Types of Rūpaka

The ten varieties of Rūpakas are described in Adhyāya 18 of the NS.

In Adhyāya 18, NS mentions and defines the following varieties of Rūpa:

1. Nāṭaka, 2. Prakaraṇa, 3. Anka
   (Utsṛṭikāṅka), 4. Vṛyāga, (5) Bhāṇa, (6) Smavakāra,
   (7) Vithī, (8) Prahasana, (9) Liṃa and (10) Ihamṛga. After describing Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa, Bharata describes Nāṭikā. This would make in all eleven varieties, but there is an interpolated verse which says that Nāṭikā embodies the essential qualities of Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa and that therefore the Rūpas are only ten. Dhananjaya, also, who tries to follow Bharata faithfully says, 'Dasadhaiva', i.e. the Rūpaka is only ten-fold; Dhanika explains this determination of number by saying that it is done from the point of view of pure type. So this excludes the mixed

1. Hemacandra does not mention Rūpa or Rūpaka in the sense of Nāṭaka, etc. in his AC. However, in his Anekarthasaṅgraha, he gives amongst the several meanings of Rūpa Nāṭakādika, i.e. Nāṭaka, etc. (II.301, p.25) and three meanings of Rūpaka as Nāṭaka, Kāvyālaṁkāra and Dhūrta (III.89, p.56). So does Medini. Amarakośa mentions neither Nāṭaka or Rūpaka.
2. NS. 18. 2-3
3. NS. 18.61.
4. DR. I.7
5. DR. p.4
Leaving aside the intervening topics for the present, I will give a straight description of the ten forms. In fact Hemacandra has adopted this method in his Kavyamuhasona (VIII-pp.432-443). I shall mainly follow him.

1. Nāṭaka: When a Rūpaka has for its subject-matter a well-known plot, for its hero a well-known and exalted person, for depiction, the life-deeds of a scion of a dynasty of royal sages, and when it takes recourse (occasionally) to divine agencies, superhuman powers and splendours, when it presents different amorous pastimes and virtues and when it consists of Ankas-acts and Pravesakas-interludes, it becomes a Nāṭaka. Briefly, a Rūpaka which depicts the deeds of kings, expressing a variety of Rasas and Bhāvas, caused by happiness and misery, it becomes a Nāṭaka.

A Nāṭaka may have five to ten Acts.

There should not be a crowd of people in a Nāṭaka. There should be only four or five active persons. In the composition of a play action should be made like a tip of a cow's tail and the exalted situations in a play should be placed at the end. At the conclusion of a play which contains various psychological states and sentiments,

---

6. Dr. Raghavan has discussed the question of number of Rūpakas and points out that there is not much significance in the number. In his view the number ten indicates only ten tendencies. He points out that all the ten varieties from Nāṭaka to Īhāmrga embody these ten tendencies in various degrees. (See his article 'A note on the name Dasarūpaka' JORŚ, Vol.VII, Part III, July-Sept. 1933 pp.270-290)

7. NS. 18. 10-12

8. NS. 18-19
experts should always introduce the marvellous sentiment.

2. Prakarana: When a poet creates by his own genius Vastu (plot), Sarîra (body) and Nâyaka (hero) and elaborates the whole thing creatively, it is called Prakarana by the wise. According to AG, here Vastu consists of the Sādhyaphala, i.e. the fruit to be achieved by the hero; Sarîra consists of Upāya, i.e. means to achieve the fruit.

In a Prakarana, the poet creates a poetic composition whose material is not taken from the life of sages (Anârśa) but from secular compositions (Āphārya). It is endowed with unprecedented qualities. Its Bīja Vastu, i.e. seed incident is newly created. In a Prakarana, the varied deeds of Brahmâs, merchants, ministers, Chaplains, Counsellors, leaders of caravans are depicted. It has neither an exalted hero nor royal enjoyment. It depicts outer persons (Bâhya). It depicts Dâsas, Vītas (Beaus), Sreśṭhis (the rich, merchants), the doings of courtesans and the deeds of women of lower family. Whatever is said regarding (plot) (Vastu), Sarîra (body), varieties of Vṛttis and Sandhis in connection with Nâtaka holds good in the case of Prakarana also. Like Nâtaka it should not be crowded with many persons. In a Prakarana, the heroine may be of the same class as the hero or may be from the courtezan class. The two (the wife and the courtezan), however, should not be shown together. Like the Pravešalâs in a Nâtaka, there should be Viškambhakas in the Prakarana. The persons in the

9. NS. 18-42-43
10. NS. 18.45
11. NS. Vol. II. p. 430
Viskambhakas would be of the middle class. It may have five to ten acts.

2-A Nāṭikā: From a combination of elements of these two main types, viz. Nāṭaka and Prakrama, Nāṭikā comes into existence. It may have for its hero a well-known character or a newly-created one. For its heroine it may have a maiden connected with the opera in the harem. A Nāṭikā has four acts, many female characters with a scope for charming Abhinayas, dance, songs etc. It would depict sensual pleasures also and its constituents are well formed. A Nāṭikā depicts royal etiquette, the hero, his chief queen, the lady messenger and such other retinue. It has scenes exhibiting anger, deceit, and their pacification.

3-Samavakāra: The subject-matter of the Samavakāra consists of exploits of gods and Asuras. It has for its hero a person who is well-known and Udātta, i.e. exalted. It consists of three acts. It depicts three kinds of Kapata-deception and the three kinds of Vīrava-excitement, and three kinds of Srangāra-erotic sentiment. A Samavakāra may have twelve heroes and its duration may be of 18 Nāḍikās. The first act depicts Prahasana-laughter, Vīrava-excitement, Kapata-deceit and Vithis. Its duration is of 12 Nāḍikās. Similarly the second act also should be constructed. Its duration is of four Nāḍikās. The third

12. NS. 18. 19
13. NS. 18. 57-58
14. NS. 18. 59-60
act is meant for completion of the plot. It should consist of two Nādikās. In a Samavakāra, each act depicts a different topic. No connection between them is desired. In a Samavakāra, Vidrava may be due to three types of circumstances, viz. (i) battle and flood, (ii) confusion caused by a storm, fire and a big elephant, (iii) the siege of a city. The three kinds of deceit in a Samavakāra may be due to (i) bad luck, (ii) work by an enemy, (iii) done by circumstances creating happiness and misery. The three types of Śrīgāra in a Samavakāra are: Dharmaśrīgāra, Arthaśrīgāra and Kāmaśrīgāra. These three kinds of Śrīgāra are then explained.

The metres recommended for a Samavakāra are of Usṇik and Gāyatri types. They have to be complicated in their compositions. This Samavakāra has recourse to a variety of Rasas.

4. Īhamṛga  In Īhamṛga divine persons are depicted. They are engaged in fights concerning divine damsels. Its plot is well constructed and such as to cause suspicion. It depicts mainly violent persons. Its verses depict the anger of women. There is much tumult and fight in it. Its Śrīgāra is related to women who are captured by deceit, force or kidnapping. Īhamṛga has the same Vṛttis and Rasas which are depicted in Vyāyoga. The only difference is that in Īhamṛga heavenly women are depicted, when the quarrel becomes intense and the fighters are eager to kill one another, their fight should be resolved by some pretext in Īhamṛga.

16. NS. 18. 63-75
17. NS. 18. 76
18. NS. 18. 78-82
5. **Dīma**: It has a well-known plot and a well-known Udātta-exalted hero. It exhibits six Rasaś, Śūmits Śrāgāra and Hāsya and consists of four acts. The Dīma in general exhibits the vigorous Rasas. Its action finds scope for earthquakes, fall of meteors, eclipse of the sun or the moon, fighting in battle, a personal combat and angry conflict. It has scope for deceit, magic, various kinds of masks. It is full of gods, the serpent kings, Raśas, Yakṣas and Piśācas. It is filled with sixteen heroes.

It depicts Sāttvatī and Ārabhatī Vṛttis.

6. **Vyāyoga**: It has a well-known hero and the body of the plot is also well-known. It finds scope for only a few women. Its action extends for a day. In it many people fight as they do in Samavakāra. It has only one act. It should not have a heavenly person, but may have a hero of royal sage. In short there must be conflict, and combat in Vyāyoga. Its Rasa is of militant type.

7. **Uttarākānka**: The plot in this type may be well-known, but it may sometimes be otherwise. The Heroes should be ordinary persons. The main sentiment in this type is pathetic sentiment, resulting from fights and violent blows. It is full of the wailings of women and words suggesting Nirveda. It is void of Sāttvati, Ārabhatī and Kaisikī Vṛttis. The action should happen in Bhāratavarṣa.

19. NS. 83-88
20. NS. 90-93
21. NS. 1894-96
There are two kinds of Prahasana: Suddha-pure and Sankīma-mixed. The pure kind of Prahasana consists of discourses of Bhāgavatas, Tāpasas, Vipras and such persons. It abounds in satirical speeches and depicts worthless fellows (kāpurūṣa). Language and conduct in it are studied or learned (Adhigata). Its incidents (Caritapada) are suggestive of particular temperaments. Its plot moves in a definite groove.

AG explains Bhāgavatas, Tāpasas and Vipras respectively as Yatis (ascetics), Vānaprasthas (persons abiding in forest), and Vipras (householder Brahmans). According to him 'other such persons' refer to Sākyas-Buddhist monks, etc.

The mixed Prahasana depicts courtesans, menials, eunuchs, Viṭas, rogues and unchaste or barren women (Bandhakīs). It exhibits immDOest dress, paraphernalia and behaviour.

The rumours that are in popular talk, deceitful contrivances, discussions of rogues are to be depicted (generally) in a Prahasana. Appropriate items of Viṭī also find place in it.

22. NS. 18. L3 -104
23. NS. Vol. II. p. 448. Dr. M. M. Ghosh says, "The word Bhāgavat relates primarily to a Saiva Saint. It is in this sense that the word has been used in the Prahasana named Bhagavadajjukiya. (NS. Eng. Vol. II. Eng. Trans. p. 269 ff.)"
24. NS. 18. 105
25. MS. 18-106
AG explains 'Lokopacārayuktavarta' as 'Sākyānām strīsamparkaḥ' contacts of Sākyas with women.

26. Bhāṇa: Bhāṇa is acted by only one character. He talks about his own experience or describes what has reference to others. It has recourse to a variety of things. This is done by uttering himself speaking others' words. There are in it imaginary dialogues by means of Ākāśabhāṣita, expressing their emotions by his own bodily acting.

A Bhāṇa is to be acted by Dhūrta or Viṭa character. There are many states and types of behavior expressed in it. A Bhāṇa has one act.

AG explains the word Bhāṇa thus. "Eka mukhenaiva bhānyante uktimantaḥ kriyānte apraviṣṭā api pāṭriaviṣṭā yatra itibhāṇah/ "A Bhāṇa (lit. speaking) is so called because characters who do not enter the stage, become spoken by one mouth, i.e., the absent characters speak through one mouth.

10. Vīṭhī: Vīṭhī consists of one act. It is either acted by one character or by two characters. It includes three types of characters, viz., Adhama, Uttama and Madhyama. The thirteen limbs of the Vīṭhī are:
(1) Udghātasya (accidental interpretation),
(2) Āvalītā (transformation),
(3) Avaspaṇḍita (ominous significance),
(4) Nāli (Enigma),
(5) Āsat-pralāpa (incoherent chatter),
(6) Vyakṣeli (repartee),
(7) Prapaṇca (complaint),
(8) Mrdava (crushing),
(9) Adhinīla (outwitting),
(10) Chala (deception),
(11) Trīgata (three men's talk),
(12) Vyāhāra (declaration), and (13) Gaṇḍa (undue combination of words)
All these thirteen Āṅgas are various kinds of clever repartees. As Hemacandra says in his Viveka - Vīthīyāṃtu
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bhāmvidha vakrokti viśeṣā vyotpadyantā / This is what we find in all these thirteen Āṅgas.

As to the meaning or definitions of these Vīthyaṅgas, the tradition has become obscure. If we compare the definitions and illustrations given in BR, ND, BP etc., we find important variations. Being clever repartees, some of the Vīthyaṅgas find place in other Rūpakas such as Prahasana etc.

In the Chaukhamba edition and the edition of Dr. M. M. Ghosh, the description of Vīthī and its 13 Āṅgas followed by the description of ten Lāsyā Āṅgas. The Nīrṇaya Sāgara edition has printed this matter in bracketted verses 182-197. It remarks in the footnote that this matter within brackets is taken from printed book, but in the manuscripts some of this matter is found in the Adhyāya that follows, i.e. 19. In the G.C.S. edition the description of the Lāsyā Āṅgas are found from verses 117 to 137 in Adhyāya 19, after the description about the Avasthās, Sandhis and their Āṅgas.

The ten Lāsyā Āṅgas are as follows: Geyapada, Sthitapāṭhya, Āsin, Puṣpagandikā, Pracchedaka, Trimūḍha, Saṁdhavākhyā, Dvimūḍhaka, Uttamottamaka and Ukta-prayuktaka.

31. DR. III. 12-21, ND
These are thus described in the NS.

1. Geyapada: When the heroin being seated surrounded with stringed instruments and drums and when Suska songs are sung (i.e. without any accompaniment of these), it is called Geyapada.

2. Sthitapathya: If a separated lady burning with the fire of love, recites anything in Prakrit while resting on her seat, it is called sthitapathy.

3. Asina: When one sits without making any toilet and is overcome with anxiety and sorrows, and looks with oblique glances, it is an instance of Asina.

4. Puspagandika: When a woman in the guise of a man recites something sweetly in Sanskrit for the pleasure of her female friends, it is an instance of Puspagandika.

5. Prachedaka: When a separated woman pained by the moonlight prepares to go to her beloved, even if he has done her wrong, it is an instance of Prachedaka.

6. Trimudha: A play adorned with even metres and abounding in many feelings and composed of words which are neither harsh nor large, is called Trimudha.

32. NS. 19-121
33. NS. 19,123
34. NS. 19,125
35. NS. 19,126
36. NS. 19,129
37. NS. 19,130
7. Saïndhavaka: When one represents a lover who has
failed to keep his trust and is using Prakrit to express
his grief through well-performed Karanas, it is an instance
of Saïndhavaka.

8. Dvimûdhaka: Delineating a song of the Caturasra type
which has an auspicious meaning and which treats psycholo-
gical states and sentiments, with the pretension of efforts,
is call Dvimûdhaka.

9. Uttamottamakata: It is composed of various kinds of
ślokas; it includes various sentiments and is adorned
the condition of passion.

10. Uktapratyukta: It is a duett (lit. a dialogue) expressing
anger or pleasure and it contains words of censure. It
should contain interesting things in a song.

This is followed by the description of Vicitrapada
and Bhâvika.

Vicitrapada: If any woman burning with the fire of love
soothes her mind by seeing the portrait of her lover, it
is an instance of Vicitrapada.

Bhâvika: If a woman who is burning with the fire of love
after seeing her beloved in a dream, expresses her
different psychological states, it is an instance of Bhâvika.

38. NS. 19.131
39. NS. 19.133
40. NS. 19.134
41. NS. 19.135
42. NS. 19.136
43. NS. 19.137
What is the place of these Lāsya Aṅgas in Rūpakas?

Dhanañjaya and some of the old writers who follow regard these Lāsya Aṅgas as connected with Bhāṇa interpreting 'Bhāṇa imaika prayojyāni and Bhāṇakṛtivat lāsyam' in the sense that the Lāsya and its Aṅgas belong to Bhāṇa.

Dr. V. Raghavan, in his learned work Śṛṅgārprakāśa, has very convincingly refuted this view of Dhanañjaya and others. His arguments may be briefly summarized here: "There is a scientific order in Bharata's description of the types of dramatic performance and the Lāsya at the end of these. The last types to be defined by him are the Bhāṇa and the Vithi. The Bhāṇa is a Rūpakain which only one character appears and carries on an imaginary dialogue through Ākāśabhāṣita. It is a monologue, narrated by one actor, though its theme is full of various characters. Says Bharata:

\[
\text{Vividhāśryo hi bhāṇah viṇeyastvekāhāryaśca / XX.112. Kāśi Edn.}
\]

The Vithi has two varieties, one which was surely earlier and was closely related to the Bhāṇa, in which only one character appeared and gave the audience only a monologue; and another variety, surely later, in which there was dialogue and two persons impersonated.

\[
\text{Vithi sayadekāṅkā dvipāṭrahāryā tathaikahāryā vā/}
\]

XX.11 (Kāśi, Edn.)
The original and earlier Vithi, or the more common Vithi, was 'Ekaharyya'. Thus Bharata ends his description of the dramatic varieties with the description of the less perfect types of the nature of monologues like the Bhana and the Vithi. Akin to these two is the entertainment called the Lasya which is also done by one individual. It is similar to Bhana, in that is done by one person.

So Bharata -

Bhana iva ekaprayogyā ni/ Bhāṅkṛtivallāsyam/

and not that the Lasya with its Angas forms the special feature characterising the Bhana as distinguished from other types. It is a misunderstanding of this fact that Bharata does nothing more than compare the Lasya to the Bhana, calling it also Ekaharyya like the Bhana, which is responsible for later writers giving the Lasya as a characteristic forming part of Bhana among the Rūpakas.

As a matter of fact, Bharata expressly says that independently the Angas of Lasya appear in the Nāṭaka:

Anyāni ca lāsyaavidhāṅgāni tu nātakē prayuktāni / XX.136.

The Vithi enters into the Prahasana; Uddhāṅkādibhiridam (Prahasanam) vīthyaṅgaṁārmiśritam bhavenmiśram // The Prahasana and the Vīthī enter the first of the three parts of the Sā makāra:

Ankastu Prahasanah / XX.68

Anko'stu sapārahasanah kapatā savīthyaṅgah //

XX.70
So also there is ample possibility of one kind of
dramatic form, the comic, the pathetic, etc. entering
another. In the same manner, the Lasya with its Angas
appear in the Nāṭaka also. Says Bharata:

Anyāni ca lāśyavidhāvangāni tu nāṭake prayuktāni/ XX.136

Therefore, there is no warrant for or meaning in stating
that Lasya pertains to Bhāna. Bhāna is only a monologue
and only narrates or describes, but never shows action
with various actors, and hence cannot show action with
various actors, and hence cannot show the ten kinds of
Lasya. Nor can Vithi, monologue or dialogue, embrace the
Lasya also. So also, the Prahasana cannot have the Lasya
and its Angas. For, these two are satirical and comical.

In the sublime types of Nāṭaka, Sudha Prakāraṇa, Nāṭikā,
Toṭaka and Satṭaka, the Lasya can appear and it does
appear. In the Samavakāra, Īhāmṛga, Dima, and Vyāgā too
it cannot appear. These are heroic and relate to Vira
rasa and fights; Lasya is related to love, Śrāṅgāra rasa
and the softest aspects. The Anka or the Utsāṭhikāṇḍa
which is an one-act Karuṣa-piece and sequel of weeping
following a calamity of war etc., can have no place for
Lasya. Those Uparūpkas in which one dancer appears, sings
and renders through gestures a phase or more of the
emotion of love are themselves forms of Lasya. The Nautch,
which has not died out in South India, is a typical
example of Lasya".
"Bharata gives another important characteristic of the Lasya, viz. that the emotional theme in the Lasya is completely an imaginative creation of the poet, uhya. It is in this respect that he says it is similar to the Prakarana, a play with a created story-uhya-karya (or kavya) or Utpadya-va\textsuperscript{\textemdash}astu. Prakarana\textsuperscript{\texttextregistered}ad uhayakarya\textsuperscript{\textemdash}vam (vya\textsubscript{\texttextregistered}m) etc. XX.137."

The description or the definitions of the 101 Rupakas given above show certain obvious peculiarities. The N\texttextregistered}aka and the Prakarana have from five to ten Acts. They are thus the major types. The Acts of remaining eight types vary from four to one.

Dhana\textjaya has given an important principle to classify the ten Rupakas. He says "Vastu net\textsuperscript{\textemdash}rasastesam bhedsk\textsuperscript{\textemdash}ah / "As Dhanika explains the Rupas differ from one another by the difference of Vastu (plot), Net\textsuperscript{\textemdash}a (hero) and Easa (sentiment). Vastu being the main determining principle of the Rupakas, Dhana\textjaya gives its three main divisions: (i) Prak\texttextsuperscript{\textregistered}ata -well-known-traditionally the plot may be Pur\texttextsuperscript{\textregistered}\textacutedge, historical or semi-historical. (ii) Utpadya-created by the imagination of the poet, and (iii) Misra-mixture of tradition\textsuperscript{\textemdash}and imagination. Another division that Dhana\textjaya gives is with reference to the characters being Divya-heavenly or Martya-human etc. Keeping these principles of Dhana\textjaya in mind, we may specify the Rupakas in ordinary language as follows:

42. Sr\texttextregistered}garaprak\texttextsuperscript{\textregistered}a, pp.575-576
43. D\texttextregistered}, I.11.
44. Ibid., p.6.
The Nāṭaka deals with the affairs of kings and the Prakarana with the affairs of the social classes in a mixed social milieu. Thus Prakarana is in modern terminology a social comedy. The Bhāṣa and the Prahasana have affinity with Prakarana, the status of the characters in them are mostly from the lower social strata. Vyāyoga, Samavakāra and Dīma have their characters from gods, demi-gods, demons etc. With some heroic characters from Mahābhārata and other Purānas, Utsarastikāṅka is something like an epilogue to the heroic types of plays. The nature of Vīthi is not made clear. It has scope for all the Rasas, but its distinguishing feature seems to be its varieties of clever repartee. In fact whenever clever repartees are found in other Rūpakas, they are supposed to be one or other of these thirteen Vīthyaṅgas.

When we compare the constituents of the ten or eleven types of Rūpakas, a question naturally arises as to how these are inter-related. Whether the minor varieties are evolved or derived from the two major types, are derived from the minor ones by combination of the elements of the latter i.e. minor. Some scholars notably Dr. Raghavan and the late Prof. D.R. Mankad have attempted to discuss these questions.
Dr. Raghavan in his article 'A note on the name Das'arupa' rejects the traditional view of classifying dramas into major and minor types and says, "But such a theoretical distinction and classification of drama and dramatic performances do not answer to the real facts of historical development." He clarifies this point and gives his own view how the major and the minor types are related and incidentally their derivation. He says, "When the Bharata Nāṭya Śāstra codified the art of drama of its time and before his time, there were available ten kinds of dramatic performances. Not all of them were or could be called major varieties or perfect types of drama. The only perfect drama-types in the scheme of Daśārūpaka are two and they are the first two, Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa .... ... Sāradātanaya says more clearly that the first type called Nāṭaka is the Prakṛti, which does not mean that it is the source of other types historically but means that it is the latest, the perfection of drama, historically speaking, in which can be found aspects all the earlier and imperfect varieties".

Dr. Raghavan illustrates his thesis as follows: "The Vithi and the Ańka certainly do not represent major varieties. The Vithi is the predecessor of the Prahasana.

46. Ibid., p.278
47. Ibid. pp.278-279. Is this interpretation of Sāradātanaya as statement correct? The word Prakṛti means the original source from which the latter Vικτις are derived. In fact, as mentioned above, we traditional view derive the minor varieties of Daśārūpaka from the major, but historically it is a different matter.
The Prahasana can live by itself as a separate type of perfect drama even though its character and features are available to an extent in the Nāṭaka and amply in the Prakāraṇa. The Vīthī of course died early and we have no old specimens of the Vīthī now preserved. Bharata's Nāṭya Śāstra actually gives in many places evidences for the disappearance of the Vīthī into the body of the Prahasana, the Prakāraṇa and the Nāṭaka, both as part of the Prastāvanā and of the drama itself. The Samavakāra, the Īhāmṛga, the Dīma and the Vyāyoga represent the Uddhata or Āvidddha types of drama, being heroic in theme. They are the early specimens of dramatic performances depicting fights among Dāvas and Asuras. The Asura Vijaya (N.S.1,59) and the Amṛta Mathana (N.S.IV.2-4), described as a Samavakāra, were the first dramatic performances. Then when Brahman took Bharata's troupe to Śiva's abode, the theme of Tripura-dāha described as a Dīma was enacted (N.S.IV,10). The Samavakāra, the Dīma, the Īhāmṛga and the Vyāyoga are very similar to each other. Bharata refers us to the other while describing each these. He gives the Īhāmṛga as similar to the Vyāyoga and the Vyāyoga as similar to the Samavakāra."

(Vide N.S. XX31s.82-85 and 95-99

The learned scholar further says, "The Vyāyoga is also described as an one-act Samavakāra, with the hero as an epic king and not as a God (NS.XX.95-96) These, by the influence of the Mahākāvyas and the growing mythological legends, gradually perfected themselves into the heroic type Nāṭaka.

@ 48. Ibid. pp.279. Vasasaraja has given us specimen of Samavakāra, Dīma and Īhāmṛga even though their earlier specimens are not available.
The tendency to depict men of society, their habits and ridiculousness, this old, natural and native tendency of man began with small imperfect types like Vīthī, grew into Prahasana and perfected itself into Prakarana. That the farcical and satirical type, the Prahasana, was of very early origin is proved by NŚ. XXXVI, 29-37. When the Prakarana and the Nāṭaka were being reached, there was however a need for variety of interest which resulted in a mutual exchange of features. Thus Sūdha varieties of Prakarana rose which were not in any way different from Nāṭaka, except in the fact of the hero not being a king of puranic glory, Prakhyāta. Similarly the Nāṭaka got such features as the Vidūṣaka for comic relief.

"The Vīthī was first done by one actor and then by two. From the latter, the Prahasana rose. From the former, a new type with erotic and comic theme called Bhāna grew as Monologue. Though the main feature of this also merged into the build of the Nāṭaka and the Prakarana, it could live separately like the Prahasana... The Misra or mixed variety of the Prahasana contained the Vīthī in it. (NŚ. XXI.111) And the Vīthī and the Prahasana were made part of the first of the three acts of the Samavakāra. (NŚ. XX.70) The remaining type in the Daśarūpaka is the Utsṛṣṭikāṅka or simply Aṅka. It has two varieties, one with Prakhyātanāyaka and another with Aprakhyātanāyaka.
Bharata says that the latter shall be only an occasional case which means that in his time the Anka was slowly becoming less heroic and more popular in its theme. The Anka is, so to say, an epilogue or a sequel to a Samavakāra, Īhāmga, Dima or Vyāyoga. These four plays depict fights among gods and other Prakhyāta heroes while the Anka depicts the result of those fights; i.e., opens with the close of the fights and begins with the wailings of the wife or wives and other related persons of those killed. Thus this one-act Karuṇa piece called Anka also goes with the heroic class or the heroic dramatic thread in the Dasarūpaka.

The topic of classifying Rūpakas and tracing their derivation is made more explicit by this learned scholar in his articles on the Vṛttis. He says, "Just as dance on the same basis of Lalitā and Auddhatya gets differentiated into Lasya and Tāṇḍava, so also the Rūpakas numbering ten get distinguished into the Lalita and the Uddhata... ... Even as the largest amount of Kaisikī can be seen only in a Nāṭaka and Prakarana, the largest amount of Ārabhaṭī can be seen only in the types, Dima, Vyāyoga and Samavakāra. Elsewhere Bharata gives a distinction of the Dasarūpa into two such classes on the basis of this Kaisikī or Lalitā and Ārabhaṭī or Auddhatya.
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The two types of dramas are called Sukumāra and Uddhata or Āviddha.

In short the opinion of Dr. Raghavan seems to be that the two major types take relevant elements from the two classes of minor types viz., Āviddha and Sukumāra.

Prof. Mankad in his 'Types of Sanskrit Drama' has also attempted in a detailed way the classification and the evolution of the Rūpakas and the Uparūpakas. He, however, is aware that the evolution can be traced in two ways. As he says, "Natural growth takes place both ways (1) towards a greater simplicity by analysis or (2) towards a greater complexity by synthesis, i.e. by additions, reduplications, joining various threads etc."

He adopts the later view. He says, "It is at least clear that Nāṭaka and Prakarana presuppose these types and must have developed from them". He seems to trace the development on the principle of number of Acts. Thus Bhāna and Vīthī would be the primitive types. Then would come Prahasana in two Acts. Then we might have Vyāyoga in three Acts. He says, "Thāmrga and Dima stop at four Acts. Nāṭaka and Prakarana with more elaborate setting, would require more acts and are allowed five to ten acts". According to him "Nāṭaka combined and sublimated the elements seen in Vyāyoga, Amka, Dima, Thāmrga and Samavakāra and yet added an individuality of its own. It can have Karuṇa, Śṛṅgāra or Vīra as a predominant Rasa."

He comes to the conclusion:
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"Thus a common thread runs through all these types and a serial evolution of Natāka and Prakarana from the earlier types is indicated." He further elaborates this point by saying, "But taking the entire line of evolution as detailed in the foregoing pages, our working basis that Bhāna Rūpaka was the first form to evolve amongst the Rūpakas, fits in very well with the whole scheme. Therefore, I am still inclined to take Bhāna as the first dramatic evolute." In a way similar to the view of Dr. Raghavan, Prof. Mankad derives his types Uddhata and Maṇṭa. He says, "It is further possible to reduce all our Rūpakas also to one of these types. And Bhāna Vīthi and Prahasana, with their mild erotic Rasas and gentle elements like Lasyaṅga are Maṇṭa. Śamavakāra, Īhaṅga, Dima and Vyāyoga with their haughty Rasas are clearly Uddhata. Anka with its Karunarasa is mild. Of course a variation may occur wherein more than one Rasa may be employed in one and the same type. As a matter of fact these Rūpakas, as we know them today, being highly individualised and developed afford great scope for a mixture of Rasas. But we may call a type Maṇṭa or Uddhata according as it has a mild or haughty Rasa predominant. Natāka and Prakarana are mostly mixed, though even here it will be possible to point out one particular Rasa to be prominent. It is thus that we can trace all our dramatic, semi-dramatic, and musical forms to their ultimate two forms Tāṇḍava and Lāṣya. Here then, the tradition has its fullest justification and provides a key to the history of the evolution of our dramas."
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are clearly Uddhata. Akka with its Karumarasa is mild. Of course a variation may occur when even more than one Rasa may be employed in one and the same type. As a matter of fact these Rupakas, as we know them today, being highly individualised and developed afford great scope for a mixture of Rasas. But we may call a type Masruna or Uddhata according as it has a mild or haughty Rasa predominant. Nataka and Prakarana are mostly mixed, though even here it will be possible to point out one particular Rasa to be prominent. It is thus that we can trace all our dramatic, semi-dramatic, and musical forms to their ultimate two forms Tandava and Lasya. Here, then, the tradition has its fullest justification and provides a key to the history of the evolution of our dramas.

These hypothetical theories about the derivation and the evolution of Rupakas and Uparupakas are no doubt interesting, but we have no historical evidence to corroborate these theories. Particularly we even cannot say whether the simpler - short one Act plays came out of the complex plays of many Acts or vice-versa. The history of the known and extant Sanskrit dramas does not help us in this matter. The three earliest dramatists that we know of are: Bhāsa, Kālidāsa and Āsvaghoṣa. Of these three, as to the dates of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa scholars differ in their opinions. Some would put Bhāsa to 6th-4th century B.C. and some to the 3rd or 4th century A.D. Similarly some would put...
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Kālidāsa in the second century B.C. and some to the seventh century A.D. The date of Āśvaghosa, however, is more definitely ascertained. He is put in the first century A.D.

Let us take the plays of Kālidāsa first. All the three plays, viz. Abhijñānasākuntalam, Vikramorvasiyam and Mālavikāgnimitram- are all full-fledged Nāṭakas. However, Mālavikāgnimitram seems to have been a model for the later Nāṭikās like Ratnāvalī and Priyadarśikā of king Harṣa.

The plays of Bhāsa though not strictly following the rules of the Nāṭyasāstra represent most of the varieties, e.g. Dūtavikyā, Karṇabhāra, Dūtaghatotkaca, and Ārubhāija, are Uṭṛṣṭikāṅkā type; Madhyma-vyāyoga is a Vyāyoga type; Pañcarātra is a Samavakāra type; Abhiṣeka, Bālacarita, Avimāraka, Pratimā, Pratijñāaugendharāyaṇa, and Svapanavāsavadatta are full-fledged Nāṭakas; and Cārdatta is a Prakaraṇa type.

As to the plays of Āśvaghosa, we have only fragments of them preserved in pieces of palm-leaf manuscripts. Dr. Jüders and other scholars have succeeded in identifying three works. Of these one is a Prakaraṇa of nine Acts. It is called Saradvatiprakaraṇa. The other two are of allegorical nature. As to these fragmentary plays, Prof. Keith observes, "The most remarkable thing regarding this drama is its close correspondence to the classical type as laid down in the Nāṭyasāstra. The piece is a Prakaraṇa, and it has nine Acts, which accords perfectly with the rule of the Gāstrā; the
Mṛchakatika and Mālatīmādhava have ten apiece; the Acts bear no titles, but this is in accord with the normal usage, though the Mṛchakatika gives names. The hero is Ğāriputra, who corresponds to the Brahmīn hero of the Čātra, and who is emphatically of the noble and calm type enjoined we do not know, nor does it appear how far the poet altered the subject-matter by invention, which is normally the case with later Prakaraṇas. The Buddha and his disciples, including besides the two heroes, Kaunḍinaya and a Čramaṇa speak Sanskrit, and use both prose and verse; the Vidūṣaka speaks Prakṛti. The presence of this figure is a remarkable proof of the fixed character attained by the drama, for in itself there is nothing more absurd that a youthful ascetic seeking after truth should be encumbered by one who is a meet attendant on a wealthy merchant, Brahmin, or minister. It can, therefore, only be supposed that Āśvaghoṣa was writing a type of drama in which the role was far too firmly embedded to permit its omission, and presumably in the story of the drama now lost to us the Vidūṣaka served to introduce comic relief. With natural good taste, he disappears from the last Act, where Ğāriputra has no need as a member of the Buddha's fraternity to bear encumbrances like a jester."

As to the fragments of two other plays, the same scholar notes, "There is no evidence of their authorship, other than the fact that they appear in the same manuscript as the work of Āśvaghoṣa, and that they display the same general appearance as the work of that writer."
That they are Asvaghosa's is much more probable than that they are the work of some unknown contemporary."

"The first of these is specially interesting as it represents a type of which we have otherwise no earlier specimen than the Prabodhacandrodaya of Krsnamisra (11th Cent. A.D.). We find the allegorical figures of Buddhi, wisdom, Kirti, fame, and Dhrti firmness—appearing and conversing."

"The other drama gives us more interesting matter. It is one in which figures a hero named Magadhavati, a Vidugata named Komudhagandha, a hero styled only Nayaka, but probably named Somadatta, a Duṣta, rogue, without further name, a certain Dhanamjaya, who may possibly be a prince if the term 'King's son' (bhattidalaka), which is recognized in the Nāṭyasāstra as the style of the younger princes of the blood, applies to him, a maid-servant, and Cāriputra and Maudgalyāyana."

Let us consider what we gather from these fragmentary plays of Asvaghosa. One is clearly a Rūpaka of the Prakāraṇa type. The third also might have been of the same type, though on account of the fragmentary character of the manuscript, we cannot be certain about it. The second drama is of allegorical type. We cannot place this under any of the ten types. We do not meet with this type of plays till we come to the Prabodhacandrodaya of Kṛṣṇamīśra (11 cent. A.D.)."
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Moharajaparājaya of Yasapāla (C.1929-1932 A.D.) and
Caitanyacandrodaya of Kavi Karnapura (1543 A.D.). Prof. Keith
remarks on this matter as follows: "It must remain uncertain
whether there was a train of tradition leading from Asvaghoṣa
to Kṛṣṇamisra, or whether the latter created the type of drama
afresh; the former theory is the more likely." Thus the plays
of these earlier poets do not help us in tracing the
development of the types of drama. We can only say that many
types and varieties of drama were written and played in the
eyear centuries of Christian Era.

Another point that we might note here is that the
Nāṭyasāstra does not mention all the different types of drama,
e.g., the allegorical type. Kṛṣṇa Kohala, another old writer of
the Nāṭyasāstra, whose material is mixed up in the present
text of the NS, mentions a number of varieties lyrical in
their character and in which music and dance predominate.
AG mentions these varieties as follows: Dombikā, Bhāṇa,
Prasthāna, Sidgaka, Bhāṇikā, Rāmakīḍā, Hallisaka and Rāsaka.
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