poetry. The first verse which is in praise of the

---

1. The three lores according to the Jainas is Grammar, logic and literature.
3. ND, p. 24, verse 10.
4. ND, p. 24, verse 11.
5. ND, p. 24, Verse 12.
Jainī Vāk and is taken from the Ṛārikā shows their devotion to Jainism. This verse is explained at great length by the authors themselves.¹

The second verse points out that the authors have studied many dramas of the great poets and have themselves written some. It is on basic of a perusal of these great works of the great poets that the authors describe Nāṭya. Here the debt to great writers of the past is acknowledged. That the authors have gone through a number of works - almost all the prominent works of the day - is also evident from the numerous references to and quotations from the various sources. The authors seem to be well conversant with these.

Over and above these works Rāmacandra has contributed some good plays of his own to Sanskrit literature from which he quotes at a number of places. (But the verb Vivṛmahe is in dual, which would go to suggest that both must have written independent plays.) But we do not come across any plays of Guṇacandra. Even in our own work all the quotations under 'Svopajña' are the compositions of Rāmacandra only and it is quite likely that Guṇacandra who was rather of sobre nature did not write any independent play at all. The verb in dual appears only to point out the joint authorship.

1. Read MD, pp. 24-25 - The verse has been discussed in this chapter later.
It is really strange that the authors here refer to plays only and not to other works on poetics and dramaturgy like the NS of Bharata, the DR of Dhanañjaya, the Abhî, the KP of Mammaṭa, etc. despite the fact that they have amply drawn upon some of them. It would have been in fitness of things if our authors had expressed their indebtedness to their predecessors upon whom they have drawn. The DR in utmost modesty states - Who can give now definitions of the types of plays? I merely state briefly or summarise what has been already said.¹

Verse 3 points to the difference between Drama (Nāṭya) and Kathā etc. Here the superiority of Nāṭya is shown to other forms of literature. Nāṭya is chiefly concerned with the development of Rasa while Kathā etc. are concerned with poetic narration made striking by various figures of word and sense. The authors are not unjustified in holding this view. If we look at the celebrated Kathās, Akhyāyikās, Cāmpūs like Kādambarī, Harṣacarita, Daśakumāracarita, etc., we shall at once find that the authors have been far carried away in showing off their pedantry in the form of poetic fancies and figures so much so that the natural flow of the story is considerably hampered and lost sight of. The author goes on describing a particular thing sitting on the wings of fancy and imagination in great details leaving the plot to take care of itself.

¹ Cf. DR I, 4 od.
This type of description has little scope in a drama. In drama the plot should not overshadow the sentiment. Of course, there are many other points in which the two differ. The very treatment or handling of the plot, the style, the language, etc., of a drama are totally different from those of other types of literature. Here the characters are delineated through their speeches and actions and the play-wright aims at developing a particular Rasa by means of these characters especially the hero and the heroine, situations, speeches, gestures etc.  

Thus the essential difference between drama and other forms of literature is that in drama it is the sentiment that predominates while in the latter the poetic descriptions.

In verse 4 the authors point out the essential requirements of a person who wants to write a drama or stage it. Firstly he must be well-versed in the science of singing, music and dancing. All these three known as Samgita form a very essential feature of a drama. A playwright should know this well as music etc. is a means of esstatic delight which is the chief purpose of a drama.

---

1. Vibhavabhavavyabhicarisamyogad vasanispattih - Ms VI.  
2. Gitam nrtyam ca vadyam ca catrayam samgitamucyate.  
3. Cf. KP I, 4 "Sadyah paranirvastaye."
Drama is called "the imitation of life." So a poet depicts life in a drama and that is why it touches our heart. The poet takes instances, situations and characters from life. So it is very necessary that he should be conversant with the ways of the world.¹

Even the actor should have this knowledge. If he does not know singing, music, etc., he cannot stage. His gesticulation or acting too will be imperfect if he has not observed the actual ways of the world. He cannot faithfully reproduce what the poet wants to convey.

Verse 5 tells us as to who can be called a true poet.

Verses 6 and 7 are in praise of Rasa. According to the Sanskrit rhetoricians, Rasa is the most important element in literature, Kāvya or any literary piece has to develop Rasa, fulfilment of which is its ultimate aim.

Here in verse 6 there is a warning for the learned poets who are so much after the figures of word and sense. This has been the weak point of many Sanskrit writers, excepting a few like Bhāsa and Kālidāsa. Later writers of post-Kālidāsan age lacking in high poetic qualities have neglected this lucidity, simplicity and natural flow of style and sacrificed Rasa, being chiefly interested

---

¹ That a poet should study or observe the ways of the world is stated in almost all works on Rhetorics:

cf. NS (KM), I, 116; KLV, 4; KDJ, 103; KP I, 3 pp, 11-13.
in high poetic fancies, verbal jugglaries, figures of words and sense — and thus rendering the style most artificial and their narration as well as description far from realistic.

Rasa is nectar. The enjoyment of this Rasa gives such aesthetic pleasure that it is compared to the joy which the great sages feel at the time of meditation upon supreme reality viz. Brahman (Brahmānandasaḥodara).

The ND strictly warns such poets as are interested merely in the strikingness of word and sense that they never deserve to be called great poets. The ND boldly and emphatically asserts that dry pedants concentrating on jugglery of words and sense can never be great poets.

If these sentiments (Rasas) are unagreeable/harsh, being full of figures like pun etc., they do not please the mind like ugly ladies. In order that a lady may please the mind she should be beautiful; her complexion should be charming. External ornaments may decorate her when properly put on, but they are not all in all. Their position is subsidiary. They can decorate only when the body is charming and a charming personality will attract even without these external means¹. This actually is the place of figures in poetry.

¹. Cf. Śāk.Kim-iva hi madhurāṇāṃ maṇḍarāṃ nākṛtīnām (I.19)
What is the real place of figures of speech in poetry has been a point of hot discussion. Bhāmaha defines poetry as word and sense which should be faultless and possessed of figures. Māmmata believes that figures of speech are necessary yet he condemns a piece (Kāvya) which has merely figures and no charming suggested sense as the lowest form of literature. The same idea of Māmmata is echoed here in different words. The authors of the ND do not condemn the figures but they give more prominence to Rasa which is the soul of Poetry.

Figures have got their own importance. Poetry is not mere thought. It is "an expression of beautiful thought in beautiful words." The poet always expresses himself in a striking mode deviating from the ordinary mode of speaking in order to create poetic charm. This he does by using figures. Such figures can hardly be considered as "Bahiranga" in Kāvya and cannot be compared to ornaments like bracelets, armlets and the like which can be very easily removed. They are not external, says as they are responsible for producing or rather suggesting Rasa.

1. KL. I, II-16.
2. Cf. the definition of Poetry given by Māmmata and his commentary on it viz. Sarvatra sālāmārāt etc; and also Sabdacitram vācyacitraṁ avyāṅgayam travarām smṛtam - Kp I, 5.
So they ought to be compared to the natural Alamkāras of damsels which Bharata speaks of under the Sāmānya abhinaya, viz. Dhāva, Hava etc. But then they should come naturally. One should not feel that there is a deliberate effort on the part of the poet to introduce a figure when it is not necessary.

But some writers go too far in their greed for figures and lose the sense of propriety. To these young artists, our authors sound a note of warning.

Dr. Raghavan in his treatment of use and abuse of Alamkāra in Sanskrit refers to a line from the Nalavilāsa-nātaka of Rāmacandra where Rāmacandra through the speech of Saparna, the minister of Dadhiparṇa, vehemently points out that those who neglect Rasa even in stageable works (i.e. dramas) being engrossed in showing off their learning by strikingness of words and sense merely, are pedants but not poets. A variety of Vyrtta is not so agreeable in a play as Rasa is just as a mango though ripe if devoid of juice does not please one's heart. The stanza, under consideration, as it occurs in a work on dramaturgy, reinforces Dr. Raghavan's statement regarding Rāmacandra's view in the matter.

1. Aprthagyatnanirvartya-Dhvanyāloka, II 17.
2. This finds a parallel in Dhvanyāloka (i) II, 18; (ii)p.148.
3. NLv VI p. 77.
In this connection viz. the place of figures in a drama, the ND brings out the principle of propriety. Those, whoever they may be, from a prince to a pauper, who do not have the sense of propriety will be ridiculed by the learned. Here the ND refers to a very important principle of Kāvya. Starting from Bharata all have recognised this principle of propriety. Bharata the earliest exponent of Sanskrit drama, defines drama as imitation of the ways of the world, or representation of action of men of different natures such as Bhīrūdāṭta, etc. Thus when drama is a reflection of life, it should represent it in true and appropriate colours. Ornaments or decoration, increase the charm only when put at the right places. Improper placing like putting a necklace at the foot and anklet round the neck will tend to produce laughter. What is true of gold ornaments is equally true of literary ornaments i.e. figures of speech which too should occur at the right time and right place. Moreover, mere ornaments cannot decorate an ugly lady. Physical beauty too is essential. Even in poetry therefore Rasa which pervades the whole of the composition like the beauty in a woman, pervading the whole of her person lends true charm.

5. Dhvenyāloka I, 4.
The idea of propriety (Aucitya) seems to have developed gradually, and seems to have very early origin. The origin and development of Aucitya is brilliantly and in a masterly manner set forth by Dr. Raghavan in his article on "The History of Aucitya in Sanskrit poetics."

The next group of verses beginning from 9 to 12 is in praise of 'Kavitva' or poetic talents. To cultivate poetic talents is the chief purpose of learning and lores. Kavitva is the soul of all learning, just as beauty is for damsels. And that is why even the knowers of the three lores consciously try to achieve it. Two things sound very ominous to one who can appreciate Rasa, viz., lack of breasts for a dear-eyed one (lady) and lack of poetry i.e. poetic talents in a learned one.

The authors in these two verses point out the necessity of poetic talents for a learned man. Kavitva is to man what beauty or physical charm is to woman. This comparison reminds us of Anandavardhana who too compares the poetic suggestion to the beauty in young women. Thus poetic talents seem to the ND to be the culmination of all learning. Here the ND seems to echo the view of Bhāmāka who remarks, "What use is the proficiency in speech without good poetry?"

It appears that there were persons who believed that writing poetry was the ultimate aim of all learning. Rāmacandra is

2. ND verse No. 10.
one of those. But in fact, a learned man—a well-read person—may not necessarily be a good poet. Poets, they say, are born, not made. For composing poetry one requires poetic talents or Pratibhā to use the technical word, without which no poetry can ever be written and even if written will be highly ludicrous.¹

But this Kavitva is primarily an innate quality—a mental impression.² It is a part and parcel of one's inborn nature. It cannot be created as the charming grace in youthful damsels. Beauty in women is natural which does not depend upon any polish or outward embellishments.³ Ornaments and polish add to the beauty but cannot produce it. A lady who is physically ugly will not attract an appreciative man though she may be loaded with ornaments.

Kavitva is also an inborn natural gift of god. Learning and education may go to develop that quality but cannot create it. A learned literary man can be a good critic but not necessarily a good poet. The root of poetic composition is that extraordinary Pratibhā which is so natural to the great poets.⁴

But there has been a variety of opinions regarding what actually is the cause of poetic composition—Pratibhā or Vyutpatti (knowledge). Ānandavardhana attributes greater

---

1. KP I. 3 Commentary.
2. KP—Samskāravīśeṣāḥ (p.11)
importance to Pratibhā. He says 'The fault of a poet arising out of lack of knowledge is not noticed being concealed by Pratibhā, while the fault arising out of lack of the poetic talents is revealed instantaneously.' Some believe in knowledge and our authors indirectly seem to share this view as they believe that every learned man must be a good poet. How far the ND is justified here is left to the discretion of the learned critics. But probably the authors mean to advise the learned people to write poetry, as the ND thinks that a lack of poetic talents is a blot on a well-read person. One must start writing as there are no means of recognising whether or not a person has the talents. In this connection the view of Bāṇḍin deserve to be noted. Even though he believes in a synthesis of natural genius, learning and practice, he states - "Even if a person may not be having that firm association of ideas or surprising genius due to merit, yet constant practice and learning will surely produce some good results." (Lit. Goddess Sarasvatī constantly worshipped will show favour unto him). Our authors have this practical view, in mind when they insist on poetic composition for a learned man. The reason too is obvious. Poetic composition is the real means of acquiring public love and permanent fame. "Those who are devoid of poetic talents and still try to gratify the world climb the mountain having closed their eyes," meaning thereby that to

2. Kāvyādārśa I 104.
3. ND p. 24 verse 12,
gratify the people without poetic ability is as difficult as climbing a mountain with closed eyes.

In the second half of the verse No. 11 the ND gives a warning note against plagiarism. This craze of winning popularity and fame is likely to lead a man of inferior calibre to write even by plagiarising from the works of other learned poets like Kālidāsa, Bāna and others. But to be a poet one must possess the power of original thinking. Not to write is bad but to write having plagiarised from other poems is the "Climax of infamy". The authors of the ND seem to echo here Bhāmaha who states: "Not being a poet does not conduce to sin, sickness or punishment; but being a bad poet (Kukavi) is directly tantamount to death." Plagiarism seems to have been a social disease from time to time and so we find many a critic condemning it. This problem has been exhaustively and ably treated by Rājasēkhara in his Kāvyamīmāṃsā.

The work opens with a benedictory verse, in accordance with the general tradition that every work should commence with a benedictory verse in praise of the favourite deity of the poet so that the deity may confer blessings on the writer as well as the reader and dispel evils and obstacles on the path of completion of the work.

1. ND p. 24, verse 11 cd.
2. Kāvyālaṅkāra I, 12.
3. ND I, 1, Page 24.
The authors are commenting here on the benedictory verse with the Kārikā section opens. It was not unusual in ancient Indian writers to write Kārikā and Vṛttī (i.e. commentary) over it themselves i.e. one and the same author writes the work (i.e. Kārikā) and the commentary over it. The authors of the ND are writers not only of the commentary but of the Kārikās also.

The ND first points out the purpose or object of giving a benedictory verse. The purpose is two-fold:

(i) To maintain the tradition formed by the refined persons.
(ii) Removal of a multitude of obstacles.

The deity propitiated here is the 'speech of the Jinas'. The authors call it to be the fit and favourite deity. The propitiation of speech in the beginning of such a work is quite common. We find speech praised in many works on rhetorics.1 Speech being the presiding deity over all literature, is the fittest goddess for a work on poetics. The praise of 'speech' indirectly implies the praise of the whole work - the language and its meaning.

But the authors here propitiate not merely Vāk or speech but Jainī vāk i.e. speech of the Jinas or Tīrthankaras. "We perpetually propitiate the speech of the Jinas, which results in the attainment of the four-fold object of human life and which holds the universe in the righteous path having permeated it by twelve forms."2

2. ND I, 1.
The authors in their commentary give a double interpretation of this verse:

1. To the religious followers the meaning will be as clear as broad day-light. Jainī Vāk, as they know, is the real origin of all literature. Whatever was proclaimed by the Jinas, the same matter has been explained and expanded with suitable changes and modifications by the later writers—the chief of Lord Mahāvīra disciples (Gaṇadharas), or sages.¹

'Ṛupa' in this context means the twelve Āṅgas of the Jaina canonical literature. They are the most important religious works of the Jainas and so are called the very limbs of Jaina literature. They serve as a foundation for the huge edifice of later literature—religious or secular. It is due to these texts beginning with Ācārāṅga and ending in Drṣṭivāda and which preach non-violence, charity, etc., that the whole universe is united with the just or righteous path.²

2. The above was a religious interpretation. But the verse is equally applicable to the dramatic art which forms the subject matter at hand.

---

1. Cf. Attham bhāsāi arahā suṭṭam ganthanti gaṇaharā niṃpaṭāvāyaka, 68
2. ND I, 1 cd.
The Jaini Vāk can be taken as the speech of the Jinas i.e. self-controlled or unbiased persons. Verily indeed it is an unbiased mind that can create give universal definitions. To make a definition the first quality essential is an unbiased clear mind free from one-sided notions. So the authors praise the speech of the great sages like Bharata. Twelve rūpas are the twelve types of plays (Rūpa or Rūpaka) in which the whole of the dramatic literature is divided into.

The aim of literature is, as our authors have pointed out, the attainment of fourfold objects of human life viz., Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. The dramatists obviously have the above four in mind. For instance, the hero is depicted to be struggling for material prosperity (Artha) or fulfilment of love (Kāma) or at times for moral or spiritual gain (Dharma). Even when direct spiritual object is not seen the poets indirectly suggest it by delineating

1. Cf. DR I. 76 with ND p. 25 line 8.
2. Cf. Caturvargaphaṇām - ND I,1. Here the ND seems to have followed Bhāmaha (Cf. Dharmaṛthakāmamokṣaṇa-KL I.2) and disagrees with Dhanika who quotes view of Bhāmaha, criticizes it and establishes Pasa alone as the fruit of literature (Cf. DR : Avaloka on I.6).
the victory of virtuous characters such as Rāma and the
disaster of vicious characters such as Rāvaṇa, which ultimately
suggests that one should behave like Rāma and not like
Rāvaṇa. (It will be clear on perusal of dramatic literature
that the method of preaching of the poet is quite different
from the method of religious preachers. The writer does
not give sermons like a priest but creates characters and
situations from our daily life and thus indirectly suggests
the ultimate purpose.)

Mokṣa i.e. spiritual freedom or beatitude can also
be included in the purpose as it is the final aim of Dharma
and even of human life. According to Hindu ideology
sumnum bonum of human life is salvation or Mokṣa - freedom
from the cycle of birth and death. The practice of Dharma
ultimately conduces to Mokṣa. So Mokṣa can be called the
purpose of a play¹, even though it is difficult to find
dramas which directly aim at Mokṣa.

The ND emphasises that the dramas must aim at the
attainment of the above fourfold object of human life.²

---

¹ Cf. ND p. 25 Lines 1-2.
² MD. p. 25, line 3.
CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS:

In praising the 'Jainī Vāk' in the verse of benediction the authors have strictly followed their religious preceptor Hemacandra who too in the beginning of his KS invokes the 'Jainī Vāk'. Though Hemacandra takes the word in a purely religious sense the ND goes a step further and interprets it doubly as the speech of the self-controlled sages such as Bharata and others.

The verse establishes the total number of Rūpakas as twelve. In recognizing the number twelve the authors of the ND have followed their preceptor Hemacandra. But here they have attributed religious significance to the number twelve by associating it with the total number of their principal Āgama scriptures (Āngas). The idea of attributing religious significance to the number must have been suggested to our authors by Dhanañjaya who associates the number ten of the Rūpakas with the ten incarnations of Lord Viṣṇu (DR.I.2).

1. It should be pointed out here that ND's attitude is purely religious. While propounding fourfold object of human life as the purpose of drama Rāmacandra has ignored here the most important aspect of it viz., the aesthetic aspect. The purpose of literature is the instantaneous highest bliss or aesthetic delight - Sadyāḥparanirvṛtti in the words of Mammeṭa. Dharma or preaching may be there but should be indirect, subordinate to joy. In fact good poetry without moral is superior to bad poetry with moral.
The drama culminates in the attainment of some fruit Dharma, Artha, Kāma or Mokṣa. Usually the drama culminates in fulfilment of love (Kāma).

The authors of the ND seem to believe that literature should convey some moral. Thus they stand not for 'Art for Art's sake but 'Art for morality'. True art can never be immoral. It is a dubious problem as to what is the place of morality in literature. It is true that the work of a poet is different from that of a preacher. Even if a poet preaches, he does it indirectly through suggestion. The advice given is like that of a loving wife who makes her husband do what she likes in such a way that the latter is all the while feeling that it is his will that dominates. Authors of the ND seem to differ slightly from the other rhetoricians like Mammaṭa and others who consider aesthetic delight as the principal aim of literature and uphold that "Preach it may, please it must."
Now the subject under discussion is a particular form of Poetry which can be represented on the stage, i.e., a drama or dramatic composition, in accompaniment with its different aspects such as sentiment, state, hero, heroine etc.

The authors reserve their right as to what they should define and what they should not. The field of discussion being too vast the authors will discuss only those things in which they believe and accordingly they do not define Sāttaka etc., which are defined by Kohala.

1. Kohala has been mentioned by the NS as one of the hundred sons of Bharata (NS (KM) I,26.) Even in the concluding chapter Bharata brings out that the rest will be discussed by Kohala." (NS (KM)XXXVI,18).

Kohala has been associated with dramaturgy, especially with music and dance. Kallinātha in his commentary on Sangītaratnākara gives very long quotations from Kohala. He is recognised to be the author of 'Tālādhya.'

Mārkaṇḍeya in his Prakrit Grammar refers to him along with Sākalya, Bharata and others. Thus his name is associated with Prakrit also and so he is said to have defined Sāttaka (which is totally in Prakrit) also.

There is a mention of a work called Dattila-kohaliya which is supposed to include the lectures delivered by Kohala to Dattila. Abhinava refers to him as an actor.

Even before Bharata and others there was a bewildering mass of theoretical details about various aspects of drama and their task was to collect and compile rather than create.
Again the things to be defined here are already well-known being defined by ancient sages (like Bharata) and accepted by the successors. The opponent may ask then as to what is the purpose in writing whatever has been already written. The authors retort that though the matter is old, their method is not old. They do not propose to repeat or echo verbatim whatever is already written. Their intention is to put the same thing in a new form with various modifications such as elucidating what is difficult and curtailing what is unimportant.

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS:

The authors of the ND are very clear in the assertion of their motive. They know their limitations. The subject of dramaturgy has been so thoroughly treated in all possible aspects by Bharata and others that there can be little scope for a new writer to contribute anything which can be called purely original. Nor does the ND claim it. The work of the ND is therefore to put the old thing in a new light. The ND is so voluminous and consists of many things which are not necessary for a dramatist to know. It treats with such topics such as theatre-building which are not important for a young dramatist. At the same time it is also quite likely that some points might have been treated very briefly by the earlier writers. Take for instance, the DR whose treatment at times is so brief that it becomes almost unintelligible. The work of the ND is to examine these works and present a lucid study elucidating some points or curtailing them as necessity demands.
THE NUMBER OF RŪPAKAS:

THE M3 enumerates the types of Rūpakas to be defined. They are twelve in number: 1) Nāṭaka, 2) Prakaraṇa, 3) Nāṭikā, 4) Prakaraṇiṇī, 5) Vṛṣyoga, 6) Samavakāra, 7) Bhāṣa, 8) Prahasana, 9) Dīma, 10) Anka or Uṣṭhitikāṇka 11) Ihamṛga and 12) Viṭṭhi.

Out of these twelve, Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa are principal, as they delineate the life of a great man, which is so illuminating, and wherein all the four ends of human life are found fulfilled. First four of the above twelve Rūpakas are possessed of all the five Sāmādhis and are fit for introducing Viskambhaṇaka and Praveśaka. The characters are high and elevated. They can have all the four Viṛtis some one as principal and others as subordinate. The remaining eight (nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) have one or more of the three Viṛtis excluding Kaiśikī. In Vyāyoga, Samavakāra, Ihamṛga and Dīma there is no one specified Viṛti as principal while Bhāṣa, Prahasana, Anka and Viṭṭhi, have a specific Viṛti as principal. In the former case, any can be made principal according to the sweet will of the author and the rest subordinate if at all they are to be used. In the latter case one is principal; the others, if at all to be employed, are to be given a subordinate position. Kaiśikī is totally prohibited here.

2. Cf. NS XVIII 9 ab. Here ND has strictly followed NS.
3. BR differs here. It points out that the Viṛti in Viṭṭhi is Kaiśikī, while in Samavakāra Kaiśikī is there but in a subordinate manner. The ND has strictly followed the NS here.
In Samavakāra, amorous sentiment is present but not the Kaiśikī.¹ The ND explains that Srūgāra as a sentiment does not imply simply passion. It requires the high development of amour (Vilāsa)². This cannot be depicted in characters of furious temperament which is the case in Samavakāra. Thus there can be no Kaiśikī in Samavakāra.

The ND here differs from the general view. It has made bold to introduce two new forms of drama into the celebrated group of ten recognised by almost all Sanskrit writers on dramaturgy. Bharata, the highest and the oldest extant authority on dramaturgy speaks of ten types of Rūpaka, although he mentions Nāṭikā and defines it. The DR also speaks of ten Rūpakas which form the subject matter of the work.

The suggestion of twelve forms seems to be suggested to authors of the ND by Hemacandra, their preceptor, who in his KS refers to the number as twelve by adding Nāṭikā and Saṭṭaka to the list of ten.³ The ND substitutes Saṭṭaka by

---

¹ Cf. Abhi.II, p. 411, lines 2–3 where he points out that Kaiśikī is not there in Samavakāra.

² This view of ND is also corroborated by the etymological meaning of Srūgāra which is explained as Srūgēma Kāmaśya parām kāśṭhā ni rochati (gacchati) iti Srūgēraḥ, which denotes high development of love. The SD interprets the word Srūga as "springing of love or sexual desire" (III, 183).

Prakaranika. 1 The idea of recognising twelve as the number of \( \text{Rūpakas} \) might have been suggested to the authors of the ND, as we have already stated, by the DR where the number 'ten' is associated with the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu. This religious reference must have led these Jainas to find out a number suited to their religion and they came to twelve which is the number of their principal canonical texts known as Ṭūgas. Still, however, it would not be correct to say that the Jainas were the first to recognize the total number of \( \text{Rūpakas} \) as twelve. Originally Bharata seems to have suggested this by adding "Nātisamjñā-śārita Kāvya." 2 Dhanika also refers to Nāṭika and Prakaranika in the commentary. 3 The SP clearly accepts the number of the \( \text{Rūpakas} \) as twelve adding Nāṭika and Satṭaka to the list of the DR. Someśvara recognizes totally 13 types of \( \text{Rūpakas} \) (eleven of Bharata (i.e. ten + Nāṭika ) + two (Trōṭaka and Satṭaka) of Kohala). The KS has followed the SP.

Here the authors of the ND have partly followed their learned preceptor (or the SP of Bhoja) in so far as they have recognized the total number as twelve. But they differ from both in not accepting Satṭaka (as Rūpaka) and replacing it by Prakaranika.

1. The authors of the ND mention Satṭaka as the first variety of the other forms of drama, and explain it in Vṛtti. (Vide ND, p. 213) but do not seem to attach so much importance to it as to define it in Kārīka.

2. NS (KM) XVIII, 109-111.

3. DR, p. 72.
The authors of the ND do not allot Sattaka a place among the twelve Rūpakas probably for the following reasons:

(i) It is entirely in Prakrit and hence is totally different from the rest of the plays which are principally in Sanskrit.

(ii) In form and subject it is almost similar to Nāṭika with only minor differences¹ and so does not have notable special feature of its own.

(iii) It has not been recognized by the old Sages like Bharata.

Thus according to the authors of the ND Sattaka is not fit to be included in the list of the twelve principal Rūpakas though they mention it first in the list of other Rūpakas² which is very probably due to their respect for their preceptor as well as Rhoja who mention it among the principal Rūpakas.

How far our authors are justified in recognizing Nāṭika and Prakaranikā as two of the principal Rūpakas will be discussed later on.

---

2. ND, p. 213.
The ND now starts defining the first and the most important of the twelve Rūpakas, viz., Nāṭaka. It represents the life of a reputed king of antiquity. This reputation may be of three types: by name, by action and by country.

The hero should be a man of the past. If he belongs to the present age, all his limitations or weaknesses also are known to people and so he cannot interest people. Similarly one cannot think about the life of the would-be great men.

The hero should be a king and hence a Kṣatriya, thereby he should be a mortal and not a heavenly being. The purpose of a drama is to instruct. The drama of Rāma, for instance, points out that we should behave like Rāma and not like Rāvana. But, gods attain the desired objects merely by the desire and so their lives cannot be imitated by the mortals. They cannot instruct us nor impress us deeply. The ND criticises those who allow a god to be the hero. A heroine, on the other hand, can be a goddess as her character is subordinate to the hero. In Śemavakāra etc., where there is nothing to instruct even a god can figure as a hero.

1. ND I, 5.
While depicting the life of the hero the poet does not always strictly follow the actual happenings. He may add something interesting and may as well omit things which cannot evoke any interest.

The aim is the fulfilment of one or more of the four ends of human life. These objects are attained immediately and not in future as promised in sacred texts.

It must be possessed of 'acts', artha-prakṛtis, avasthās and Sandhis. It may have a god in a subordinate position, a god can figure as the helmsman of the hero or as a ratnakār-nāyaka or rakṣār-nāyaka. The introduction of gods in a subordinate position is also meant to make the audience realize that gods do help their true votaries.

SYNONYM OF KAUTĀ : 

The ND derives the word Kāṭaka from Kāṭ (10 P) to please, to make dance, so called as it makes the hearts of spectators dance by providing great delight. It criticises abhinava who derives the word from kāṭ which means to bow down, pointing out that in that case there will not be lengthening of the first vowel and the word form would be Nāṭaka and not Nāṭaka as we get Ghaṭa (and not Ghāṭa) from the root Ghaṭā.

DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN NĀṬAKA AND OTHER FORMS OF LITERATURE : 

Now the ND goes to differentiate Nāṭaka from other forms of literature. Nāṭaka differs from Kathā etc.
(Though both delight the minds) the latter cannot be so delightful as the Nāṭaka for it does not have the charming varieties of Acts, Samādhīs, etc. It also differs from the other types of drama such as Prakarana and others as in the former the dramatist has to delineate the king and his vast paraphernalia such as ministers, commanders-in-chief, etc. while in Prakarana and others, the field is comparatively limited.  

The ND has very effectively argued out as to why a god should not figure as the hero in a Nāṭaka. Here the authors have indirectly emphasized the importance of 'realism' in drama without which a piece is bound to fall flat upon the minds of the spectators.

The authors of the ND have given fresh etymology of Nāṭaka in deriving it from Nāt to make dance, which is, in fact, a causal form of 'Nat' to dance. This criticism by the authors of the ND is based on grammatical intricacy. This reveals the authors' knowledge of grammar.

Dhanika derives the word 'Sātya' from the root 'Nat' denoting movement (Avasthapanā). The root 'Nat' should be taken in the sense of gesticulation or imitation as drama is principally a mimetic art.

1. ND p. 38. 2. ND p. 37.
3. The word Nat denotes many senses: (i) to dance, (ii) to act (iii) to injure - while its causal form Nātayati (it) means to act, to gesticulate or to imitate.
4. Vide DR : Avaloka, p. 3.
Now the ND takes up the topic of different types of the hero:

The heroes can be divided into four types from the point of view of their nature. Of course, all of them are noble or self-controlled (Dhīra):

1) **Dhīrodāhata** (haughty):
   He is unsteady, furious, arrogant, imposter or a hypocrite and boastful. Gods belong to this type.

2) **Dhīrodāṭta** (exalted):
   He is very serious, just, powerful, forgiving and steady. Ministers and leaders of the armies are unfailing by of this type.

3) **Dhīralālita** (light-hearted):
   He is amorous, fond of art, happy and tender at heart or by nature.

4) **Dhīrasānta** (calm):
   One who has no pride, who is merciful, modest and just - is known to be Dhīrasānta. Banias and Brahmins belong to this type.

Kings can belong to any of the four types.

There can be exceptions to the rule. Though born a Brahmin, a man like Paraśurāma may be of Dhīrodāhata nature. The ND therefore quotes the exception viz., the above rule may be violated in case language, nature, dress or mission demands otherwise.
The ND has followed here the NS\textsuperscript{1}. But while the NS holds that Kings are Dhîralalita, the ND thinks that they can belong to any of the four types. The NS is open to the charge of self-contradiction when on one hand it states that Kings are Lalita, and on the other, it points out that the hero of a Nātaka is an exalted (Udātta) King.

The most important of all the characters in any literary piece are the hero and the heroine, and Indian rhetoricians have taken great pains to delineate them fully from top to toe. The theorists demand that the hero who is termed Nāyaka must have particular qualities. He must be brave, noble, dignified, pure, learned, virtuous, self-controlled, intelligent and having handsome personality.\textsuperscript{2} The four types of the hero mentioned by the ND are in keeping with the earlier authorities like the NS, the DR and others.

The ND here criticises the view of those who hold that the hero of a Nātaka must be of Dhīrodātta type only. The ND opines that they do not comply with the theory of the sage (i.e., Bharata) nor have they been supported by the actual practice, as we find, in some of the Nātakas, the heroes of Dhîralalita type also. The dramas, in view of the authors of the ND, are likely to be the Svapnavāsavadatta and the like whose hero is Udayana who is recognized as a

\textsuperscript{1} NS (GOS) XXIV, 16.
\textsuperscript{2} For qualities of the hero: vide DR II, 1-2.
Dhiralalita type of hero. The criticism seems to have been directed against Dhanañjaya and Dhanika who think that the hero should be Dhīrodātta\(^1\) and the authors of the ND seem to be perfectly justified here, in so far as the actual dramatic practice goes against their opponents' view.

**Plot:**

Plot is of two types - 1) Principal and 2) Subordinate.

**Principal** is one of which pervades the entire play and whose development and culmination is the main object of the playwright.

**Subordinate** plot or incidental plot is popularly known as sub-plot. It is subordinate as it follows the main plot. It is called Prāsaṅgikā as it is introduced by way of the efforts of some one else\(^2\).

Nothing is principal or subordinate by nature: it is the writer who makes it so. The fruit of action which is the most desired of all the fruits will be naturally understood as principal and the rest will be subordinate whose purpose is to help the main fruit; e.g., In Rāma story, the bringing back of Sītā is represented to be principal and the friendship with Sugrīva, Vibhīṣaṇa, killing of Rāvana, etc. are represented as subordinate as they are means for the attainment of the above principal end.

---

1. Vide DR III, 22 and also Avaloka p. 70, lines 3-5.
The poet (i.e. the dramatist) is not absolutely free to make a thing principal or otherwise. He has to observe the propriety, whatever fruit is the most appropriate to the nature of the hero should be made principal, e.g., in the TFV the efforts of Yaugandharśayana form Prāsāṅgika to the main thing viz., the attainment of the kingdom of Kaśāmbī.

The Sub-plot is essential only when the hero requires external aid to accomplish his end, and not always, e.g., in the Kosālikā Nāṭikā the hero needs no help in obtaining Kosālikā and hence no sub-plot. So also in the Šṛṭya.

From another point of view the plot may be divided into four types: 1) Sūṣya (to be suggested), 2) Prāyojya (to be staged), 3) Abhyūhya (to be imagined) and 4) Upeksya (to be neglected or left out.)

1. This is not to be actually put on the stage, as it is either dull and insipid or vulgar (though interesting such as embracing, kissing, etc.)

2. This is to be actually staged. It should be interesting and in keeping with the refined taste.

(5) This can be easily imagined and is closely connected with the former two varieties of the plot, e.g., walking, etc. (i.e., journey) can be easily imagined when the person or the party is shown to arrive at the destination.

(4) This is so repugnant and odious. It creates shame if represented on the stage and has to be totally done away with, e.g., eating, taking bath, sleeping, answering to the nature's call, etc.

The ND makes a note here. Sometimes if this becomes necessary to be staged being an indispensable part of the plot it may be staged such as sleeping of Śiśu in Rāma's lap in the UTR.

The ND criticises the views of those who held that the hero of a Nāṭaka can be only Dīrodātta only. The ND points out that firstly these people do not concur with the view of Bharata; secondly they go against the literary traditions.

1. For instance, in the Śāk, the journey of Śakuntalā and her party at the end of Act IV is imagined when they arrive at the court of Dushyanta in Act V.
of the playwrights as we have Nāṭakas having heroes of Dhiralalita and other types.¹

The ND now turns to another division of plot which is popularly known as Nātyaśāstra (conventions of speech):

INTRODUCTION:

While writing a drama, the dramatist has to face a number of difficulties. His medium is that of speech or conversation. He has to unfold the minds of the characters through their speeches and actions. He has also to bear in mind the stage and the audience as the drama is primarily meant for being staged. This creates a number of problems. The entry and exit of characters have got to be made dramatic. Then once a character has entered the stage, it is not possible to remove it suddenly without proper reasons. Moreover, the character might be required on the stage soon afterwards.

1. It is clear beyond doubt that the ND is referring here to the Dāṇika in his commentary to the DR (I, 23,24) points out that the hero of a Nāṭaka should be of Dhirodāṭta type (p.70). It is difficult to comprehend why the ND says that these persons are misinterpreting Bharata. In fact Bharata specifically points out that the hero should be known and Udāṭta (GG (223) XVIII,10). ND's real stand seems to be practical. Authors of the ND have before their mental eyes some Nāṭakas like the Svapnavasavadattam of Bhaṣa whose hero is Dhiralalita instead of Dhirodāṭta.
It may also happen that in order that the audience may fully comprehend a particular character it is necessary for the latter to reveal the innermost workings of his mind to the spectators, but this may not be desirable (from the point of view of the playwright) for other characters on the stage to hear as it may come in the way of the further development of the plot.

The ND considers these as "the divisions of plot" from another point of view. It divides the plot into five parts:

1) Prakāśa, 2) Svagata, 3) Apavārita, 4) Janāntika, and 5) Ākāsokti or Ākāśabhāsita.

1) Prakāśa (Aloud) — Generally all speeches are to be heard by (the spectators in the theatre and) all the characters on the stage and so this direction may sound redundant. It is, in fact, understood where there is no other direction. It is, not mentioned by Bharata and so Prof. Balbir thinks it to have been introduced later. This stage-direction is to be introduced only after Svagata. The DR places it under Sarvaśrāvya.

2) Svagata (also called Ātmagata) — When the speech is not meant to be heard by any other character on the stage it is known as Svagata. This is a sort of soliloquy in which

1. All. O. C. Thirteenth session, Nagpur, 1946, p. 190.
2. Cf. BS. XXV, 39 (KM).
the speaker gives free vent to his inner emotions and personal thoughts.

As a matter of fact there is no distinction between Svagata and Ātmagata (both being synonyms). But Sāgaranandin takes the two terms differently, and recommends the use of Tripatākākara in either. But the distinction between the two is not explained. On the basis of the Anartha-rāghava I, p. 48 Prof. Levi has wrongly tried to distinguish between the two. The explanation of Prof. Balbir too viz., "Ātmagata is the word that is yet in the character and Svagata that which is to be heard by that character alone who speaks it out." is also far from being plausible.

(iii) Apavārīta (or Apavāritaka or Apavārya) - when a secret is disclosed to another having turned aside from all others who are not expected to hear, having bent the body before the person to whom the matter is to be revealed it is known as Apavārīta. It is so called since the matter is to be concealed from many. Here the two characters come forward to a corner of the stage and talk.

1. Vide NLR - Svagataṁ ātmagataṁ caiva svayam tripatākāpañinā; yat paṁḥet tatra samyojyaṁ dvayaṁ etat prayoktbhiḥ. (p. 35).
2. Le Theatre Indien: notes to p. 61.
3. Apavāryate Bahūnāṁ Pracchācyata Itypavārītam, - ND, p. 31.
(iv) Janāntika - When the matter is to be concealed from only one character while others on the stage may hear it the above stage-direction should be used. This is to be suggested by a technical sign of the hand called tripatāśa.\(^1\)

It is so called as the speech is to be concealed from only one while it may be revealed to others.\(^2\) In explaining this the ND has strictly followed abhinava.\(^3\)

If we look to the actual use of the terms Janāntika and Apavārīta by the dramatists in their plays we shall find that there is much confusion and ambiguity and arbitrariness in the employment of those terms.\(^4\) One and the same dramatist uses Apavārīta at one place and Janāntika at another even though the situations are quite similar. On the other hand, a dramatist like Bārsa does not employ the term Janāntika at all in his plays.

---

1. Here all the three fingers (of the hand) except the ring-finger (ānāmika) are kept straight while the ring-finger together with the thumb are kept bent or curved - ND. p.31.
2. अपवार्षितस्यानांमानिक: कविस्न्यपताक: अपोत्वमसार्थ नेिनि तदपवाषान्त अभिनयके सहे अन्य्ये जानामेक्षेत्रं अपवार्षितवाद वहुलालिका अभ्यस्तस्तान्य निकष्ट जानामेक्षेत्रं। ND. p. 31.
The purpose of Tripatākākara seems to be quite practical. Now is the audience going to know whether the speech is Apavārita or Janāntika. Turning aside (Paravṛtti) may go to bring out this distinction to some extent. Tripatākākara is a sure sign to distinguish Janāntika from other speeches.

Professor R.D. Karmarkar has tried to bring out the difference as under:

According to him in Apavārita, other characters on the stage are entitled to hear the speech, barring those from whom the speaker has turned away. In Janāntika, the persons on the stage are excluded by Tripatākākara. Ho interprets Anyonyāmantraṇa thus: "It must be addressed to a particular person by name, and the speech must be replied by the person addressed, who also has to address the first by name." But here he does not seem to have taken Abhinava's remark (and the RS) into consideration.

(v) Akūsabhāṣita - Here there is only one character on the stage. The character employing this device addresses another imaginary person who is not on the stage and himself puts the questions and answers them. At times the question is put as though it was put by another person while at times the answer to the question put by the character is given in such a way as it came from some one else. The obvious purpose of this device is a practical one - viz., the economy of characters.

2. ND., p. 32.
The ND reckons this to be another division of plot. The DR too gives this as a division of plot. The BP divides the plot into two - 1) Śrāvya and 2) Āśrāvya. The former is subdivided into Sarvasrāvya and Niyataśrāvya, the latter being further subdivided into Janāntika and Apavārita. The ES also accepts the above division substituting the word Prakāśa for śrāvya and Svagata for Āśrāvya.

The Nātyoaktis are highly important in a drama from the point of view of its representation on the stage. It is true that each character on the stage has to speak loud enough that a person sitting in the remotest corner of the stage may be able to hear him but very often the dramatist has to face certain practical difficulties. Generally the characters on the stage talk among themselves. This is the usual dialogue form in which a drama is written. Nevertheless at times the occasion demands that the speech of a particular character is not expected to be heard by other characters on the stage nor is it possible to dispose off the characters who are not expected to hear. At such a juncture the stage-direction Svagata is used. Here the character is soliloquising i.e. thinking.

1. DR I, 63.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vaśtu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarvasrāvya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prakasa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janāntika</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. ES p. 234.
to himself. The character in this case generally moves forward to a corner on a stage leaving other characters behind. Sometimes the speech of the character is meant to be heard only by one character and not by others. The character to whom the matter is to be reported secretly is drawn on one side of the stage and the person turns his back against those who are to be excluded. Here the playwright uses the stage-direction *Apavārya*. Sometimes it happens that the speech may be heard by all other characters except one. This creates a practical difficulty mainly how the audience is to understand as to which of the characters is not supposed to hear the speech. In *Apavārya* the matter is to be concealed from all but one and so the two characters can come on one side of the stage and talk, which would clearly go to suggest that the remaining characters are not supposed to hear the talk, but here the case is quite different. There is only one character from whom the talk is to be concealed. Should then that character be asked to clear out silently from the stage? But the presence of the character may be quite necessary on the stage and after a few moments the character will have to enter the stage again.

This type of sudden entry and exit is highly unnatural and defective from the dramatic point of view. Bharata has prescribed definite rules for entry and exit of characters. The characters cannot enter and leave the stage unnoticed. The character abruptly leaving the stage is bound to put the audience in a state of confusion. Similarly an abrupt entry
of the character would naturally disturb the natural flow of conversation going on at that time. To remove this technical difficulty the dramatist uses the stage-direction, Janāntika. Here a special sign called Tripatākākara is to be made by the speaker with reference to the character which is to be excluded. When this sign is made the learned audience will automatically understand that a particular character is not supposed to hear this.

Generally, the speeches are to be heard by all characters on the stage and so the stage-direction - 'Prakūsā' is understood. This direction is specially used when it is preceded by the stage-direction, Svagata.

The discussion on Ākāśabhāṣita also suggests that there should not be too many characters on the stage. Only those who have a definite role to perform in the development of the plot should be allowed to come on the stage. The remaining may only be suggested. For effecting this economy of characters, the stage-direction Ākāśabhāṣita becomes useful.

Most of the writers on dramaturgy ordain Tripatākākara for Janāntika, but no body elucidates as to why that sign should be used in Janāntika only. The NR seems to be wrong when it defines Janāntika as mutual speech having brushed other characters aside by Tripatākākara. In this case the difference between Janāntika and Apavārīta becomes indistinct. In fact, Tripatākākara can be practically directed to only one
particular person (or at the most a group of two or three). Here the view of the ND seems to be more plausible.

The ND's divisions of the plot into three types, viz., i) śāvyā, ii) āśāvyā and iii) niyataśāvyā, cannot include another special important variety which is known as ākāśabhāṣita and the DR has to treat it separately. The ND seems to be a bit more systematic when it divides the plot into five as stated above. It is quite natural that these five varieties of plot later on bear the appellation of Nātyokti as they are more truly the varieties of dramatic speech rather than of the plot. They are, in fact, the stage-directions which are primarily meant for the actors.

The ND does not introduce the word Nātyokti probably because it believes in giving the least number of technical words which go to make at times even simpler things complicated and difficult to understand. This view is corroborated when we find other instances, too, where the ND purposefully avoids the technical words.

After discussing the various divisions of plot, the ND now proposes to discuss what the ideal plot should consist of.

The plot of a drama should mostly comprise of prose as it is in prose that the sense or import is easily caught. The prose should be short and sweet. The prose may at times
be intermingled with simple and elegant verses in limited number. The prose should not be clumsy and full of long compounds.¹

Various incidents which bear affinity with the main story are to be introduced. They should go to develop the plot, i.e., help the attainment of fruit, e.g., entry of monkey in the KTN, which becomes responsible for obtaining the board which forms the seed of love. Or in the Satya, the fight between Kapalika and Vidushaka is responsible for the falling down and exposure of the picture of Damayanti.

The descriptions of oceans, the sun, the moon, seasons, morning, evening, mountains, amorous sports, etc., are not to be introduced uselessly just to satisfy the itch of poetic composition.² Even if the description is to some purpose it is to be given very briefly in a stanza or two, since more of description interrupts the natural flow of sentiment.

---

¹ This was considered to be an essential feature of prose-writing. The authors like Dāna and Subandhu took pride that they could use pun at every syllable.

The ND here strikes a note of warning for a dramatist that the prose of drama should be very simple and easily comprehensible.

² Kāvyakauvasāt - ND, p. 32.
There should be only one sentiment principal, the others ought to be subordinate. At the end there should be Adbhuta only, in the sense that there should be the acquisition of some extraordinary fruit. The Love or the Heroic or the Furious ultimately results in achieving an excellent damsel or land or destruction of enemies. In the absence of some extraordinary object in view, what is the use of taking the trouble of employing various means?

Sentiment is undoubtedly a very important element of the drama, but being too much after it one should not interrupt the easy flow of story. The various figures and Sandhyanas and other subordinate Rasas, etc., are also to be employed in such a way as they may not hinder the principal sentiment but may go to heighten it.

The thing which has already been stated once, if required to be re-stated, should be whispered in the ear of the character to whom it is to be told together with the stage-direction "Karna". This is in order to avoid the fault of repetition.

Incidents should be even like the hair on a cow's tail: Some hair in the tail are very short, some are a bit longer and reach to the middle of the tail and a few are longer still going up to the end. Similarly in a drama also some incidents are of short duration, some stretch up to the middle of the play and some up to the end; e. g., in the Rām the spring-festival occurs only in Mukha Samādhi, the story of Bhāravya and others which is mentioned in Mukha-re-appears in the
beginning of Nirvahana, and the chief incidents such as the acquisition of Ratnavali are spread up to the end.

Having fully described what ought to be introduced in the plot, the authors now go to describe what ought not to be introduced. The matter which is improper or opposed to the sentiment or the nature of the hero should be either abandoned or modified to suit the atmosphere, e.g., for a 'dhīralalita' type of hero, dalliance with another's wife is improper while to show arrogance in him is contradictory (or opposed) to his nature. Similarly embracing, kissing, etc., on the stage is improper for Śrugāra while depiction of Bibhatas is totally opposed to it. This type of impropriety or contradiction should vigilantly be removed or should be changed in such a way as it may appear quite proper, natural and concordant, e.g., in the SLV, the abandonment of one's own wife on the part of a dhīralalita hero was improper and so was represented through the introduction of the Kāpālika.

ACT:

Drama is a composition in acts (just as Mahākāvyya is in Cantos). It is a unit of action in drama. An Act indicates

1. Bharata ordains that a piece should be composed like the tip of a cow's tail. (Gopucchāgram - NS XVIII. 42)

   The ND's interpretation of the word agrees with the Abhi. II, p. 439. The ND mentions this as an opinion of some and offers another explanation viz., the each succeeding act should be smaller than the earlier one (SD VI.11). But this explanation does not seem to be plausible as it is highly artificial and unreasonable to arrange the acts in such an order.
completion of a stage (Avasthā) or a part of it according to the need of the situation. Its time-limit is not less than 48 minutes and not more than 12 hours\(^1\). At the end of an act Bindu should be employed so that the two acts may not seem to be unconnected with each other. To illustrate the point, the ND quotes from the TPV III where the concluding verse indicates Bindu\(^2\). This rule is to be followed not very literally, because at the end of the final Act of each play, or at the end of one-act play or in a type of drama like Samavakāra where the acts are mutually unrelated, no Bindu is necessary. The life of the hero together with its joy and suffering should be delineated therein. Whatever would interest the spectators should only be represented in the Act, other things may be suggested or may be left to conjecture or totally left out.

Here the ND criticises those who complete an Avasthā in the middle of an act. Against whom especially the criticism is directed is not clear. It is probable that here the ND criticizes the dramatists who do not observe the above rule viz. a new avasthā should commence with a new Act.

---

1. ND offers the justification for this time-limit. If it is shorter than 48 minutes, it would appear as an incomplete performance being too short when represented on a stage. If it is longer than 12 hours it will disturb the daily routine work and would be tiresome. Vide ND p. 35.

2. ND, p. 34.
An act should not contain too many extra activities which are not closely connected with the main plot. It should not have too many characters. It may generally have (seven or) eight characters. The Act should not have more than ten and less than four or five characters. If there are too many characters on the stage the four-fold his trinics will not be clearly perceptible. And so such an action like lifting up of a hill, etc. (Parvatoddharanādi) also which can be accomplished by the assistance of a multitude of men ought not to be represented on the stage.¹

One important characteristic of Sanskrit plays is that all the characters exit at the close of an act.

Acts should not be less than five or more than ten in a Nātaka. The number may range from five to ten. If each Avasthā occupies one Act the total number will be five. If one stage is prolonged for one reason or the other upto more than one act, the total number will accordingly increase. Sometimes one stage may occupy even three acts, e. g., in the Venī the Garbha Sandhi (Prāptyāśa stage) spreads over three acts (III, IV and V). In Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī we find four acts. There one of the Avasthās is mixed with the other.

¹ In a Samavakāra even though there are many characters it is not the fault as it is its special feature.
There are positive restrictions laid down by the old sages as to the nature of things to be represented on the stage, e.g., nowhere in the play, a fatal blow to the hero (by the enemy) should be shown. It may be shown in the case of the hero of the Patakā or Prakārī. If the blow is caused by the hero himself as in the Satya where the hero cuts the flesh from his own self to offer it to gods, it is no fault. Similarly in the Nāg, the blow caused by Garuḍa to Jīmūtavāhana who dedicated himself for the cause of another person helps in heightening the Rasa. So also in the RV the entry of Laksmana being struck by a missile is not faulty as he is not the hero.

In place of a deadly blow, either capturing by the enemies (such as that of Udayana in the Vasavadattāntavāra) or escape or alliance should be shown.

FIVE ARTHOPAKSEPAKAS (SCENES OF INTRODUCTION)

The plot of a drama, we have already seen, is divided into four types i) Prayojya, ii) Sūcya, iii) Abhyūhya and iv) Upekṣya. Only that part of the plot which is interesting, captivating and suitable to the refined test can be represented on the stage; that which is abhorrent and odious has to be totally omitted, but still there are certain incidents which are insipid and unstagable and yet the knowledge of which has got to be provided to the audience, in the absence of which they cannot fully comprehend and appreciate the plot and its future development. Such incidents and episodes
which have got to be suggested can be made known to the audience in five ways. These are technically known as Arthopakṣa-pakas.

Some incidents are unstagable, e.g., a long journey.
A short journey which occupies three to four Muhūrātas may possibly be represented on the stage, but a long one which would require more time cannot be represented on stage and has got to be suggested by Viśkambhaka, as it would consist of resting, sleeping, eating, drinking and such other actions which would naturally bore the audience. Similarly a siege around a town too cannot be staged as there are so many activities such as raising tents, machines, digging subterranean passages etc. The political revolution or decline of a kingdom of a particular country too cannot be staged as it consists of fighting and blood-shed. Amorous dalliances such as kissing, embracing, etc., too should not be staged being so shameful. Here the playwright must resort to indirect suggestion such as entering a secluded place or so. Similarly death, fight, etc., which consist of personal injury such as loss of a hand or a foot and such other things which are injurious should not be staged.\footnote{The authors here point to some exceptions: The rules are not to be blindly followed. In the Nāgānanda, for instance, Jimūtavāhana, the hero, is shown to be deprived of limbs.} The events of such
nature are to be suggested by the aid of 'Introductory Scenes.'

They are five in number - i) Viskambhaka, ii) Pravesaka, and
and

iii) Ankāṣya, or Ankamakha etc iv) Cūlika v) Ankavatāra.

Viskambhaka:

Viskambhaka treats that part of the plot which is insipid or even if it be interesting is incapable of being staged in a single day; and thus unfit for being staged.

It may be relate to the past, the present or the future. It is in lucid Sanskrit or Prakrit which does not abound in long compounds. It is brief so that it may well connect the succeeding Act with the preceding one.

Viskambhaka is of two types - i) Suddha and ii) Saintina.

i) Suddha. - It is so called as it has no low characters.

It is by middle characters. It is in Sanskrit.

Even one person can perform it by means of Ākāśokti, Svagata, etc. Even a lady character if she is introduced here will speak in Sanskrit. It may be men and women. Middle characters mean a minister, a commander-in-chief, a merchant, a Brahmin, a queen, a leader or a distinguished person, an adversary of the hero etc.

ii) Saintina. - It comprises of middle as well as low characters. It may be in Sanskrit as well as Prakrit as the low characters are not allowed to speak Sanskrit. Low characters consist of attendants and servants.
It can stand in the beginning of the first act of a play after the prologue to suggest the needful things of the first act. It may be placed in between the two acts in order to connect them with each other.

Viskambhaka may be etymologically explained as follows:

It is so called since it supports (Viskabhināti) the plot by connecting the incidents in an apt and appropriate order.¹

**Pravesaka**:

Pravesaka has almost all the characteristics that have been stated with reference to Viskambhaka. The difference is in the characters. In Viskambhaka the characters are middle (and low also in Sankirna) while here they all are low characters and so speak Prakrit. These low characters are meant for accomplishing the work of the hero and have no purpose of their own.

The authors give an etymological explanation of the word Pravesaka. The word is derived from Pra (causal) to make enter, i.e. to introduce. Pravesaka is so called because it makes enter the indirect things - matters - in the heart of the spectators.²

---

1. ND, p. 38, line 8.
2. ND, p. 39, line 2.
Here the authors quote a view of some who hold that Pravesāka cannot stand at the beginning of the first Act. This suggests that according to the ND it may stand even in the beginning of the first Act.

Pravesāka and Viśkambhaka form a separate group of their own in these five Arthopakṣepakas. They have a good deal of similarity. Their nature is almost the same. The only important difference lies in the characters that figure therein.

These figure only in Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Naṭikā and Prakaraṇī, the four of the principal forms, rather more developed forms of drama. The reason is clear. These two viz., Pravesāka and Viśkambhaka are generally introduced to suggest events spread over a long duration of time and place. In the Vyāyoga and other one-act plays there is limited action as the plot itself is small, and consequently there is little scope for Pravesāka or Viśkambhaka. Samavakāra though it has three Acts has its Acts mutually unconnected and so there is no need of such connecting links like introductory scenes, nor do the remaining two-ṭīma and

---

1. This is the view of Abhi, referred to as 'Kecita'. Cf. Tatra pravesakoṭi prathamopakṣepe na yojya iti yuktam. (Abhi. II, p. 434.)

But Abhinava also allows the option that it may also occur between Prastāvanā and the Act I.
ihāmpga—whose action is confined to a few days only need to introduce either of these two. They may have the remaining three, viz., Ankāsya, Čūlikā and Ankāvatāra as they are used to suggest events of shorter duration.

The authors of the ND do not fail to give an etymological explanation too. The explanation echoes the one in the Abhinavabhāratī.¹

The Abhi states that the low characters have no purpose of their own to serve but are for the sake of the hero, the heroine, etc., with the words—"Anye Ivākuḥ" and illustrates by Anattaumi Bhaṭṭidāriyās.² The same illustration and the view are repeated by the ND.

ANKASYA OR ANKAMUKHA:

When the characters at the close of the previous Act allude to the subject of the succeeding Act (which is otherwise unconnected) it is called Ankāsya or Ankamukha.³

This is illustrated by the ND from the Viṇacarita, that is, the Mahāvīṇacarita. At the end of Act II Sumantra announces the arrival of Vasiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra and Parasurāma and the characters leave the stage to see them.⁴ Thus the Act ends and the new Act III opens with the introduction

3. ND I, 26 ab., cf. DR I, 62.
4. Here the illustration is the same as DR's, pp. 32-33 and is explained in identical terms by ND.
of the sage Vasistha, Visvamitra and others. Thus the two acts have been mutually connected. Here the ND seems to have followed the DR.

The SD defines it differently. "It is a part of an act which suggests the subject-matter of all the Acts and which also alludes to the central theme," e. g., in the Malatimadhava the dialogue between Kamandaki and Avalokita in the Viskambhaka of the Act I suggests the central theme and the subject-matter of all the acts.1

CULIKA OR CULĀ:

Culā or Cūlika occurs when the sense or the coming event is suggested by some characters—male or female—from behind the curtain.2 It is called Culā or Cūlika as it resembles Culā in the sense that the voice behind the curtain is like Sikha (top) for the matter or plot to be actually staged; e. g., in the Uttararāmacarita Act II, the arrival of Ātreyi is suggested by an off-stage character Vasantikā behind the scenes with the words, "Wel-come to the one who has penance for wealth (Tapodhana)" and then enters Ātreyi.3

1. SD, p. 181. Here the SD seems to have followed the NLR which defines it as Sūtranām Sakalānkānām (p. 16).

The illustration also is the same.

2. ND I, 26 cd.

3. cf. DR, p. 32.
Rāmacandra gives another illustration from his own work Nalavilāsa where Sekbara, a character off the stage, suggests the entry of Kalahamsa by words, "Welcome to Kalahamsa together with His attendants."

The third illustration is given from the Ratnāvalī where the time-keeper or the bard (Bandī) behind the curtain utters a verse to the effect that the feudal Kings were waiting for Udayana as the sun had set in the West. This makes Sāgarikā understand that the person whom she thought to be cupid was none else but King Udayana himself.

The definition of Cūlā agrees perfectly in sense with that of the DR.

The RS divides the Cūlikā into two - Cūlikā and Khandacūlikā.¹

It is rather difficult to understand as to why the ND treats Ankāsya and Cūlikā together as one unit. The DR treats them separately.

The significance of Cūlikā appears to be two-fold. Firstly, Bharata ordains that no character (of importance) should enter the stage without previous introduction. A main character should be introduced to the audience without delay, otherwise the audience will not be able to understand the plot properly and that is why the playwright cleverly introduces the main character of the play after the prologue

¹. RS III, 103-187.
with the words of the Sūtradhāra viz., "Here is so and so........" etc. Not merely some character but other matters even may be suggested by this method. Secondly it helps the playwright to bring out the economy of characters on the stage by suggesting the matter by some character behind the scenes.

ĀDKĀVĀTĀRA (Continuation-scene):

When the very characters that figure in the preceding Act also start the new Act immediately following it, it is called Ārikāvatāra. There is hardly anything to be suggested here, since there is no gap between the two acts. Actually the Act is in continuation and is terminated only that it may not be too lengthy and lose its inherent technical unity which an Act should have.

The illustration is quoted from the Māl. of Kālidāsa. At the end of Act I, the Viḍūṣaka says: "Then both of you having approached the audience-hall and having properly arranged the orchestra you may send a messenger or rather the sound of the drum itself will cause us to rise," and after these words when the sound of drum was heard the same characters - all together - commence the new Act.¹ Thus in fact there is no gap.

¹. cf. DR (p. 35) gives the same illustration & explanation.
Here the ND points out another view, of some ("Anye tu") who define Ankavatāra as follows:

"It is a part of an Act in which allusion is made to the subject-matter of the following Acts and the whole plot" as is done in the Ratnāvalī, Act II, where love between Sāgarikā and Udayana which forms the central theme of the whole play is suggested by the words - "such an excellent girl should long for such a bridegroom only."\(^1\)

The ND remarks that this (i.e., Ankavatāra) is also known as Garbhāṅka which is that part of "an Act which alludes to the central theme of the play (Bijartha) and which appears, when staged, like an Act within an Act".\(^2\) The above definition of Garbhāṅka is very much similar to (or, we may say, almost identical with) the definition of Ankavatāra as given by Abhinavagupta.\(^3\) The definition of Garbhāṅka as given by the SD also resembles the above one to certain extent.\(^4\)

It appears that the definition of Abhinava which he quotes with the words 'yad uktam' does not seem to be quite scientific for the simple reason that, it makes no distinction between Ankavatāra and Garbhāṅka.

---

1. RTN, p. 33.
2. cf. ND, p. 41.
4. "Garbhāṅka is another Act which comes within an Act, which contains the seed (Bija) as well as the fruit (Phala) and which also has Raṅgadvāra, Āmukha etc." SD VI, 20.
According to the SD, it is known as Ankāvatāra where the new act is introduced in continuation with (as a part of) the earlier one being suggested by the characters at the end of the act, e.g., in the sak, Act VI is introduced being suggested by the characters at the end of the Act V, as a part of the same.¹

According to the NLR (p. 18) it is Ankāvatāra when at the end of an act (the subject matter of) the coming act is briefly suggested by the dramatic speeches.

The above discussion goes to suggest that the notions about Ankāvatāra are not quite clear and unanimous.² On the one hand it is reckoned as simply a scene in continuation while on the other it is called that part of the Act which makes allusion to the subject-matter (Bīja) of the following acts. Still more interesting is the third view where it is identified with the Garbhāṅka which is an Act within an Act or a play within a play.³

---

2. cf. Dr. V. Raghavan : Niṭṭukalakṣaṇa-ratnakośa, p. 68.
3. Dr. Jackson and Dr. Ogden have discussed in detail the use of Garbhāṅka in Sanskrit drama but have not touched this controversy between Garbhāṅka and Ankāvatāra. Vide Priyadarśikā (Intro.) pp. cv. CXI.
The ND further elucidates as to when and where the different Arthropaksepakas should be used. The first two viz., Visākamba and Pravesaka are to be employed when a long interval of time is to be suggested. When the time-duration to be suggested is small, Ankaśya should be used. Cūlikā is meant to suggest still smaller duration, while Ankaṭavatāra is used when the duration is extremely small or insignificant (as at the end of Act I in the Hālavikāgnimitra).

**CRITICAL REMARKS**

The Arthropaksepakas beginning with Visākamba have a great importance from the point of view of a dramatist. A dramatist must have a vigilant mind to distinguish between the matter which will be staged and that which has to be merely suggested, since all the incidents cannot be staged some of them being practically impossible to stage. Still they cannot be omitted sometimes as they form an inevitable link in the story. This huge amount of Sūrya type of Vṛtta has to be suggested by Arthropaksepakas. In other words, to reveal to the audience the events during intervals between the Acts - the theory permits a choice of five forms of scenes of introduction.

---

1. The ND here seems to follow Abhinavagupta who states thus - If the time-duration of a month of a year is to be suggested pravesaka and Visākamba may be introduced. If the duration is limited (Parimāta) Ankaśya is to be employed, if it is small (Alpa) then Cūlikā and if it is the smallest i.e. insignificant (Alpatama) Ankaṭavatāra is to be used. Abhi. II, p. 422.
The earliest reference to the name Arthopakṣepaka is to be found in Kohala.¹ It is so called because it introduces some matter.² The name Arthopakṣepaka does not occur in the MS of Bharata. Moreover, Bharata mentions and discusses only two of the five Arthopakṣepakas, viz., Pravesaka and Viskabhaka. In the MS (GOS Vol. III) Ch. XIX, vs. 110-116 we get a discussion of the five Arthopakṣepakas. But the editor points out that these seven verses are definitely an interpolation. The text of the MS is handled so roughly from time to time that it is very difficult to sort out the genuine from the spurious. These seven verses are very probably interpolated by some later writer in accordance with the view of Kohala or the Compiler. Some of these have been suggested even by Bharata or the commentator Abhinava.³ It is further stated that out of these, the last verse, (Number 116) is definitely from Kohala. Verse No. 115 is quoted in the Abhi. with the words - "So it is said" while commenting over Pravesaka.⁴ Verse No. 111 is also found in Kohala only differing in the fourth quarter. Abhinava in his commentary (Vol. II, p. 434) actually quotes this verse under the name of Kohala. Verse No. 112 and 114 are taken from the eighteenth chapter of Bharata's MS.⁵

² Artham upaksipati iti arthopakṣepakah.
³ MS (GOS) Vol. III, p. 64.
⁵ cf. MS (GOS) XVIII, 55 and XVIII, 33 respectively for the verses no. 112 and 114.
This above view of the editor of the NS about interpolation is again corroborated by the fact that Abhinava does not comment over these seven verses.

The NS Ch. XVIII does treat of Pravesaka and Viskambhaka but not quite systematically. The nature of Pravesaka is explained in XVIII, 26-30 and 33-37, intervened by the rules regarding time and place in the Act vs. 31-32. Then the author begins to talk about other matters concerning an Act. Then comes the discussion about Prakarana - its definition, the hero, the heroine if she is a harlot, the language, etc. After this there is a discussion of Viskambhaka and its types, viz., Sudha and Suhkîma.

This diffuse, unconnected treatment of the two of the five Arthopaksepakas and the absence of the remaining three altogether point out that Bharata might not have had, a systematic idea about these Arthopaksepakas and probably those ideas developed later on. Abhinava, in his Abhinavabhārati on the topic of Pravesaka, treats the subject briefly enumerating the five Arthopaksepakas under the name of Kohala.

The DR gives a systematic exposition of the topic considering the five Arthopaksepakas as means of suggesting the matter which is indelible and not fit to be staged.

1. NS (GOS) Vol. III, p. 64.
2. This also finds a corroboration in the statement of Abhinava who ascribes the authorship of Arthopaksepakas to Kohala. Abhi. II, p. 421.
The ND gives a clear explanation of what things can be suggested by Arthopaksepalas. Some details are excluded from representation for obvious reasons of practicability, e. g., which take long time, which can be represented with great difficulty, which are tedious and boring, some others to avoid offending the feelings of the audience and some because they may be painful and shameful. But can they be altogether dispensed with? No. Some of them are indispensable for maintaining the continuity of the plot, and the proper understanding of the events to be shown. They provide a suitable background for the coming events, without which the scenes that follow will suffer and the audience will not be able to appreciate them well. They thus form a connecting link between the two independent Acts which are separated from each other in time and place.

Out of the five the first two, viz., Pravesaka and Viskamabhaka are more important. They differ from each other in the following points:-

The Viskamabhaka is performed by middle characters (which is Sudha) or by the middle and inferior characters (in which case it is called Samkarna) while the Pravesaka is carried on entirely by inferior characters. Moreover, the language of the Viskamabhaka is Sanskrit or mixed i. e., Sanskrit and Prakrit (when it is Samkarna) while the latter is wholly in Prakrit. Next, Viskamabhaka may be used even at the beginning of the play while the Pravesaka is to be used only between the two Acts. Usually there are not
more than two characters in a Viśkambhaka, for Pravesaka there is no such rule.

Prof. Jagirdar notes another important distinction between the two. According to him, Viśkambhaka was meant for summarizing important events supposed to happen off the stage, while Pravesaka was merely a kind of scene-shift.¹

The nature of Ćūlīkā is very simple. It distinguishes itself from all the rest by the fact that here the matter is to be suggested by some character 'behind the scenes'.

It has an importance of its own. As far as Viśkambhaka and Pravesaka are concerned they can come only in the beginning of an act. But what should be done if something has got to be suggested in the middle of the act? It is here especially that Ćūlīkā comes to help.

Now we come to Ānkāya and Ānkāvatāra. Just as Viśkambhaka and Pravesaka appear in the beginning of an Act, in the same way the Ānkāya and the Ānkāvatāra form the concluding part of an act.

In Ānkāya, also known as Ānkamukha, the characters of the previous act suggest the situation of the new act that immediately follows. In Ānkāvatāra all the characters that figured in the previous act go to commence the new one. The succeeding act is in continuation with the previous one. It is, so to say, the extension of the closing act.

¹ Vide - Drama in Sanskrit literature, p.54.
A question may naturally arise as to what then is the sense of creating a new act. The playwright ought to continue with the same one. The reasons are not far to seek. There is a particular time-limit for an act. An act should not be too long as it would be boring to the audience. When the matter is too lengthy it is to an advantage to divide it into parts. A small interval of five or ten minutes does good to give the audience the necessary mental rest which will make them fresh and energetic and at the same time curious to listen to the events to follow.

Another point also may be noted. There should be some synthetic proportion among the acts. It should not happen that one act is too long while others are too short.

Thus in Ankāvatāra there is a continuity of the scene with a short interruption.
After the discussion of five Arthopaksepakes the ND turns to another topic, viz., the means of obtaining the fruit, technically called Arthapraaktis. They are totally five. The ND does not call them Arthapraaktis but simply recognises them as the causes or means for realising the end (Phalasya hetavah)\(^1\).

For understanding the concept of Arthapraaktis it should be necessary for us to bear in mind the technique of Sanskrit drama. Sanskrit drama culminates in the attainment of the desired object or fruit coveted by the hero. The whole of the play centres around this prime motive and hence constitutes a struggle on the part of the hero to obtain the desired end. But how can a single man handicapped with human limitations achieve the end unless he is backed by other persons or favourable circumstances? In this case, he requires external help and the function of the Arthapraaktis is to help the hero in obtaining his end. Nevertheless, if the hero is capable enough to achieve the end by himself and needs no external aid some of the Arthapraaktis may not be introduced. The ND therefore has

\(^1\) HD I, 28.
clearly stated that all of them are not indispensable and may be employed at the sweet will of the poet. ¹

These are five: Biṇa, Patakā, Prakārī, Bindu and Kārya. The ND adds in the commentary that the order is not important.

These artha-prakṛtis are primarily divided into two:
(1) animate and (2) inanimate; either of these can be subdivided into principal and subordinate. To take inanimate first Biṇa is principal being the root of all further development and Kārya is subordinate. Animate is also of two types. Here Bindu is principal as it connects the different acts with the main one. Subordinate is of two types - i) accompanied by one's personal interest and ii) meant for the good of the hero only with no interest of one's own. The former is Patakā while the latter is Prakārī.²

1. ND p. 41.
2. The same may be put in a tabular form as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artha-prakṛtis</th>
<th>Inanimate</th>
<th>Animate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biṇa</td>
<td>Kārya</td>
<td>Bindu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With personal interest with no personal interest</td>
<td>With no personal interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of these Bīja and Bindu are principal as they pervade the entire plot.

Here it should be noted that the ND has literally followed Abhinava in the above-mentioned classification. ¹

**BĪJA (Seed or germ)**

The Bīja is that means which in the beginning slightly indicated culminates into fruition. ² It is like the cornseed which though hidden in the ground when just sown gradually develops into branches and sub-branches and ultimately yields the fruit.

The Bīja forms the beginning of the play proper. It is employed after the prologue. Bīja is the means to the realization of the fruit intended in the plot. The Prologue is the performance by the actors in order to introduce the play only and whatever speeches relating to the chief end of the therein they play are introduced are meant for initiating the actual play and so even speeches uttered in the Prologue which form a part of the Bīja are repeated in the play by the character entering the stage. Just as in the RTN, the speech in the Prologue -

"Destiny when favourable immediately unites one with the

² ND I, 29; cf. NS XIX, 22.
coveted object having brought it even from the different isle, or the middle of the ocean or from the extreme limits of a quarter" - is repeated by Yaugandharāyana in the main scene.¹

The Bija assumes different forms. Some times it may constitute activity.² When the removal of a particular calamity is the ultimate end, it may indicate the befalling of that calamity.³ At times it consists of an indication of the ensuing adversity or prosperity,⁴ or the Bija may mark the disappearance of the danger when calamity has already befallen.⁵ Thus it may assume various forms.⁶

The definition of the Bija as given by the ND seems to echo the NS.⁷

1. RTN I, 6.
2. e.g. in the RTN, the activity of Yaugandharāyana viz., the depositing of Sāgarikā in the harem, which is ultimately the cause of acquisition of Ratnāvalī by Udayana.
3. The ND illustrates this by a verse uttered by Śāpa in the Māyāpūspaka, which refers to leaving of Rāma for the forest, death of Dasaratha etc.; ND, p. 43).
4. e.g., the speech of Manavaka in the TPV: "The minister even while acting unfavourably towards the master is thus severely put to trouble.......etc?"
5. e.g. In the MDR, Cānaka saying, "Who, when I am alive, wants to assault Candraguptha?" etc.
6. The ND seems to have followed Abhi. while discussing these divisions of Bija (cf. Abhi. III, p. 13, lines 7-9). The ND has put it more systematically and elaborately adding illustrations of its own.
7. cf. NS (GGS) XIX, 22.
The introduction of the Bīja in the beginning of the play is highly necessary. It is the seed which is responsible for the further development of the plot. A Seed in nature too is the origin of all creation. The apparent analogy seems here to be that of a tree. It is the seed which is responsible for the whole tree and which ultimately culminates into the fruit. In drama also Bīja is at the root of all action, and it finally transforms itself into fruit (Phala). Dr. Pandey gives two-fold purpose of the seed: It is the means of determining the attitude of the audience, at the same time it informs the audience of the circumstances from which the action arises.¹

PATAKĀ (Episode):

It is so called as it increases the glory and reputation of the hero, just as a banner of a chariot or a temple increases their splendour.

It is meant for helping the cause of the hero. At the same time it has its own purpose to serve. Just as Sugrīva, Vibhīṣaṇa and others being helped by Rāma procured for Rāma fame and name and helped him in getting Sītā back by defeating Rāvana and at the same time attained their object too (as both attained their kingdoms).

Patākā is not indispensable. If the hero requires the aid of other persons in attaining his object, Patākā is to be employed. If on the contrary the hero rests on his own strength and does not require any external aid, Patākā is not essential. The same is the case with Prakārī also.

Patākā can come in Mukha, Pratimukha, Garbha and even Avamāraśa. By that time it accomplishes the cause of the Patākānyāyaka too. Its personal aim should be accomplished within Avamāraśa because if it is stretched still further upto Nirvahana it would cease to be the helper of the hero as both would have their aims achieved simultaneously. Moreover, the attention of the audience would also be divided.

Patākā and Prakārī are the two types of sub-plot (Prāsaṅgika Vṛtta)\(^1\) and the purpose of the sub-plot is to expedite the main plot. The dramatist should also take care to see that the sub-plot is not over-delineated so as to supersede the main plot or hinder its natural progress. It is meant for helping the main action.

The term Patākā is significant. Patākā i. e., the banner of a chariot beautifies the chariot as well as itself,

\(^1\) Vide DR I, 13.
in the same way, the hero of the Patākā helps the hero of
the main plot as well as himself.

**PATAKĀSTHĀNAKA (Pro-episode)**

The authors of the ND justify the introduction of this
topic when they have already started discussing Patākā. Of
course, the Patāka and the Patakāsthānaka are totally distinct
but there is some element of similarity between the two.
Patakāsthānaka is defined as an equivocal speech or situation
which foreshadows a coming event whether near at hand or
distant. The element of being helpful to the main plot is
common to Patākā and Patakāsthānaka. It is different from
Patākā and works as an embellishment in the play. It can be
employed more than once and there should be no drama without it.
It is employed at intervals only and not continuously as a
Patākā. This is how it differs from the latter.

**TYPES OF PATAKĀSTHĀNAKA:**

It is divided into four types:

1) When there is an unexpected sudden gain of the
desired object, e.g., in the RTN, act III, the King thinking

---

2. And that is why it is called Patakāsthānaka. of Pataka-
sthānasya tulyāṃ patakāsthānakām - ND p. 144.
3. of NS (GOS) XIX. 31.
Sāgarikā, who was tying herself upon a tree for committing suicide to be Vāsavadattā when releases her and recognizes her by her voice and cries out - "Oh, is it my beloved Sāgarikā? Enough, enough of......etc."

Here the aim was different while another motive which is highly artistic and attractive is accomplished.¹

2) The second variety consists in speech which seemingly hyperbolic is in fact true.² The speech appears as a sort of exaggeration. But that apparent exaggeration is no exaggeration at all but a hard fact, e. g., in the Rāmābhyyudaya, Act II, Sugrīvā sends a message to Sītā:

"What more should I say? O illustrious revered lady! Rāma will bring you without loss of time even if you are on the other side of the ocean."

¹ In this illustration the ND seems to have followed the Abhi. III, p. 19 and that is why it gives another illustration from the NLW, author's own work, where another purpose—obtaining the picture of Damayanti—is accomplished while the king tries to prevent Vidūṣaka and Kāpālika who are prepared for a combat. For still a third illustration from the Nāg. see ND p. 45; compare it with Abhi. III, p. 2020.

² cf. NS, XIX, 32.
Here this hyperbolic statement of being on the other side of the sea is actually true in the case of Sītā. And this suggests that over and above the actual purpose, the other one, viz., bringing of Sītā will also be fulfilled.

3) The third variety consists of speech having double meaning. Here by virtue of paronomasia another sense different from the one actually meant is suggested, e.g., in the RTN, "...is waiting for Udayana, cause of great joy to the eyes, as one would do for the rising moon". Here the verse uttered to describe the evening twilight brings out another purpose for Sāgarikā, viz., recognition of King Udayana.

4) When the speech uttered in reply by the person, without the knowledge of the speaker conveys some another sense connected with the play and which definitely suggests as to how the things will ultimately turn; e.g., In the MDR, Gāṇakya - "Oh, if the wretched Rākṣasa be caught!"

1. Vide ND p. 45; and cf. Abhi. III, p. 20. Note the essential difference — an apparent contradiction when Abhi refers to the Act VII of the play while ND mentions Act II.
2. of. NS (GOS) XIX, 34.
4. of. NS (GOS) XIX, 33.
Siddhārthaka (having entered) "Sir, .......caught."

Here the sense which was doubtful in the first sentence when taken together with the subsequent sentence is established beyond doubt and then Gāṇakya (joyfully to himself) "Bravo, the wretched Rākṣasa is caught!" Here the peculiar co-incidence goes to suggest the future event.  

It will be easily seen that the ND has modelled this discussion of Patakāsthānaka purely on the NS and the Abhi. The four varieties of Patakāsthānaka and their definitions are in accordance with the NS with the only difference that the third variety of the NS has been put last (i.e. 4th) by the ND and the fourth variety has been put as the third one. The illustrations are all copied, so to say, from the Abhi, except the one that Rāmacandra quoted from his ML (1st variety).

2. It has to be noted here that this variety of Patakāsthānaka has an intimate similarity with the Ganda, one of the thirteen Vīthyaṅgas. Ganda is explained as a speech having a different purpose when connected with the relevant topic, brings out a new sense which reflects upon the things going to take place (cf. II, 97 ab). It does not touch this point even though it has suggested the difference by pointing out that the sense contained in Ganda is bad or foul, like the foul blood in a pile. Thus the suggestion of Sītā's abandonment in Act I of the Uīk is, though similar to the above instance (i.e. Patakāsthānaka fourth variety) is an instance of Ganda (cf. III, p. 138). Abhi. has done well to explain this difference correctly (Abhi. III, p. 21).
The DR disposes of the discussion of Patakāsthānaka by giving a general definition in a verse and does not bother to enter into the divisions and sub-divisions. The DR defines it thus: "When a relevant thing going to happen is suggested by irrelevant means (Anyokti) it is known as Patakasthānaka".¹

Patakāsthānaka which may be translated into English as 'Dramatic Irony' has a special importance in Drama. It adds charm to the situation. It occurs when there is one meaning for the actors on the stage and another meaning quite different from it, for the audience in the theatre. The use of such irony in a drama is like sauce and salt which makes the dish palatable. Life, as we know, is full of irony and since drama is the imitation of life it is also capable of ironic treatment.

Patakāsthānaka, like irony, is mostly based on double significance. But it has to be noted with reference to the Patakāsthānaka that its chief purpose is to be helpful in the development of plot. It is not meant simply as a decoration.

¹ vide DR I, 14.
PRAKARI (Incident)

Just as the Pataka is meant for helping the hero in his efforts, even so is the Prakari meant. But Prakari goes one step forward in the sense that its sole aim is to help the hero while Pataka has its own purpose also to achieve. That is why it is called Prakari which means "that which helps (Kr. - to do or to render (help) ) specially (pra-)."

Moreover like Pataka, Prakari is also not inevitable. It differs from the Pataka on the point that it is highly short-lived, while Pataka extends over longer duration. The episode of Jatayu in the story of Rama is an illustration of this type.

The DR does not seem to take into account the fact that in Prakari the Prakari-nayaka has no personal motive to accomplish (and thus renders selfless help to the hero), and consequently illustrates it by the Sravana-episode in the Ramayana. According to the DR Pataka stretches far while Prakari is short-lived. Some authors opines that Prakari constitutes description of the season and the like that occurs in a

---

1. vide ND, p. 46.
2. The ND has followed here Abhinaya.
composition. It is meant to help others just as a small bunch of flowers ( laghūḥ puspādipraṣaḥ prakarī ) is meant to beautify the bed ( or the table ) etc.¹

BINDU ( expansion )

The main purpose is often lost sight of on account of other digressions which come in the middle and are necessary too. But again that main thread should be taken up. This important work of joining the broken link once again is performed by Bindu. It pervades the whole story as an oil-drop spreads over the entire surface of water, and that is why it is called Bindu - a drop — as it has the pervading capacity.² Like Bīja it pervades the whole story, as it is Bīja which transforms itself into fruit at the end. Thus Bindu too pervades the whole of the story with the difference that Bīja starts from Mukha Sandhi itself, while Bindu follows it.

1. KP : Kāvyādāśsāṅketa, p. 220.
2. cf. AD p. 46 : Somāvāra gives another explanation of the word: Just as the drops of ghee dropping gradually (one after another) cause the fire to burn continuously, in the same way Bindu (viz., Viṣṇuḥbhaka, Praveśaka etc.) becomes the cause of combining the scattered threads (literally limbs) of the story or plot. — KP, Kāvyādāśsāṅketa p. 220.
Vinda plays an important part in the achievement of fruit. The fruit may belong to the hero, his help-mate (i.e., Patakanayaka) or both. Thus Vinda serves the purpose of linking the activities of all these. The hero, for instance, links the activities of his antagonist and vice versa. e.g., in the Aśvamedha (Act V), while hearing the story of Sugrīva, Rāma becomes unhappy being reminded of the abduction of Sītā. The Vinda also illustrates from the TV (Act XI). ¹

KARMA - (Denouement) - It brings the seed sown by the hero or the Patakanayaka or the Prakarinsayaka to perfection by developing it into fruit in the form of achievement of the desired object. Bhoja remarks that it consists of any one of the three principal objects of human life, viz., Dharmo, Artha, and Kama.²

In conclusion it should be noted that even when the hero needs no external aid these three will be there - Dīja, Vinda, and Karja. While if the hero needs aid there will be Patakā or Prakari or both in addition to the above three.³

2. *प्राप्तैवायमानं नाम-कामं इति पुरुषार्थं स्वयंभूतं (MS) p. 171.
3. A, p. 17, last three lines.
The ND explains as to how the importance (Sukhyata) or otherwise of any Arthaprákṛti is decided. The ND has stated at the outset that out of the five, Bija and Bindu are principal, the rest subordinate. This is because that the former pair (Bija and Bindu) pervades the entire story. While the remaining may be principal or subordinate according to their utility in the achievement of fruit. Thus in the Mahabharata, the Patāka viz., the story of Ārjuka, becomes principal and important. Even Prakārī in the Kundamālā, viz., rearing of Sītā and her two children by Vālmīki becomes principal. Both Patāka and Prakārī get importance in Kāma-story, for example, the story of Sugrīva and Vībhīṣaṇa (Prakārī). Where Patāka and Prakārī are not important or are completely absent, Kārya becomes principal.

When Patāka enjoys a prominent position it too has the Sandhis. They are known as Anusandhis. They are meant to help the main Sandhis. If not so, the story of Patāka would not be known as sub-plot and there would be increase in the number of Sandhis. The Anusandhis can be two (Mukha and Hirvahana) or more.

1. ND, p. 41.
2. It is true that Kārya is as indispensable as Bija and Bindu, still it is the natural consequence and hence relatively less important as compared to the cause which is Bija.
3. ND, p. 48.
AVASTHA

There are certain stages through which a hero passes as he employs the different means while trying to achieve the end. They are the activities of the body, the speech and the mind.1 These too are five in number: 1) Ārambha, 2) Yatna, 3) Prāptyāśā, 4) Niyatēpti and 5) Phalāgama. They are indispensable in a drama. In a sub-plot they remain in a subordinate position. In Nāṭaka, Prakarana, Nāṭıkā and Prakarāṅkā all the five stages are employed but in Vyāyoga and others all may or may not be employed.

They are to be introduced in the same order as stated above. Naturally a man with sound reason will first begin a task, then he will make strenuous efforts to achieve the object (Yatna), by and by he will have the hope of success (Prāptyāśā), then he will be sure of his success provided he succeeds in removing a particular impediment on the way (Niyatēpti) and finally he will achieve the object in view (Phalāgama).

1. ND, p. 49.
Ārāṃbha (beginning). - It is the eagerness or inner urge to procure the fruit or the desired object, and the efforts as a result of the eagerness.

This is the first stage of the plot-development. Drama represents the struggle of a noble man - hero - to achieve a particular, desired object and before the efforts can actually start there must be a burning desire - an inner urge to achieve that object, "where there's a will there's a way". A strong will is the first requirement for any task to accomplish. The will first, and the efforts will follow automatically. Thus Ārāṃbha does not mean barren desire. The hero here starts his preliminary attempts to achieve the object.

In these Avāsthās - in one or more - the different activities of one or more of the following viz., the hero, the helmpate, the rival or enemy, and fate are seen. Even if beginning etc., may be caused by fate still it does not imply total negation of human efforts. Fate and efforts both combined bring out good or evil results. Both are supplementary to each other.

1. ND, I, 35a.
2. ND, p. 50.
Prayatna (effort). - It means speed in efforts and activity to achieve the end. Here eagerness has increased considerably and thinking that in the absence of the particular means it is not possible to attain the fruit, a serious effort has been started. Āraśibha implies simple eagerness. In Yatna the same eagerness is heightened, e.g., in the RTN, the heroine tries to paint the picture of Udayana when she thought that it was not possible to see him personally. This shows that her love has considerably advanced.¹ The ND illustrates from the NLV also.²

This is a subsequent stage in the normal course. When a man thinks over a particular object he develops attachment for it and gradually becomes passionate for it. This passion does not allow him to sit at rest. The man tries to achieve it by hook or crook. He gets after the object and thus the efforts start.

Prāptvāśa (hope or prospect of success). - Here there is a hope of the achievement of the fruit on account of certain occurrence or event only. Here there is no other fruit

¹ cf. RTN, p. 31 lines 11-12.
² cf. NLV, p. 35 lines 7-9.
obtainable nor does it imply the removal of all obstacles. There is a hope that the fruit will be achieved. Just as in the Veṇī (Act III) with the killing of Duḥśāsana at the hands of Bhima, we naturally expect that all the rest of the Kauravas will also be killed.

After efforts comes the hope. One should deserve first and then desire. What is impossible for a man who has a strong will and puts in untiring hard work? By continuous struggle man does go near to his target. The target seems to be at hand, and there is a ray of hope that inspires him to struggle with doubled zest and vigour. Still the obstacles are equally great.

Miyatāpti (Certainty of success) - All the obstacles but on in the path of the achievement of fruit have been removed, and all the helping causes have conjoined together and consequently the fruit - achievement is sure (Miyata) only if that particular obstacle is overcome, e.g., in the Veṇī the entry of Bhima and Arjuna in search of Duryodhana with the words of Bhima, "Where is Duryodhana, the author of deceits in gambling, the igniter of the house made of lac..." etc. Suggests the certainty of success provided
Durysodhana is captured and killed.

In Prāptyāsa we have seen that by continuous efforts, the person entertains a hope that he will be able to attain his end. This hope is like a beacon-light which impels the man to move on and on in the direction of light. So this stage is highly essential. But the course of life—the course of high ambitions and achievements—never runs smooth. One has to meet with a thousand impediments and one. By patience and perseverance one has to cross this thorny road to success. Life is a continuous struggle and drama is nothing but an imitation of life. The purpose of drama is to mirrorise life. Thus struggle or conflict becomes the essence of drama.

But here is an essential difference between the Sanskrit drama and the Western drama. In Western drama the hero though trying his best, is sometimes represented as being unable to cross the difficulties beset as he is with human infirmities. Man is after all man. He is never perfect and often gives way to his personal defects which he cannot overcome, and there starts the tragedy. This is more realistic as in life good men do not always
prosper. On the contrary, the good and virtuous have to suffer while the cunning and wicked take undue advantage of their goodness. Like the drama of life, English drama too often ends in catastrophe. But Sanskrit theory allows no such tragedy on stage. The Indians are too much optimistic about life. They firmly believe that good will end in good. And so the obstacles do come. And the good have to pass through all the thick and thin of life, but ultimately will achieve the end. Thus at this stage the impediments being cleared out the hero is sure of achieving his goal.

Phalāgama (Achievement of the fruit). - Phalāgama means the immediate achievement of the desired fruit. This achievement must be immediate and not such as may be obtainable in the other birth like other fruits such as heaven etc., that are obtained by the performance of meritorious deeds such as giving alms, etc. The fruit has been produced fully. Phalāgama means the approach of the fruit. It denotes the beginning of the arrival and not the actual arrival. The obtaining of fruit by the hero is the chief purpose of the play. Thus these are the five

1 Vide MD, p. 52.
stages in the course of the obtaining of fruit. Other stages may be produced by the activities/efforts of the ministers, the heroine, enemies, fate etc., but in such a way that ultimately the fruit of the play goes to the hero only.

This is the final stage of the play. The seed sown in the first stage has developed into a fruit. The efforts of the hero together with other assistants, have here borne the actual fruit.

Here the ND may be accused of being a little unsystematic in the sense that the illustrations of all the five stages are not given from one work which would have gone a long way in presenting a very clear picture of the Avasthas in actual plays. The ND first illustrates from the RTN, then from the Veni, and then again from the RTN. This is unnecessary as well as undesirable.¹

SANDHIS

After having discussed the different stages (Avasthas) of the plot-development, our authors turn to another aspect of the plot, viz., Sandhis (junctures). The Sandhis are

¹ It should be pointed out here that the DR illustrates all the Avasthas from the RTN.
The word Sandhi is derived from the root 'Dhā' with 'Sa' which means to join together. Sandhi therefore literally means a joint. Sandhis are responsible for joining or connecting harmoniously the different parts of the story (or plot) which are linked together by their contribution towards the same end, each part having its own secondary end just as the joints of the body join the different limbs of the body.

They correspond to the five Avasthās, such as Āraṁbha, Yatna, etc., i.e. Mukha corresponds to Āraṁbha, Pratimukha to Yatna, Garbha to Praptyāśā and so on.

As the avasthas such as Arambha, Yatna etc. are indispensable in the same way the five corresponding Sandhis too cannot be dispensed with in Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇikā. In Samavakāra and others all the five are not needed.

The Sandhis (smaller Sandhis) of the sub-plot are known as Anusandhis.
In this brief explanation of Sandhis the MD suggests the following:

It indicates that the idea of Sandhis is based on the analogy of human body\(^1\). Poetry is often compared to the human form of a male or a charming damsel\(^2\). Word and sense are its body\(^3\). Rasa is its soul. Figures of speech are its embellishments. Gunas are its qualities like beauty, valour etc., and so on. The same analogy is continued in the concept of Sandhis also. Joints in the body perform the work of connecting the limbs. Similarly, Sandhis, in the drama, connect the different stages of the plot. A thing appears charming only when its parts are properly joined with one another.

The important point that is suggested here is this that five Sandhis correspond to the five stages (Avasthās) stated before. This will mean that the Sandhis strictly correspond to the Avasthās. Each of them begins with the corresponding Avasthā and ends with it.

---

1. cf. The idea of Sarasvati-putra or Kavyaprāsa as given by Rājaekkara-vide KM, chapter III.
1) Mukha (opening). - It is that part of the main plot where the Bija originates. It corresponds with the first stage called Āraṁbha. Just as the face is the most prominent part of the body so is Mukha to the main plot. It marks the beginning of the play. Here the seed (Bija) is first in some and the sentiment first depicted, e.g., the first act of the RT where we find a fusion of different sentiments such as Vīra (in the desire of Yaugandharāyaṇa to conquer the whole of the world); Śṛṅgāra in Udaya enkindled by spring, Adbhūta in the witnessing of the people's festivities and again Śṛṅgāra commencing from the arrival in the garden.

In the Satyāharīścandra too we find different sentiments like Adbhūta, Karuṇa, Raudra, Vīra, etc., depicted in Mukha.

Here again the MD emphasizes the importance of Rasa in a play. Rasa is the soul of dramatic performance and so the dramatist should not lose sight of it.

1. cf. Abhi. III, p. 23; MD has verbally followed Abhi.
2. MD seems to emphasize the depiction of sentiment which is the chief aim of drama according to Sanskrit rhetoricians.
3. cf. Abhi. III, p. 23. The illustration is the same as in the Abhi. The MD has expanded and elucidated what Abhi stated very briefly.
2. **Pratimukha** (progression) is that part of the plot where the seed which is seen in Mukha and then veiled by some secondary incident becomes manifest. It is accompanied by the stage 'Yatna'. It is so called because it is favourable (Prati - Ābhimukhya) to Mukha, e.g., in the RTN the seed which is sown in the utterance of Vaugandhārāyaṇa: "Destiny when favourable..." etc,¹ is veiled and becomes hardly visible in the spring-festival and cupid-worship; and is clearly unfolded in Act II at the meeting of the King and Sāgarikā arranged by Susāṅgatā and hence Pratimukha.²

3. **Garbha** (Climax). - It is that part of the plot which is accompanied by the stage Prāptyāśā. The seed which has been originated and manifest further develops to a stage wherein it is gained and lost in turns by the hero and he frequently searches every time it is lost.³

The ND illustrates from the Veni. Acts III, IV and V. At the end it points out that in Garbha the element of loss

---

1. RTN I, 6.

2. The ND has followed Abhi. here. The DR and others define this as that part of the plot wherein the Bija develops in such a way as to be perceptible and imperceptible in turns. DR I, 39.

3. Garbha is so called because fruit lies concealed in it.
or despair predominates since here there is merely a probability of attainment of fruit; otherwise the acquisition of fruit would be sure and certain. Contrary is the case in Avamärā or Vimarā (Pause) where the element of gain or hope dominates which indicates the certainty of success in acquiring the object.

Here one point deserves attention. The ND has started illustrating from the RTN and we naturally expect illustrations from the same, in order to have a coherent, unified impression. But here we find the ND illustrating from a different work viz., the Venī, in spite of the fact that Abhinava from whom the ND has drawn abundantly illustrates from the RTN. (The ND probably switches over to the Venī, from the RTN with the conviction that the Venī (Acts III to V) provides a more convincing illustration of the Garbha than the RTN. Again here each sandhi is to be illustrated suitably. It is, therefore, not binding on the authors to illustrate all the Sandhis from one play only).

Avamärā or Vimarā (Pause) is that part of the plot where the seed which is sown in Mukha and is fast developing into fruit meets with some serious obstacle. It corresponds

1. The ND clearly echoes Abhi-III, p. 26 lines 6-8.
with the fourth stage called Niyatapta. Vizanada is so called because the hero here thinks (Vi4 Mra = to think), that is, reflects or doubts the attainment of fruit though it is near at hand on account of some powerful obstruction. Thus there is a cause for despair. Nevertheless the great men when obstructed by impediments strive more assiduously and hence are sure to attain the object. These impediments must be shown to befall the hero in order to illustrate that the path to success never runs smooth. It is beset with thorns. Yet one should not slacken one's efforts for the attainment of the fruit as the fortune favours the brave. These obstacles may be of hundred types being caused by curse, anger, selfishness, etc. The ND gives a number of illustrations from different works such as the Râh, the RV, the Śak, the Vidyâvileśita and the Venî. The Abhi points out that this Sandhi is 'Sandehâtmaka'. According to him Sandhe is possible even after Sābha varâ, when some unforeseen obstacle appears in the way of achievement of the desired object.

5. Hirvahana (Close of Pencouement). - It is that part of the plot where the seed and its different stages of development niyânaMândâseasonment together with all Avasthas.

1. ND, Pp. 57-58.
Arthaprekāśas and Sandhis are shown to contribute to the production of fruit. It corresponds to the stage called Phalāgama. It ends with the actual attainment of fruit which marks the end of the play itself, e.g., in the RTN after the entry of the magician up to the end.

Some opine that Nirvaha is that part of the plot where different Sandhis beginning with Mukha and different Avasthās are again briefly touched or indicated one by one, e.g., in the Satya Act VI the speech of God namely, "He, desirous of testing your worth or excellence, created all this, viz., hunting, the ascetic-girl, the Kulapati, the parrot, the jackals, the travellers, the King of the Mlecchas, the death of a man ...." etc.

Hence hunting etc., indicates Mukha, the parrot, etc., Pratimukha; the traveller, etc., Carthā; and the man, etc., Vimarṣa. Thus all these Sandhis together with the corresponding Avasthās are mentioned here.

1. Here the SB has closely followed Abhi. III, p. 29 lines 17-18.

2. It is difficult to decide whose view this is. It has been referred to briefly by Abhi. in one sentence. Vide Abhi. III, p. 29 lines 6-7. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra have lucidly put this view adding an illustration from Rāmacandra's own work.
In fact, this Sandhi occupies a relatively shorter duration. Avamár's ends with the removal of the final impediment which obstructed the path of success and accomplishment of fruit and here the Nirvahane begins. Naturally, the drama at this stage is drawing to its close.

It is quite evident that the authors of the ND are considerably indebted to the Abhi. for the entire discussion on this subject. Nevertheless, the ND deserves special credit for good many illustrations which it has supplied, at times from kamacandra's own works and which go a long way in concretising the concepts.

Prof. Jagirdar opines that the five stages of development mentioned above (i.e., the five Sandhis) are just the five members of a syllogism in Indian Logic. But this sort of comparison is not quite correct or convincing.

CRITICAL REMARKS

A deeper study of the trinity of Sandhis, Avasthas and Arthapratihat will make it abundantly clear that there is a

1. Drama in Sanskrit Literature, p. 119.
string of unity of concept running through all these three. It will not be far to realise that Avasthas, as the name itself suggests, indicate the stages (or conditions) of development. These stages of development are from the point of view of the hero. These Avasthas indicate the psychological development of the hero. First of all a desire springs in the heart of the hero. This marks the beginning of play proper, the first stage called Arambha. The desire, when it is a genuine one, is always succeeded by ardent efforts in order to accomplish it. This forms the second stage known as Yatna. But the course of victory or success never runs smooth. It is generally infested with innumerable impediments and for a moment the hope for success is lost. This is a state of suspense and known as Pratyāśa. (This is known as 'Climax' in English Drama). But soon the mist of suspense is to clear - the darkness is to be dispelled - the obstacles overcome and the attainment of the end is almost certain but for the removal of one or two obstacles. This is Niyaṭāpti and finally the obstacles that blocked the path are removed completely and the final object attained (Phalāgama). Thus it is evident that here we get an analysis of the plot or
action purely from the viewpoint of the hero who by all means is the central figure of the play.

Sandhis form an objective analysis of the plot from the point of view of the playwright himself. A playwright is supposed to develop the play in a fixed pattern. He cannot show the achievement of the result first and the efforts afterwards. This would sound awkward and absurd. The plot should develop in a very natural, realistic, psychological, dramatic way. There should be a definite aim to be achieved and all the incidents, episodes and the like represented should be ultimately conducive to the achievement of that aim. Firstly, he should represent the seed, the germ - the motive force of the plot - development. The germ is responsible for rousing the hero to action.

These Sandhis well agree with the five stages of comedy in western drama which are 1) cause or beginning, 2) growth or progression, 3) height or climax, 4) pause or consequence and 5) close.¹

The divisions into Avaasthas will obviously appear to be very logical and psychological. This concept of Avaastha very

¹ In tragedies the last two stages are iv) fall and v) catastrophe.
much corresponds with the five stages of plot-development according to the Western critics. According to Western critics, conflict is the soul of drama. Drama, mirroring life, must represent, in the true sense, the conflict—the conflict of ideas and emotions, thoughts and ideals, rights and duties. These conflicts are universal. Life deprived of conflicts can never be imagined. Life is a bed of thorns. Its course never runs smooth. At every step, man is confronted with innumerable difficulties. What to do and what not to do is the problem which every sane person has to face. So the climax in drama comes in the middle in the stage Prāptyāśā where the fate of the hero appears to hang in a balance. He is suffering through acute mental torture and trying to cross the vast ocean of difficulties, making his way through all the thick and thin. The curiosity—as to what will happen now—is the highest here. But slowly and gradually in the course of the last two stages the hero overcomes the difficulties one by one, and the spectators' minds are proportionately relieved of the tension, and ultimately the play closes with the attainment of the object in view. The five stages (Avasthās) should invariably be present in the Bātaka.

Arthaśāstra, on the other hand, are not, strictly speaking, the divisions of the plot. They are in fact as Bhoja and other theorists have pointed out, the material causes

(Hetū, Kārāṇa) of the plot. In other words, they are the factors that are responsible for the smooth and gradual development of the plot. The ND is therefore perfectly justified when it calls them "means of achieving the fruit" (Phalasya hatavaḥ).

The development of the plot is comparable to the development of a seed into fruit. The name Bīja (seed or germ) which marks the beginning of the play appears to be significant. It is the motive force of all dramatic action. The same Bīja which is sown in Mukha shoots forth, develops and ultimately transforms itself into fruit. But before that it has to pass through the three Sandhis for its full growth.

Sandhi is so called because:

1) It properly joins the different parts of the plot into a harmonious one.

2) It is the result of the combination between Avasthās and Arthaprakṛtis (The view of the DR).

The DR, while discussing the Sandhis, lays down that the five Arthaprakṛtis joined respectively to the five Avasthās give rise to the five Sandhis beginning with Mukha.
What the DR means is this:

\[
\text{ARTHAPRAKRTI} + \text{AVASTHĀ} = \text{SANDHI}
\]

1. Bīja + Āraṁbha = Mukha
2. Bindu + Yavna = Pratimukha
3. Patakā + Prāpyāsā = Garbha
4. Prakārī + Niyatāipti = Avamarā
c5. Kārya + Phalāgama = Nirvahāṇa.

This view of the DR is not convincing for various reasons:

(i) Patakā and Prakārī are not indispensable in the plot as they are to be employed only if the hero requires the external aid for achieving his end and even in their absence all the five Sandhis are seen.

(ii) Patakā need not occur in Garbha only. It may start with Mukha or Pratimukha and stretch up to Avamarā even.

Similarly it is not proper to confine Prakārī to Avamarā only.

(iii) The Bīja is not confined merely to Mukha. It, in fact, pervades the entire plot as it is the Bīja whose progressive development into the fruit is the ultimate

1. Vide SD, P. 41; also Abhi. III, p. 16.
aim of the drama.

Bindu also is to be employed not only once but may be employed as many times as the main thread is lost sight of and in any of the five Sandhis. It pervades the entire plot.¹

Thus the mathematical formula laid down by the DR cannot be accepted literally.

If at all we want to justify the DR the statement may be understood as representing a state of idealistic perfection of dramatic technique.

Prof. K. P. Kulkarni also does not seem to be correct when he explains the Arthaparaptis as stages in the development of the action and the five Sandhis as corresponding to the five Arthaparaptis.²

¹ Of Bhoja, who explains it as – यावतशापतिय यद्बन्धहृ – SP (MS) p. 179.
² Vedic-Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists, Pp. 37-38.
SANDHYAÑGAS

The ND begins with the subdivisions of Mukha Sandhi. They are twelve in all beginning with Upaksépa and ending in Paribbhavāna. Out of these twelve, the first six, viz., Upaksépa, Parikara, Parinyāsa, Samāhiti, Udbheda, and Karana occur in the Mukha Samdhi only. Out of these six again, the first three are to be put in the same order and that too in the beginning, the fourth one in the middle and the fifth and the sixth at almost the end of Mukha. The first five of the above limbs together with Yukti are indispensable here. The remaining ones viz., Vilobhana, etc., are possible in other Sandhis also irrespective of the specified order if the plot demands it. Bheda which implies exit of characters has got to be employed at the end of every act and at the end of Pravesaka and Viśakambhaka as well. Sandhyaṅgas are employed after the prologue as prologue does not form a part of the drama proper. In this introductory paragraph about Sandhyaṅgas the ND touches some of the note-worthy points about the concept of Sandhyaṅgas. It points out that the particular

1. cf. ND, I, 41, 42.
2. Vide ND, I, 44d.
Sandhyāṅga may be the Ānga or a part of a particular Sandhi only, but it does not mean that it is to be employed only there. In fact, most of the Sandhyāṅgas excepting a few can be employed in any of the five Sandhis. The fact that it is a part of a particular Sandhi simply means that it is usually and more often found in that Sandhi. This does not deprive it of its right to appear in other Sandhis also. Moreover, it is possible to reduce the number of the Sandhyāṅgas as some of them can be included in others. But the ND adheres to the old tradition.

Now the ND states the purpose of Sandhyāṅgas. The ND points out that they must be employed because they develop the plot; otherwise the story though possessed of all Sandhis will be too brief; e.g., the entire story of Rāma could be covered in a few sentences, the wife of Rāma was abducted by Rāvana in the forest, Rāma made Sugrīva his friend by procuring for him the monkey-kingdom, constructed a bridge over the sea, killed Rāvana and brought Sītā back.

Moreover, what sort of interest will such a story create in the minds of the readers? On the other hand, even an uninteresting story when represented strikingly through Sandhyāṅgas becomes highly enjoyable. Even if the story is

1. cf. ND, p. 59-60.
repeated when the occasion demands it, it does not appear to have been repeated when expressed with the help of Sandhyangas. Thus the plot is saved from being tedious.

Much of this discussion is based on the Abhi. As regards the purpose of Sandhyangas the ND has in mind the HS and the DR. The NS (DR simply follows it) gives sixfold purpose of Sandhyangas, and the same has been summarized with apt illustrations by the ND.

Bharata stretches the popular analogy of Kāvya and the human body, and points out that Sandhyangas are to drama what limbs are to body.

Now we take up individual Sandhyangas one by one.

1. Upakāsana. Sowing of the seed is Upakāsana. Here there is simply a suggestion of the seed—the central motive which is to expand over the whole of the play, e.g., in the RTN I, 6, Yaugandharāyana's speech, viz., "Destiny if favourable at once brings the desired object, even from a different isle,"... etc. suggests the course of events to follow, viz., the union of Udayāna and Sāgarikā, who came actually from the other isle.

2. NS XIX, 51-52.
3. Cf. NS (GOS) XIX, 53.
4. The definition is quite similar to the DR where we find "Nyāsa" instead of "Upti" of the ND. Both the ND and the DR illustrate from RTN I, 6.
2. **Parikara.** Consists in a slight expansion of central motive which is already suggested by the previous limb, e. g., in the *Veni*, I, 10 Bhīma's declaration that he would break the peace as soon as it was effected strengthens the idea that war was inevitable.

3. **Parinyāsa** - When the seed which is thus expanded is specially confirmed beyond any shadow of doubt it is called *parinyāsa*\(^2\), e. g., in the *Veni* (I, 21) Bhīma's assertion that he would surely break the thighs of Duryodhana and braid the hair of Draupādi clearly affirms the seed already sown\(^3\). ND also illustrates from Rāmacandra's own plays, the *Bēh*, and the *Rohiniśṛṅgāṅka*.

The ND notes that these three limbs of Mukha Sandhi should follow in succession\(^4\). The reason is quite clear. The seed has to be sown first, then expanded and then confirmed.

---

1. The same illustration is found in the Abhi. III, p. 38.
2. NS and DR define it as Tannispatti. ND's definition seems to follow Abhinava. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 38.
3. This illustration is found in Abhi. III, p. 18.
4. ND, p. 61.
4. **Samāhiti** - repetition of the briefly-stated seed in order to establish it clearly beyond doubt is Samāhiti\(^2\), e.g., \(\text{Vepī I, 24}\) clearly points out that the anger of Yudhīśthira, the cause of the destruction of the Kurus, is now violently stirred and is working in all its fury against Kurus.

5. **Udbheda** - is the sprouting up of the seed. The seed that was sown at the commencement of the play now springs up as a young sprout springs up from the earth. The seed sown in the ground becomes swollen first. This is the earliest stage of the growth of the seed as the seed that lay hidden is slightly brought to light. Thus it is a part of Mukha only and not of Pratimukha which implies a complete manifestation or full development of the seed, e.g., in the \(\text{Vepī (I, 26)}\) Bhīma's declaration of his determination to kill all the Kurus and not to see Draupadi before doing it.

The ND here gives the view of some others who define it as 'unfolding of a secret', e.g., in the \(\text{MN}\) the verse

---

1. In the \(\text{MS}\) the fourth Aṅga is Vilobhana and Samāhiti or Samādghana stands seventh. But in the ND has clarified at the outset that the order of these Aṅgas, unless it is so specified, is not binding.
2. Sam (well)+\(\overline{A}\) (on all sides)+\(\overline{\text{bhā}}\) (to put or to nourish).
Astapaeta....etc., (I,25) uttered by the bard reveals the identity of Udayana.

The view is evidently held by the DR\(^1\). The illustration too is from the DR. The ND gives another illustration from Rāmacandra's own work Rāghavābhyudaya where, too, such concealed identity is revealed\(^2\).

6. Karana - is commencing to do what is appropriate to the occasion, e.g., in the Vepī (Act I), Sahadeva and Bhīma declare to proceed to fight against the Kurus\(^3\).

The ND here mentions the view of some\(^4\) who define Karana as removal (destruction) of calamities by blessings or other means, e.g., in the Vepī, Draupadī wishes the welfare of Bhīma by conferring a blessing with the words, "May bliss attend on you, as on Hari, prepared for battle against demons".\(^5\)

But most of the works agree with the first view which the ND accepts. The NDR calls this limb as Kāraṇa though its definition and the illustration are not different.

---

1. Cf. DR I, 29b.
2. Cf. ND, p. 63. It is possible to see the influence of the RTS on Rāmacandra here when he creates an almost similar situation in his play.
3. The same illustration is found in Abhī. III, p.41 and also DR, p.10.
4. It is not quite clear as to whose view the ND refers to here.
5. Vide Vepī, p.23.
7. **Vilobhana** - consists in supporting a person in his desire to do a particular thing by means of praise, e.g., in the **Veni** (p. 19) Draupadi pays a handsome tribute to Dhīma by saying "What is difficult, my lord, for you to accomplish when (once) you are violently enraged?"¹

The ND has followed Abhinava here. The latter remarks that this limb and the first three (viz., Upākṣepa, Parikara and Parīnyāsa) occur usually in the Mukha only. The NS has put it after Parīnyāsa and so the ND remarks that it occurs after Parīnyāsa only but it is not mentioned after Parīnyāsa as Vilobhana can occur in other samhitas also.

8. **Bhadana**². It is the exit of the characters on the stage. When the characters (on the stage) leave the stage in pursuance of some end or the other it is known as Bhadana, e.g., in the **Veni** the powerful speech of Dhīma declaring the heroism of the sons of Pāṇḍu in the battle-field results into the exit of Sahadeva (and Dhīma also) from the stage³.

---

¹ ND, p. 64. Abhi too gives the same illustration. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 58. DK gives Veni. I, 22 as the instance of this Anga.

² The NS (also the DK) calls it Bheda.

³ Here ND has followed the Abhi. The illustration is also drawn from the Abhi. Cf. Abhi III, p. 42.
The ND mentions here the view of others who define it as "encouraging the person". The Veni illustrates the point when Draupadi asks Bhima to be rather careful in the battlefield and guard his person well.

The ND mentions still a third view according to which Bhedana consists in the expedient of sowing dissension among the foes who have joined together and who bar the appearance of fruit from the seed.

9. Praapta - is defined as "obtainment of pleasure or what would bring happiness; e.g., in the Veni Bhima is happy to learn from the Kañcukin, that Kṛṣṇa has failed

1. The view referred to here belongs to none else but the DR. The illustration given here is also in accordance with that of DR. cf. Avaloka; p. 11.
3. It is not quite clear as to whose view exactly the ND is referring to here. The ND does nothing more but mentioning it. It does not illustrate. Shri G.K. Shrigandkhar considers this to be the view of the DR (vide, ND: Preface p. 6) but the view is not found in the DR. It may probably refer to Bhoja who defines it as "Saṁghātarūpabhedaḥ."

The NS defines the limb as Saṁghatābhedaṁrtha i.e. disruption of the union (NS (KM)XIX, 73). The word is open to a double interpretation. The ND has followed the one given by Abhirava, viz., 'dispersal of characters under one reason or the other' while others seem to have interpreted it differently (i.e. disrupting the enemies).

4. The NS calls it Prāpti.
to settle the feud peacefully 1.

A particular Anga is at times repeated in one and the same Sandhi in order to provide striking or extraordinary speech in abundance. In the Venī, this same Anga is repeated in the words of Bhīma, viz., "Shall I not destroy the hundred Fāfuravas in the battle through rage? Shall I not drink the blood of Duhāśana from his chest? Shall I not crush with mace the thighs of Suyodhana? May your king make peace on (that) condition 2, which give great pleasure to Draupadī, and hence an illustration of Krāpaṇa.

10. Yukti - consists in pondering over the action or the task to be accomplished with proper discrimination taking into full consideration the merits and demerits or advantages and disadvantages of the same.

The ND illustrates from the Udāttarāghava where Lākaśmaṇa ponders over the act of Kaikeyī and Bharata. 3

11. Vidhāṇa - When happiness and misery are represented in one character or different characters we have Vidhāṇa. Vidhāṇa is of four types.

2. Venī, I, 15. The illustration seems to have been cited, following the DR. Cf. DR, p. 8. Abbi cites another illustration, of course, from the same work Venī.
3. Vide ND, p. 66.
(1) Happiness and misery are found in one character.

(ii) Happiness and misery are found in different characters.

(iii) In one character there is only happiness.

(iv) In one character there is only misery.

The ND illustrates this from the Nāg (I, 19) where Madhava says, "That heart of mine which in her presence was benumbed with astonishment,....and which was stupified with joy as if from a plunge into nectar, now writhes as if touched by live-coal." Here there is an experience of happiness and misery both.

This Aṅga is to be distinguished from Prāpāṇa or Prāpti which also implies attainment of happiness. In fact Prāpti indicates the search for happiness, or the object of happiness, while in Vidhāna the happiness is just at hand and it belongs to one character only.

12. **Paribhāvanā** - is astonishment or rather curiosity arising out of the desire to know what a particular thing is. Just as in the Nāgarāṇḍa when the heroine is seen by the hero he begins to imagine who she is\(^1\).

Looking to the form of this Aṅga and the illustration of the ND we are immediately reminded of the figure of speech called Sandheha. It is probable that some of the Aṅgas like

---

this later on developed into figures.

Now let us consider the Āngas of Pratimukha Sandhi. They are thirteen in all. Here the order is not so important. The first eight Āngas may or may not have scope in this Sandhi depending upon the nature of the subject matter. The remaining five ought to be necessarily employed in this Sandhi". 1

13. Vilāsa - is the desire of man and woman for the pleasure of Love. The ND illustrates from the Sak.(II,1-2) where Duṣyanta expresses his desire for Sakuntalā.

This Āṅga must be employed in the beginning of Pratimukha only. Whatever sentiment has been delineated in Mukha, the same has to be developed by the Vibhāvas etc. of that Rasa. The same love as is depicted in Mukha in amorous dramas (whose fruit is acquisition of love) is developed in Pratimukha by the aid of Vilāsa. In dramas dominated by heroic sentiment Vilāsa stands for energy (Utsāha) etc.2

1. ND I, 46-47.
Similar illustrations are quoted from Rāmacandra's own plays - the Nāℓa and the Kaumudi.\(^1\)

Here the ND criticizes the love-scene between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī found in the Venī which is a drama of heroic sentiment. The ND has clearly pointed out that in a heroic drama Vilāsa should not be taken to mean amorous sport as love has little scope there and so the Vilāsa depicted in the Venī in the midst of war is highly improper. The ND quotes in support of the view a Kārika from the Dhvanyāloka,\(^2\) viz., "Sandhis and Sandhyāngas are to be employed with a view to developing Rasa and not merely to fulfil the conditions of the Sāstra.\(^3\)

The love-scene in the Venī has been a subject of criticism by most of the rhetoricians. Abhinava\(^4\) criticizes it in the particular context, so too Rāmacandra. The ND simply reproduces this criticism.

---

2. The criticism of the love scene in the Venī is also found in Dhv. p. 265.
14. Dhūnana\(^1\) - is a slight disrespect shown to the request made. The ND illustrates from the Pārthavījaya where Yudhishṭhira persuades Bhīma to help Duryodhana who was captured by Citrasena but Bhīma refuses to help him who was the doer of so many misdeeds.

The ND refers to the view of some who define Dhūnana as despondency (Arāti)\(^2\). The ND includes it under Rodha.

15. Rodha is (frustration) or despondency on account of the hindrances in the way of obtaining the desired object. The ND illustrates from the Devī where the speech of Rāmagupta addressed to Candragupta (disguised as a woman) giving vent to his love for him is taken by Dhruvadevi as one addressed to a lady and she is highly distressed.

16. Saṅtvana - is pacification of an angry person. The illustration is given from the RBhā where Rāvaṇa, who is infuriated by the unpleasant words of Mārica and therefore girds up his loins to send him to heaven, is pacified by Prahasta. In the speech of Mārica there is another limb called Vajra which consists in a cruel remark. Vajra is explained later on.\(^3\) This clearly indicates that the order followed

---

1. The NS and the DR call it Vidhūta.
2. The view referred to is held by the DR. Cf. DR I, 33a.
3. ND, p. 79.
does not have any significance. One more hint that we get here is that it often happens that one limb may go to develop the other. Limbs are often mutually connected. Thus Sāntvana and Vajra have a special relation.

Sāntvana implies pacification of anger. This anger is naturally caused by some unpleasant or haughty talk. In this case Vajra becomes the cause of Sāntvana. We can also establish the fact that Vajra should generally be succeeded by Sāntvana as Bharata prohibits the scenes of actual violence on the stage. The playwright may suggest the battle by sending them out of the stage in the heat of anger.

The NS (And the DR) calls this limb Paryupāsamā. Which is defined as pacification of the furious¹.

17. Varnasambhuti - occurs when a host of characters like the hero, the heroine, helpmates, etc., assemble together. Varna here means the characters so called as they are described (Vargyante) (as gathering for the accomplishment of a particular object when otherwise they are generally separated.)

The example is cited from the RTN. Act III, where many characters meet viz., the king, the jester, Sāgarikā (heroine) and Susaṃgata (her friend).²

---

1. NS (GOS) XIX: 80.
The ND here mentions the view of others who understand
the word Varna as four castes, such as Brahmin, Ksatriya, etc.,
and there is an assemblance of two, three or four of these
Varnas at one and the same place.

This view is obviously held by the DR which defines it
as an assembly of the four castes¹ and gives the same
illustration as given above by the ND.

There is still a third view which defines Varnasambara as
'repudiation of the described object.' Varna is taken to
mean 'varnita artha' (described object) and Samhāra to mean
(Sam+hṛ to suppress to withdraw suppressing, withdrawing,
repudiating.

The view seems to refer to the NIR². The illustration
is cited from the Veni. Where Bhānumati asks Pūryodhana to
avert the evil effect of the falling of flag of the chariot
by the loud recital of the Vedas by Brahmans³.

It is quite clear that theorists differ on the meaning of
the word Varna. Abhinava severely criticizes the view, who

1. Cf. DR I, 35. cd.
2. NIR, p. 30.
take the word Varṇa to mean four castes. Considering it to be futile. It can be easily perceived that a drama has more concern with the characters rather than their castes, and hence the view has to be rejected, as Abhinava remarks, looking to the secular atmosphere of drama.

18. वर्मा - is laughter or joke for the sake of sport or enjoyment². Its essence is humour.

The ND gives three illustrations from the RTM (Act II) which comprise jokes between the jester and the king and between Susaṅgata and Sāgarikā. The purpose of selecting three illustrations from one and the same work is stated to be that it is possible to employ one and the same Sandhyānga again and again. Similarly the ND gives three humorous illustrations of Varmā from Vāmacandra’s own work. NLV, e. g., when the king asks Lambastani to take her seat, the Vīḍuṣaṇaka humorously points out that the seat was too weak for her to sit and advises her to sit with care³A.

1. Yat tu brahmaṇādīvarpa caṇṭṭayamelanam iti tad aphaḷatvād anāḍṵtyam aṁva.-Abhi. III, p.47.
2. The DR too gives a similar definition. Cf. DR I, 33c.
3A. Vide ND, p. 75.
19. **Narmadyuti** - When that particular humorous speech is meant to cover over some fault it is called Narmadyuti, e.g. in the RTN (Act II) where Vidūṣaka styles gāthā as a Vedic metre in his attempt to hide his ignorance and excites king's laughter.¹

The ND mentions another view under the phrase 'Anye Āhuh,' according to which it (Narmadyuti) means 'joy produced by Narma i.e. humorous remark.' This, again, is the view of the DR². The view is illustrated by the RTN (Act II, p. 54) where sāgarikā outwardly expresses her anger at the words of Susaṅgatā that she did not leave her anger even when the king held her by the hand.

The ND concludes this discussion by a useful remark, viz., these two limbs (Nos. 18 and 19) are to be employed in dramas of love only, because humour fits in them only as their dominant upātti is kaiśikī which represents love (and humour)³.

---

1. ND, p. 76. Abhi. Also Cf. III, p. 35d. Mark specially the lines commenting upon that as given by ND which agree with Abhi. almost literally (ND, p. 76, lines 7-9).

2. Cf. the definition of DR I, 35d and the illustration that follows.

20. **Tapana** - (NS-Tapana) is perceiving of a calamity or danger. The illustration is given from the *Parthavijaya* where Kanuki cries for help to save the queen of Duryodhana assaulted by Gandharvas and immediately Yudhisthira takes up his bow in haste.

The ND mentions another view which does not regard this Tapana as limb but read Samana instead, which is defined as pacification of anger (or anxiety or distress) and averting the evil or danger.

This view is found in the DR which does not recognize Tapana but reads Śama instead and defines it as alleviation of uneasiness or anxiety or despondency (Arāti). The illustrations, of course, differ, the ND's is from the *Parthavijaya* and the DR's from the RTN. Moreover, the ND gives two types of Samana, viz., pacification of anger, etc., and alleviation of uneasiness. The DR ignores the former.

21. **Puspa** - When a sentence uttered excels the one formerly uttered that is known as puspa. Just as a flower

---

1. Vide ND, p. 76-77.
2. Cf. DR I, 33.
3. The definition echoes the NS; Cf. NS XIX, 80.
decorates the hair, in the same way here the later sentence
decorates the earlier one. 1 The ND illustrates from the
Vilakṣaduryodhana where Bhīṣma describing the battle remarks -
"Formerly we who were in a great number ready to fight with our
weapons saw only one (Arjuna) but afterwards we saw as may
Arjuna's as we were."

22. Pragamana (Pragayana, 2 Prājaman3) is a series of
questions and answers. There should be two at least in the
series. It should consist of clever arguments or witty
speeches. It ought to be such as may reveal some important
aspect of the plot, character or sentiment, e.g., in the Nīlī
the interesting dialogue between Nala and Damayantī where Nala
refuses to leave Damayantī's hand as it had thrown Nala into the
fire of separation by drawing her portrait. The dialogue
ultimately reveals the mutual love between Nala and Damayantī4.

This limb may be compared with the Vīthyaṅga named Vākkelī 5
which is also defined as a 'series of questions and answers -
a humorous dialogue'.

2. DR, p. 14 F. II.
3. NS (KM), pp. 314, 316.
23. **Va.1ra** is a cruel remark made to one's face. It smashesh the former speech or action of the opposite party. An apt illustration is provided by the quarrel between Karna and Asvatthama in the Veṇī. Act III. The ND also illustrates from the Krtyārāvana and the Raghuvilāsa.

24. **Uparāyana** - is an argument or a trick in order to accomplish a particular object. The ND illustrates from the KTR where Śītā who firstly refused to get into the royal car of Rāvana was made to do so by threatening her that if she did not obey, he would cut the heads of Brahmans in her presence.

The SD defines this as 'conciliation or propitiation (Prasādana).

25. **Anusarāpana** - is the pursuing of a desired object, which though once seen has been lost for the time being. The illustration is given from the Pārthavijaya where Draupadi who had forgotten her insult by Duhśāsana with the passage of time again remembers it.

The NS mentions this limb as Parisarpa, but the definition does not differ materially from that given by the ND.

After this the ND turns to the limbs of Garbha. They are thirteen in number. The ND here notes that the first
eight of the thirteen are subsidiary while the remaining five are principal.

26. **Samgraha** - (Propitiation). It consists in the use of conciliatory words (Sāma), giving of a gift (Dāna) causing dispute (Bheda), punishment (Dānda), fraud, magic, etc. The illustration is given from the RTW (Act III) where the king is pleased with the Viddāśaka and gives a gold bracelet in return.

The DR too gives the same illustration from the RTW.

The ND illustrates Bheda and Dānda also from the Raghuvilāsa.

27. **Rūpa** - is a statement embodying doubt regarding the true nature of something. Rūpa implies indefinite form. This form is different from Yukti (of Mukha) which has a definite form and consists in pondering over an action or a task to be accomplished.

The ND illustrates from the KTR where Rāma, not recognizing Jaṭāyu first, says "Is it a mountain with its wings cut off by Indra? Is it eagle, the son of Vināṭa, cut off by demon -

---

1. RTW, p. 65. This illustration is found in Abhi. III, p. 89.
2. Vide DR, p. 18.
3. Vide ND, pp. 82-83.
kings who are his enemies? Or is it dead Jatâyu...? "etc.

It is easy to see here that this limb corresponds to the figure of speech called 'sandha' and very probably this limb might have later on developed into the figure of speech of that kind.

This limb can very well be compared with the limb Paribhāvanā of Mukha Saṃdhī, where too a similar doubt arises in the mind of the person on seeing an object of beauty. Still their difference can very well be seen from the actual illustrations quoted by the MD. In paribhāvanā the person is dazzled, as it were, by the extraordinary beauty of the object in front and suspects it to be some unearthly creature, while in Rūpa there is a doubt about the real nature of the thing on account of several reasons such as the distance, as a result of which the object is not very clearly perceived. Thus this limb (Rūpa) is much nearer to the figure sasandhāa.

The MD gives another view. Rūpa is a remark embodying a doubt or apprehension. The illustration is from the RTW (Act III) where the king fears whether the love affair might have been known to the queen.

Clearly enough this view belongs to none else but the DR. The DR (p. 17) gives the same illustration too. This definition of Rūpa much resembles Yukti which consists of thinking over
an action or task with proper discrimination.

According to the third view Rūpa or Rūpaka means 'a speech with striking sense'\(^1\). The illustration that they quote is the novel description of war as given by Sundaraka in the Veni.

The Nīśa defines Rūpa as a hypothesis having a striking sense, corresponding to the above view, but illustrates it from the RTT, III,2.

28. Anumāna - is an inference or deduction on the basis of characteristic sign (liṅga or Hetu)\(^2\).

The ND, following the Abhi\(^3\), points out the distinction between Anumāna and Yuktī that in the former there is a definite conclusion or decision while in the latter there is merely a surmise or guessing. Thus the two are totally distinct.\(^4\)

1. It is not quite clear as to whose view is mentioned here. NS (GOG) Vol. III too in the foot note on p. 48 mentions the same view.

It seems on a closer analysis that according to this view, Rūpa will mean a novel or graphic description, thus forming the base of Svabhāvokti.

2. The definition of the ND seems to be more scientific than that of the NS which defines it as conception of a thing on the basis of a similar one. Cf. NS (GOG) XIX, 85. Here the word Rūpa is rather confusing.


4. Cf. ND, p. 84.
The MD illustrates this from the Svapna-vasavadatta of Bhāsa finding slab in the Śephālikā bower warm and the flowers crushed under feet Udayara infers that some one who was already sitting there has left the place instantly seeing him arrive.1

A similar instance is quoted from the Yāḍavābhyaudaya2.

It is easy to see that this limb later on develops into the figure Ānumāṇa.

29. Prārthana - is an entreaty or request for love, joy, festivity, etc., appropriate to the ultimate end or fruit to be obtained. The MD illustrates from the Devīcandrāgupta, Act IV where the hero entreats Mādhavasena for the union,3 and the KTR where Laksmana prays for prosperity.4

The MD mentions the view of 'others' who define it as mere entreaty or request of any kind,5 e.g., in the RV a demon having assumed the form of Hanumāt's father requests

1. In fact this verse is not found in the Svapna, that is available at present.
2. Vide MD p. 84.
3. Vide, ND p. 91.
5. The view seems to belong to the NIL (p. 32).
Rāvana to forgive all the faults that the child has committed such as the destruction of the garden, killing of Akṣa, etc.

Some do not accept this limb as well as the earlier one, viz., Anumāna. The DR does not recognize Prārthanā but does accept Anumāna.

30. Udāṛtī - is an exaggerated speech. The MD, following the Abhiś, illustrates it from the RTN III, 2, where Udayana wonders as to how mind which is by its very nature unsteady and difficult to be hit is smitten by cupid by all his arrows simultaneously².

The PP illustrates from the RTNM, where Vidūṣaka says that the king will be pleased more by hearing the good news than he would be by acquiring the domain of causalas³.

The word Udāṛtī in common parlance is used in the sense of illustration but here it conveys a special sense; 'Ud' is in the sense of 'excellence' and ā-ṛ-, means 'to speak'.

1. RS & DR call it Udāharana.
2. The illustration contains an element of contrast and thus forms the figure Virodha. The same illustration is found in Abhiś, III, p. 64.
3. RTNM, p. 64.
This sort of exaggeration is at the root of all figures of speech.

31. **Krama** - is the discovering of the feeling of another person by one's imagination and intelligence. The MD illustrates it from the Devicandragupta where Candragupta reads the feeling of Dhruvadevi, and the RHN where the king describes the peculiar helpless state of Sāgarikā. The latter example agrees with that of the Abhi.

The MD mentions the view of 'others' who define it as 'the acquisition of an object which is already being thought of', e.g., in the RHN, Vidūṣaṇa arranges a meeting between the King and Sāgarikā who was already being thought of.

The MD refers to still another view according to which Krama means acquisition of the future object. The illustration is found in the Veda when Kṛṣṇa points out to Duryodhana that the son of Drona has resolved to bear the huge burden of war.

---

1. Cf. Saśā Sarvatra Vākrotīlla... 6, 85.  
2. **ID, pp. 85-86**, the definition echoes 66 x92, 84.  
3. **ID, p. 86.**  
5. The view belongs to the NR and the illustration also is the same.
Being invested with supreme command by Duryodhana he is capable of uprooting the three worlds even, what to talk about the forces of Yudhisthira? Clearly this view refers to the <hlr>. The illustration is also the same as given by the <hlr>.

32. **Udvega** - fear caused by thieves, kings, enemies or the heroine (i.e. the elder queen), etc. The ND illustrates from the Citratpalavalmabita of Sakukaka where the heroine, her friends, old men and others express their fear on account of the attack of the Dasyus. In the Mrachakatika Carudatta is afraid of the king on account of the charge of theft levelled against him. The definition of the NS runs as follows, "The fear from King's enemies or Dasyus is known as Udvega". The ND has followed this. The ND in the explanation adds the fear from the elder queen too. This is in accordance with the Abhi. The Abhi. takes the word 'enemy' in the sense of "the queen". In a drama of love the enemies cannot have much scope. There the word should be taken in the sense of those who put obstacles on the path of the hero in his love-affair. The Abhi. accordingly

1. [NIR, p. 32].
2. Cf. [ND, p. 87].
illustrates from the RTN where the king and the Vidūṣaka dread the arrival of the queen Vāsavadattā. The ND following Abhinava, adds the word Nāyīkā in the explanation.

The ND adds another instance of Udvega from the RTN where Sāgarikā through the fear of the queen makes up her mind to commit suicide.

33. Vidrava - is apprehension of some obstacle or dreadful object. It is so called because it causes the heart to melt or soften. Udvega implies the danger that has already approached while Vidrava implies the possibility of the attack. The ND illustrates from the KTR (Act VI) where Rāvana, while in Śāntigṛha, hears the words, "O lord, save, save". A maid comes there and Rāvana asks her to report what the matter is. Here Rāvana has the apprehension.

The ND here criticizes the view of those who recognize Sambhrama instead of Vidrava, defining it as fear and trembling. This view is held by the DR. This Sambhrama is included in the two Aṅges, Vidrava and Udvega.

1. Cf. RTN III, p. 75.
2. Cf. RTN III, p. 78.
3. Cf. DR I, 42 b.
34. Ākṣepa\(^1\) - is the revelation of the germ which is employed in Prāptyāśā and which is the cause of the final attainment of the fruit, e.g., in the Veṇī the charioteer speaks "Droṇa could not save the king of Sindhus from the son of Prthū, though he had promised him freedom from fear. Here on Duhāśana, as on a deer, has been perpetrated an atrocious deed by Bhīmasena. Having fulfilled on the battle-field, even the difficult-to-be-accomplished vow of the enemy, Fate, which is adverse to the family of the Kurus, is not satisfied even with this\(^2\).

Here the ND gives another alternative explanation, viz., when the Bīja which is the desire concealed in one's heart is brought out it is known as Ākṣepa, just as in the ETN the words of the king, who takes Vāsavadatta as his dear Sāgarikā and describes her beauty reveal the secret love of the king for Sāgarikā\(^3\).

The ND adds here that 'some' do not recognize this limb\(^4\).

---

1. NS calls it Ākṣipti.
2. Veṇī. IV, 2.
3. ETN III, 11.
4. It is difficult to trace who are the persons referred to here as *Kecit.*
35. *Adhibala* - is defined as 'superiority of intellectual power or superiority of fraud or cunningness'\(^1\). The ND explains that when of the two persons bent upon deceiving each other if one succeeds by virtue of his superior strength, intelligence, friends, etc., it forms an instance of Adhibala, so called because there is superiority (Adhi) of strength (Bala) in the matter of fraud\(^2\).

The illustration is given from the FTN where the king pours out all his imagination and poetic fancy of a lover before Vasavadatta with the words "Does not her moon-like face cause the beauty of the day-lotus to fade? Does it not bring delight to the eyes?" etc.\(^3\)

Here the king has been deceived by Vasavadatta dressed as Sagarika on account of the stupidity of the Vidusaka.\(^4\)

---

1. Here the two readings betray a double meaning. The actual definition is 'chulāchikya'. i.e. superiority of cunningness which fully agrees with the definition of the KS which defines it as deceiving by fraud (Cf. NS XIX, 37) but in the commentary while explaining the definition, the word is replaced by Bala i.e. power such as that of the intellect.

2. The explanation of ND follows Abhi. III, p. 57.


4. The same illustration is found in Abhi.
Others, note the ND, define Adhibala as fruitlessness or failure of the deceit or fraud e. g., in the RTN the king entreats the queen, "O queen! Here shall I, who am full of shame, wipe off with my head the reddish tint of your feet caused by red lac; but that caused by your anger can be removed only if compassion be shown to me". ¹

Here the efforts of the king to deceive Vasavadatta do not meet with success².

The ND refers to still a third view according to which Adhibala consists in a sentence embodying taunt.³ An illustration is quoted from the Vānd where Bhīma tauntingly remarks to Dhṛtarāṣṭra that he ought not to be furious for

¹. RTN III, 14.

². This view seems to refer to the NLR or the DR. The definition by the NLR verbally agrees with the view even though the illustrations differ (Vide NLR, p. 32). The DR supplies two definitions of Adhibala. According to one definition Adhibala constitutes deceit (Adhisāmdhi), while according to the other Adhibala consists in overturning the plot or rendering others' plan fruitless. The same illustration as quoted by the ND is found in the DR too. The two views do not differ substantially. According to both, in Adhibala there is an element of fraud or deceit as one party tries to befool the other and the one having superior intellect succeeds.

³. Vide ND, p. 90. It is difficult to trace whose view is referred to here.
he himself was the witness of the great (!) deed performed
by his sons in pulling Draupadi by her hair in the assembly
and that they had received their due.1

36. Marga - is speaking out what is true. In its
gloss the ND points out that a sentence embodying truth when
applied to the relevant context is called Marga. The ND
illustrates from Rāmacandra’s own work Rāghurilāsa: (Act IV)
where Rāvana gives out the truth that path of love is
peculiar and indiscriminate as Sītā abjured from Rāvana,
the Lord of Lanka, who removed the pride of even the gods,
and loved Rāma who lived the life of a forester.

37. Asatyāhāraṇa3 - is deception or fraud. The
illustration is from the Māl. where the Vidūsaka feigning a
serpent-bite explains that as he wanted to see the queen
he went to the pleasure-garden to collect flowers for the
customary offering. There he was bitten by a venomous snake
on the finger.

2. The definition literally follows HS* (GCS) XIX, 83.
3. HS (DR too) calls it Abhūtāhāraṇa.
This though he was not actually bitten by the serpent he pretends and thus deceives the people.

38. Totaka - (Totaka-SD) is a speech full of excitement or agitation due to anger, joy, and the like. It is so called because it breaks (wounds) the heart ('Tut' (causal) to break) 1.

The ND illustrates from the Raghuvilāsa (Act IV) where Rāvana is overjoyed in anticipation of Sitā's love. 2 This is a speech full of emotion caused by the excess of a particular feeling or emotion in one's heart.

Now the ND turns to the thirteen limbs of Avamarsa. The first nine of these, beginning with Drava, are employed according to the need or occasion while the remaining four are used prominently.

39. Drava - is disrespect to the respectable person 3, e.g., in the RTN, disregarding the husband who was personally present, Vāsavadatta puts into fetters Vīdūṣaka and Sāgarikā. 4

---

1. Toṭayatī bhīnatti ḫrdayam iti-ND, p. 91; also Cf. Abhi. III, p. 51.
3. Vide NS XIX, 90; DR I, 45.
4. ND takes this illustration from Abhi. III, p. 53.
40. Prasānda - is mentioning the great (i.e., one's elders) in a revered manner. Just as in the Vēṇī. Yudhiṣṭhira remembers his worthy ancestors and pays homage to them by offering them libations of water¹.

The ND mentions another view according to which Prasānda means 'an irrelevant speech', e.g., in the Vēṇī. Yudhiṣṭhira laments the death of Bhīma (being deceived by the demon in the disguise of an ascetic)—

"That destroyer of Kīcaka, slayer of Baka, Hidimba, and Kirmīra, your loved husbands, my younger brother, and the elder brother of Arjuna has passed away, it is reported".²

Here the grief of Yudhiṣṭhira is out of place as the death of Bhīma was merely a rumour spread by the demon.

It may be noted here that the view referred to here belongs to Bhoja³. The illustration too is the same in the SP.

41. Sampatha - (altercation) is an angry speech, e.g., in the Vēṇī. the passage which reports exchange of hot words between Bhīma and Duryodhana⁴. The ND illustrates also from

¹ Vide Vēṇī, VI, p. 181.
² Cf. Vēṇī. VI, 18.
³ Cf. SP (MS), Pp. 222-223; also Cf. NLR, p. 35.
⁴ Cf. Vēṇī. VI, 10-11.
the YBb. Act VII, where there is an exchange of hot words between Balabhadra and Nārada.

42. **Apavāda** is censure of one's own faults or of others. Thus Apavāda is of two types—(1) finding one's own fault, e. g., in the Pūspadūṣitaka the Brahmin abhors his own self. (ii) Finding the faults of others, e. g., in the Raghuvilāśa Act VII, Kārica exposes the faults of Kāvana.

43. **Chādana**—(Sādana-NIR) is the wiping out of one's own insult. In the RTH Sāgarikā wishes, when the magic fire blazes forth, that it was her good luck that the burning fire would put an end to all her miseries.

Here the ND mentions the view of others who hold that Chādana means an enduring of an insult in order to attain a particular object, e. g., in a play called Anāgasenāharinandin (written by Sūktivāsakumāra) the hero Harinandin brought ill name for himself by accepting the crime of theft with a view to saving the Brahmin.

This view has been followed by the SD. Bharata defines it as a statement or speech arising out of disgrace and made with some purpose.

---

2. Cf. ND, p. 41.
3. RTH IV, The illustration seems to be taken from Abhi. III, p. 56.
Others do not recognize this limb and read 'Chalana' instead, which is defined as 'insult', e.g., in the RBh, the insult of Sītā by forsaking her constitutes Chalana.

Others define Chalana as 'infatuation' (Vyāmoha), e.g., in the HBṭa, the 'Insul' of Sita by forsaking her constitutes Chalam.

In the Venī VI, the demon in the disguise of an ascetic deceives the king Yudhiṣṭhira and Draupadī and as a result both fall into a swoon.

44. Dyūti implies censure (or rebuking). The ND illustrates it from the Kṛtyāravāna where Angada rebukes Kandodari thus:

"O foolish one, why are you crying? Who can save you who have come in the cage in the form of my two arms like a doe fallen in the lap of a lion?"

Here the ND mentions the view of 'Some' who define it as Tarjana (reprimanding or threatening pointing to the contempt or ridicule) and Udvejana (hurting the feelings, frightening) and others who define it as Tarjana and...

1. The reference is to the DR as it does not recognize the above limb. Even the illustration from Rāmābhhyudaya agrees with that of the DR.
2. It is difficult to see who held this view.
3. Cf. DR 1, 46 b.
Adhārṣāna (burtinig) but both the views take Dyuti as any remark which is directly or indirectly meant to insult and thus are included into the above-mentioned-definition of the ND.

45. Kheda - is fatigue, physical as well as mental, e.g., in the Vikram, Purūravas says, "O I am tired. Let me enjoy the cold breezes coming over the ripples on the bank of the mountain-river." This suggests physical fatigue. Mental exhaustion is suggested in the RV Act VII, where Rāvana was disheartened to hear the news of his kinsmen being over-powered by Rāma inspite of the fact that he who had performed marvellous feats of valour was alive.

At times this exhaustion may be physical and mental as well.1

The ND makes a note here. In fact Śrama or Kheda, Udvega, Vātaka are Vyabhicāris, still they are mentioned in the list of Sandhyāṅgas also in order to strengthen a particular Rasa.

46. Virodha2 - is an impediment or obstacle in the way of attaining the desired aim, e.g., in the KTR Act VII the

1. Vide ND, p. 97.
2. MS & DR (I, 47b) call it Virodha; Abhi. calls it Nirodhana Cf. Abhi. III, p. 55.
chamberlain tells Laksmana, Vibhishana, and others that Sita herself entered into fire on seeing the head of Rama fraudulently created by the magical powers of Ravana. This forms a serious impediment in the task of bringing Sita back.

Here the ND points out that some do not recognize Kheda and Virodha and mention Vidrava and Vicalana instead. Here the Vidrava is taken to mean slaughter, binding etc., e.g., in the Chalitarama we find a verse illustrating Vidrava where lava is described to have been captured by the opponents. The resolve of killing can be illustrated from the MRC (Act X) where Carudatta is taken to the gallows. A simultaneous binding, killing (by fire) is perceived in the RTN as Vasavadatta cries out "My lord, I did not say that for my sake. Here is Sagarika perishing restrained with a

1. It is quite obvious that by 'Anye' here the ND seems to refer to the DR which mentions Vidrava and Vicalana still however one point has to be remembered here. The DR does not mention Kheda but does mention Virodhana which it defines as angry speech. It is difficult to understand in this case the difference between Virodha and Saipheta which also means angry speech. The illustrations of both as given by the DR do not differ in purport (or sense).

2. Vide ND, p. 93.
obtain by my cruel self and thus forms an instance of Vidrava.

Vidrava occurs even when haste or confusion is implied. Just as in the Veni. Yudhishthira says, "Who, who is there? Bring the bow together with the quiver. Is there no attendant here?". This clearly shows haste and confusion.

Vicalana means bragging on account of valour, family, learning, physical charms, good fortune, etc., e.g., in the Veni. Arjuna addresses Bhurtarāstra and Gāndhāri as follows:

"O father, O mother, here is bowing to you the middle Pāṇḍava, the killer of that son of Hādi in the battle-front, on whom all the hopes of conquering the enemies were fixed by your sons and who in his pride had defied the world as if it were like straw."

Here Arjuna waxes eloquent over his great feat and hence it is Vicalana.

1. RTN, p. 104.
2. The definition is in accordance with the DR which defines it as bragging. The illustration that follows, also, is verbally copied from the DR; cf. DR, p. 26.
It will be easily seen that in this case Vicalana becomes identical with Samrađbha which is defined as 'proclamation of one's own power'.

47. Samrađbha - is proclaiming of one's own strength or power, e.g., in the Venī, Bhīma thunders (before Duryodhana) "O fool! That you were made to give vent to your sorrow, like a woman, by means of your tears and that you were made to witness the tearing of the chest of your brother - this is the reason why you, an unworthy king, were allowed to live (so long), when Bhīmasena, an elephant to the lotus-pond of your family, was enraged" and a similar angry reply by Duryodhana2. There need not be wrath or anger, e. g., in the Venī (VI, 6) Yudhīśthira's speech to Draupadī describing the valour of Bhīma is devoid of wrath.

The ND explains the difference between Samāphata and the Samrađbha. In the former there is simply an angry speech while in the latter there is a proclamation of one's strength also.

The DR does not mention Samrađbha but its definition of Vicalana resembles this limb.

1. ND, p. 99.
2. Venī V, 33-34; (ND, p. 99). The same has been quoted by the DR to illustrate Virodhara (DE, p. 25.)
48. **Sakti** - is that limb where pacification of one who is angry is made by one's power of intellect, or when the angry foe is completely destroyed, e.g., in the RTN (IV, I) the king's speech shows that the anger of Vāsavadattā standing in the way of the acquisition of Sāgarikā is pacified; or in the KṣR (Act VII) we find the utterance, "Alas, Rāma of great valour has like Pralaya sportively felled down Rāvaṇa like a mountain with (high) peaks". Here the destruction of Rāvaṇa is mentioned.

Some define Sakti as "pacification of opposition" ¹. The illustration is from the UTR (VI, 11)² where Lava's opposition to Candraketu and his army is removed or allayed at the sight of Rāma.

Here some regard another limb called Bhāvāntara which occurs when the expressed intention is quite opposite to the real intention, e.g., in the Tāpāsavatsarāja (Act VI) Yeugandharāyaṇa, who really wants Vāsavadattā to refrain from ending her life, says, however, "Vinitaka, make a pyre". Here the act of making a pyre which is opposed to his intention of saving Vāsavadattā is performed with a different view altogether.

¹. The view refers to DR. Vide DR, p. 23.
². The same illustration is quoted by the DR (p. 23).
There are others who do not recognize Sakti but read Ājñā instead, which they define as 'an order' through anger without considering appropriateness or otherwise of the same. The illustration given is from the KTR, which forms a dialogue between Dārunikā and Trijata.

Trijata - "What do you say, Dārunikā?"

Dārunikā - "Venerable Trijata, let the unalterable order of the lord ( Rāvana ) fall on my person, but I will not perpetrate this heinous act."

T. - "Still you are called Dārunikā."

(From behind the curtain).

"O Trijata, here is your dear friend Sītā, desirous of entering fire, with a view to putting an end to her life having seen the illusory bead of her husband."

T. - "O I am doomed, unfortunate as I am. May, by good luck, the order of the king not be executed."

This suggests that Rāvana had ordered Dārunikā to kill Sītā.

There are thus differences of opinion regarding the subdivisions in all Sandhis and these different views are
to be considered authentic as they have been recognized by the old authorities and as they constitute varieties of striking speech.

49. Prarocanā— is the representation of the accomplishment of the desired object in advance which is to follow in the Nirvahpa Sandhi. It is so called because the object of the play is shown here in bright colours (Pra + Ruc). The illustration is cited from the Venī where the braiding of Draupadī's hair and coronation of Yudhīśthira are represented in advance as accomplished when Pāncałaka says, "Enough of doubt. Let the jars, studded with jewels, be filled with water for your coronation. And let Kṛṣṇa hold festivity at (the near prospect of) the tying of braid suspended for an exceedingly long time".¹

The ND also illustrates from Rāmacandra's own work RV².

Some define this limb as "a direction to honour persons with gifts, etc." e.g., in the Venī (Act VI, Pp. 150-51) where Yudhīśthira orders through Sahadeva his attendant to employ clever spies, etc., to whom rewards in the form of money

¹ Venī. VI, 12. (p. 169). This illustration is also found in the DR, Cf, BR, Pp. 25-26. The explanation also resembles BR-Bṛāvīcōpi siddhatvena kalpanam.
² ND, p. 102.
and honour are promised, to trace Duryodhana who has disappeared on hearing of Bhima's vow.

Some read Yukti instead of Prarocana and define it as 'Savicchedakti'.

It should be noted here that this Prarocana has nothing to do with the Prarocana, an element of Bhārati Vṛtti.

50. Adāna - is the vicinity or the fore-seeing of the accomplishment of the desired object\(^2\), e.g., in the Nāgas (Act IV, 29), the eagle thinks that the protector of Nāgas was a preacher to him and that he would remove his desire of killing the Nāgas, which suggests that the accomplishment of the chief object of the play, viz., protection of the Nāgas is quite near.

51. Vyavasaye - is acquisition of the means to accomplish the desired fruit, e.g., in the RTN from the

---

1. ND, p. 102. This view partly belongs to Bharata who defines this limb as 'Savicchedam Vacaḥ' (XIX, 96). But Bharata recognizes prarocana as well.

2. Cf. NS XIX, 94 ab. and Abhi. III, p. 55.
entry of the magician up to his speech, "Your honour must invariably witness one performance".

Some define this as 'an assertion or mention of one's own strength'\(^1\). This view (and the illustration that the ND quotes) refers to the DR. But here the ND differs from the DR and points out that assertion of one's own power is called Samrâmbha (which is defined in the same terms) and it includes this kind of Vyâvasâya.

The ND notes here that 'some' hold this Sandhi as well as the Garbha Sandhi to have been comprised of twelve limbs only as they drop any one from the above thirteen\(^2\). This point is suggested in the Abhi\(^3\).

Now we come to the fourteen limbs of Hirvâhâna, all of which are equally important.

52. Sandhi - The seed sown in Mûkha Sandhi reaches the stage of fruition after undergoing the gradual development (such as sprouting etc.), e. g., in the RTh Vasubhûti says, "Sûbhrevya, this girl extremely resembles the princess"; and

---

2. The DR too mentions twelve omitting Vidrava.
Bābhraya too says, "I too have the same (idea) in my mind". Thus the seed sown in Mukha is brought near.

This limb must be introduced.

53. **Nyodha** - is searching for the desired object which had been lost. The illustration is from the Chalitarāma where Ėva, taking the image of Sītā to be real, salutes it.

The DR calls this limb Vibodha and defines it as "Vibodhaḥ Kāryaṁṛgaṁ" - 'The seeking after the end'. The ND here follows the NS.

54. **Grathana** - is the perception of the fruit or the ultimate aim e.g., in the Vedī. Bhīma speaks, "Pāṇcāli, you have not to bind up your tresses that were pulled down by Duṣāsana, with your own hands as long as I am alive. I myself will bind up your hair-braid". Here the final aim, viz., tying of Draupadī's braid is perceived.

55. **Niraya** - 'is narration of one's own experiences'.

The illustration is cited from the Yādavabhyūdaya where

---

2. Vide DR I, 51 and DR, p. 27.
4. DR has the same illustration, Cf. p. 28.
Vasudeva informs Samudravijaya of the hardships he had to suffer while concealing Krsna in Gokula.  

56. Paribhāsa is condemning one's own self. The person here introspects and makes a clear confession of one's faults. The ND gives three illustrations in order to elucidate the point. In the TPV the king says, "Dear, what do you say? Favour me who am devoid of love and shame and who am dragging the life any how, by your sight showering nectar in the form of joy". Here the king condemns himself. The ND also illustrates from the NLV (Act VII, 9) where Nala condemns himself for his cruel deed of abandoning Damayanti in the lonely forest.  

The ND mentions the view of 'some' who define this limb as 'the conversation of persons with one another' and adds that the passage referred to above can serve as its illustration.

---

2. NS (and DR) Paribhāsa.  
3. NS defines it as mere senure or condemnation (Parivāda) but Abhinava's commentary explains that the faults confessed belong to the person himself.  
4. The view referred to is that of the DR. It appears that the view of the DR is not so convincing. Mutual talk or dialogue is essential to a drama. There is no speciality about it and, moreover, it becomes totally inexplicable as to why this limb should come at this stage only. Moreover the illustration that the DR gives embodies personal condemnation as defined by the ND. Thus the view of the ND is naturally preferable.
This limb has a special significance of its own and is highly essential at this juncture. Here the persons themselves who have done something wrong or who have been in one way or the other responsible for the obstacles against the union of the hero and the heroine regret and repent. Thus this is a sort of happy reconciliation between the two rival parties which is utterly essential in order to bring a happy end. As for instance in the Śāk. Act VII the king repents and falls at the feet of Śakuntalā, or in the Śāl, Dhārīṇī repents and willingly consents to the union. Thus the limb is important from various points of view: (1) It suggests the end of the play. (2) It also suggests that the end in a Sanskrit drama should be happy. (3) It indicates that the dramatist has not to be satisfied by merely the attainment of the object coveted by the hero but there should be a complete psychological re-conciliation between the opposite parties.

Thus this limb must be employed.

57. upāsti\(^1\) - is service to others\(^2\), e. g., in the Ve. Bhīṣma congratulates Draupadī that the enemies were destroyed.

Here Bhīṣma delights Draupadī and hence this limb.

1. The NS and the DR do not mention this but read Prasāda instead which has the same sense. Cf. NS XIX, 98 and DR I. 52b.
2. ND, p. 106.
The ND here mentions the view of those who read Prasāda in lieu of Upāsti, which is defined as 'propitiation arising out of the performance of pleasant and benevolent deeds by a passage to the beloved person'. The limb is illustrated in the TPV, where the king appreciates the benevolence, and loyalty of Kumanvat and Yaugandharāyāsa, his two able ministers.

58. Krtī - is maintenance (i.e. protection) of the acquired thing, e.g., in the RTV Vāsavadattā asks her husband to act in such a way that Ratrāvaḥ may not remember her kinsmen who live far away in Simhala-dvīpa.

The ND points out here that some read Dyutī, instead of Krtī, and define it as 'removal of things unfavourable to the object acquired'². The illustration is cited from the MDR (Act VII, p. 208) where the causes that are unfavourable to accepting the ministership on the part of Rākṣasa who was already under control are removed and thus he is compelled to accept the ministership in order to save the life of his friend Candaradāsa.

1. The illustrations of Abhi. and DR as well differ.
2. 'Aparā' here seems to refer to the NS. The NS does not regard Krtī, of course, there is not much of difference (in sense) between the two (Dyutī and Krtī). DR regards Krtī but the definition faithfully echoes the one of Dyutī as found in NS. Vide DR I, 53a.
There are others who define Dyuti as 'removal of anger etc. which might have occasionally arisen'. The ND illustrates it from the RTN, where Yasagandharayana informs the king and the queen of the forstelling of a siddha, viz., one who marries Ratnāvali will be a sovereign king and that she was the sister of the queen. This pacifies queen's jealousy and anger for Ratnāvali. From the illustration quoted and the interpretation referred to it is not far to see that the ND here anonymously refers to Abhinava who explains the NS XIX, 100 as stated here by the ND.  

59. Ānanda - is the attainment of one's desire, e.g., in the RTN, Vāsavādattā requests the king to accept Ratnāvali and the king, overjoyed at the offer, replies who will not honour the gift of the queen.  

60. Samaya - is 'escape from misery'. It is the time when misery or misfortune comes to an end. The ND illustrates from the MRC (Act X) when Sarvīlaka comes by the order of Āryaka with the words "Get away, Get away, 0 rogues..." etc.

3. Cf. NS XIX, 100 cd.
4. The illustration agrees with that of Abhi. III, p. 58.
5. MT I, 64.
61. Parāśāhara - is 'the experience of something wonderful'. The ND illustrates from the Ṛghaṇī: Sītā repudiated by Rāma enters fire and behind the curtain we hear the sound and uproar of astounded people and there enters the god of fire carrying Sītā and all instantly stand up in wonder and bow to him. Here we find Adbhuta as Sītā who once entered fire is again brought to life. Illustrations are cited also from the RV & the Puṣpadūṣitaka. In the latter the ND points out that as many as nine limbs are contained in a single verse.

62. Bhāsana - is speech accompanied by sweet words, gifts and the like. This is illustrated from the Mṛgottama where Sarvilaka, at the instance of Āryaka, confers favours on Cārudatta, Vasantasena and others.

This limb is absolutely essential in the construction of a play.

63. Purvabhāva - (Pṛāgbhāva) It is the anticipation or foreseeing of Kārya e. g., in the Kṛṣṇa Yaugandharāyana says,

2. ND, Pp. 111-12.
3. The ND clarifies this point at the end of the discussion, viz., that this difference of name while actually defining is due to the metrical demand. Cf. ND, p. 113.
"Having realised this, your honour (the queen) is the authority in doing whatever you like to your sister", and then Vasavadatta's sarcastic comment, viz., "Why don't you clearly say, 'Give Ratnāvalī to the king'?" Here Vasavadatta perceives the kārya undertaken by Yaṅgandharāyaṇa.

The ND also illustrates from the YBh.

Some read Pūrvavākyā instead of this limb and define it as a speech similar to the earlier one already spoken in the earlier Sandhis such as Mukha etc. The illustration is cited from the MDR (Act VI) where Gāṇekya says, "Let the bonds of all except those of horses and elephants be untied. I only who have made good my vow, will tie up my tuft of hair," as it contains words which he had earlier uttered in the Mukha Sandhi.

Here it may be noted that the MS also reads pūrvavākyā which it defines as "reproducing what has already been said earlier by a character." By Kecit the ND probably refers to the MS.

---

1. The same illustration is found in the Abhi. as an example of Dyūti (Abhi. III, p. 54).
2. See ND, p. 112.
64. **Kāvyasamāhāra** - is the desire to give a boon. This is represented by the question, "What may I do to please you further?" This indicates the fulfilment of the desire of the hero and the eagerness of the speaker to render service to or help still further the hero etc. This attainment of the end marks the end of the play and hence this limb is known as Kāvyasamāhāra - conclusion of the play.

The ND points out that this limb must be employed and should precede Praśasti.

Here we see a simple but important trait of the Sanskrit drama in general. All dramas end with this type of remark rather query (where a man of superior ability expresses a desire to do good to the hero.)

65. **Praśasti** - is a prayer for good things. This is uttered by the hero or some other important character. The ND illustrates from the KāR and the YBh\(^1\), both of which contain good wishes for all.

This limb has got to be used. This is also known popularly as Bharatavākya, possibly in honour of the great sage Bharata or because it is uttered by all the actors. The play should always end with such a desire of common good. It is regarded

---

1. The ND, p. 115.
by some as a part of the story or plot itself and act as a
limb of Nirvaha. This is how the number will be sixty
four and not sixty five. The first three limbs of this
Sandhi viz., Sandhi, Hirodha and Grativana and the last three,
viz., Purvabhava, Kavyasambhara and Praasati are used in this
Sandhi only, while the rest of the limbs may be used in other
Sandhis also according to the needs of the plot-development
Here also they are used only if they are required.

The ND points out the purpose of the Sandhyaangas once
again. They are employed in order to maintain the continuity
of the plot, which is highly essential for developing (Prati) a Rasa. If the story breaks—does not flow in continuity—the
dominant states etc., will also lose their corresponding
continuity with the result that the audience will not be able
to enjoy Rasa.

The ND thus lays stress on the point that the purpose of
the Sandhyaangas is ultimately to develop Rasa which is the
ultimate aim of a dramatist. But while achieving this aim a
dramatist should see that the limbs are employed so naturally.
They should not give an appearance of artificiality or
labouredness on the part of the writer himself, in somehow
introducing them to satisfy the requirements of Sanskrit drama
and then only the Sahyayyas can enjoy them.

The ND adds that the anigas are of the nature of the 
sthāyī bhāva, vibhāva, etc., amabbāva, and vyāhīcārī-
ghāvas.

They are employed in the different Sandhīas in keeping
with propriety. This sense of propriety is mastered by great
poets whose aim is to develop rasa only and not by inferior
poets who indulge themselves in the employment of striking
words and sense only.

Moreover, in order to achieve the above-stated end a
dramatist may employ one and the same limb twice or thrice or
even more, e.g., in the Venī. Sampheta and Vidrava are
employed again and again in order to develop vīra and raudra.
So also in the RTN vilāsa is often employed to develop
śringāra. But, beware! Avoid extremes. Do not use a particular
anga over and over again in your zest to develop a rasa as
too much of every thing creates insipidity. A dramatist
should be economical. The principle of economy is important
not merely in life but in literature too. The playwright should

1. Ibid, p. 115 lines 19-20.
not employ two limbs where one serves the purpose.1

The problem of employing the Sandhyaṅgas is left to the artistic sense of the playwright. It is he who has to decide as to when, where, how and how many times a particular limb should be employed. There can be no hard and fast rule which can dictate its use. Poetry is an art and cannot be bound by rigorous rules. It is the outcome of natural talents which cannot be fettered by blind rules. Thus the sense of propriety i.e., the theory of Anicitva is rightly esteemed by the MD.

The ND's view about the place of the Sandhyaṅgas in the plot is equally clear and apt. These limbs are means to an end (and not end in themselves) means to develop Rasa. Rasa reigns supreme in a drama and all other paraphernalia is meant to develop that supreme Rasa only. The ND, therefore, strikes a note of warning for those lesser

1. The ND illustrates from the Pratimāniruddha where the author does away with Parikara as its sense is understood in the Upakṣepa. Similarly, in the Rādhāvpralamba Parikara and Parīnyāsa are not employed, both being included in the Upakṣepa (ND, Pp. 115-16).
poets who give undue importance to the external beauties of word and sense and ignore the chief element, Pasa.  

The above discussion of Sandhyaṅgas makes the following points quite clear:—

1. The order of Sandhyaṅgas, excepting at a few places where it is specifically laid down, is not important.

2. One and the same Sandhyaṅga may be repeated twice, thrice or even on more occasions than three.

3. Sandhyaṅgas of a particular juncture need not be employed in that Sandhi only. They may occur at any suitable situation. The fact that they are the limbs of a particular juncture simply indicates that they are more usually found in that particular juncture.

4. All Sandhyaṅgas need not be employed in one drama. Only those which are relevant and useful to the plot-development ought to be employed.

1. It unluckily happened that the rules which were originally meant as an aid to the dramatist were followed rigidly by the later playwrights and they took pride in exhibiting their knowledge of the same. The result was that the dramas lost their individuality and appeared as a cast in the same mould.
5. The chief purpose of drama is to develop Rasa. The Sandhyāngas should be employed as a means to the above end (and not as an end in themselves).

At the end the ND refers to a view of 'Some' who accept twenty one other Sandhyāngas over and above the sixty four. These limbs are:

(1) Sāma (2) Bheda (3) Nāṇḍa (4) Dāna (5) Vadha
(6) Pratītyupamamātīvā (7) Gotraskhalita (8) Sāhase (9) Bhaya
(10) Bhi (11) Kṛṣṇā (12) Krodha (13) Ojas (14) Śrīvarāja
(15) Bhrānti (16) Kṛtvavadhāraṇā (17) Mūta (18) Lekha
(19) Svapna (20) Citra (21) Mada.

The ND does not accept these twenty one as independent limbs. Out of these, Sāma, Bheda etc. are not separate limbs by themselves as they can be included in Sangraha, a limb of Garbha Sandhi, which comprises of Sāma, Dāna, etc. Pratītyupamamātīvā etc. are of the nature of the Vyabhicārīs. Mūta,

1. Originally the ND reads 'Bhi' which the editor corrects at 'Bhi' in the bracket. But in view of the NS from which these verses appear to have been quoted the correct reading seems to be Mūta (Cf. NS XI, 106) and not Bhi. Moreover Bhi would be as good as Bhaya which immediately precedes it.

2. In fact Bhaya and Krodha are the Sthāyi bhāvas of Bhayānaka and Raurka Rasas respectively.
Lekha, Svapna, Citra, etc., are of the nature of the plot and the rest can be included in some limb or the other (amongst the above-mentioned sixty four), e.g., in the Ucchātarāghava, Upakṣepa is of the nature of Īttvavadbāraṇa, in the Pratimāṇiruddha it is of the nature of Svapna, in the Hāmābhyudaya, of Bhaya, in the Venī, of Krodha. Similarly, the rest also can be included in some or the other of the remaining limbs.

These twenty one Sandhyantaras have been originally mentioned by Bharata. The MD has bodily lifted these verses from the MS. The MD simply mentions these "other varieties of Sandhis" without giving their definitions. The MS also does not define them.

The MD does not recognize the so called 'Sandhyantaras'. It states the grounds for rejecting them. These are based on the Abhinavabhārati. Abhinava, however, rightly remarks: These are the Vibhāvas etc., meant for guiding the playwright.

1. Vide MS (Ed.) XIX, 104-7.