

The So-called *Vyaṅgyavyākhyā*: Selected Remarks for Reading It Philologically—A Review of K. G. Paulose (ed.). *Vyaṅgyavyākhyā: The Aesthetics of Dhvani in Theatre*. pp. xvi + 546. New Delhi: Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan–D.K. Printworld. 2013.—By Christophe Vielle (Oriental Institute, Louvain-la-Neuve).

Scholars have been waiting a long time for an edition of the *[Tapatī-]Saṃvaraṇa-* and the *[Subhadrā-]Dhanañjaya-dhvanis* (henceforth *dhv*) or *-vyākhyās*, two distinct commentaries, by the same Brahmin-scholar, on, respectively, *Tapatīsaṃvaraṇa* (henceforth TS) and *Subhadrādhanañjaya* (henceforth SDh). Both plays were composed by the Kerala king of Mahodayapuram Kulaśekhara, a contemporary of the commentator himself. Unfortunately, despite other qualities it might have, the work made by Paulose does not deserve to be called an ‘edition’, even if it provides us for the first time with the complete text of both commentaries, copied from the codex T.281 of the Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library of the University of Kerala (henceforth KUMML). This *devanāgarī* transcript on paper was made by a pandit of the Department for the publication of Sanskrit manuscripts/Curator’s Office Library, Trivandrum, in 1915 (date given by Paulose p. 67, supposedly from the transcriber-notice usually found at the end of such codices). In fact, beside T.281-‘B’ (= Alph. Index KUMML, vol. 5, 1988, p. 230, serial no. 25740), the *Tapatīsaṃvaraṇa-dhvani* is available through at least

three palm-leaf manuscripts in Malayalam script: KUML no. 5866, C.1343-A and 17957-B (= Alph. Index vol. 2, 1965, p. 20, s. no. 6553, and vol. 5, pp. 230–31, s. no. 25741–42, respectively),¹ and also through the *devanāgarī* manuscript on paper R.3048 from the Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras (Trien. Cat. vol. 4, part 1, Sanskrit A, 1928, pp. 4444–45).² The palm-leaf manuscript which was the source of part B of the transcript T.281 was, like the one used for part A, obtained in 1912 from the collection of Govinda Pisharoti in Kailasapuram

¹ KUML no. C[urator].1343-A corresponds to the second of the two *Samvaraṇadhvani* mss. listed by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī in *A catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts collected... for the Department for the publication of Sanskrit manuscripts*, Trivandrum: Government Press, vol. 1 [mss. collected in 1908–1912], 1912, p. 27, no. 254 ('2 *aṅkau*' only, 1920 *granthas*), and represents s. no. 1343A in L. A. Ravi Varmā, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Curator's Office Library*, Trivandrum: V. V. Press Branch, vol. 8, 1940, pp. 3086–87 ('C.O.L. No. 2434A'/ general no. 2055; *Samvaraṇadhvani*, 1800 gr., formerly owned by Nīlakaṇṭha Vārier, Pantalām); the latter description shows that the last folio of C.1343-A has in fact the very beginning of the third *aṅka*, an extract of which is presented as the 'end' of the manuscript (before the 'colophon' corresponding to the one of the second *aṅka*). KUML no. 17957-B appears to have a text more incomplete than C.1343-A (1200 versus 1800 *granthas* according to the Alph. Ind.). KUML 17909-C (Alph. Ind. vol. 5, p. 231, s. no. 25743) given as *Tapatīsamvaraṇa-vyākhyā* could constitute one more manuscript with a fragment (450 *granthas*) of the text.

² R.3048, which like T.281-B (and no. 5866, see next fn.) has 3 *aṅkas* complete, was, according to the descriptive catalogue, "transcribed in 1919–20 from a [palm-leaf] MS. of M. R. Ry. Tippan Nambūdirippaḍ of Ponnūrkoṭṭa-mana, Perumbāvūr post, Travancore State". Perumbavoor is the headquarters of the present Kunnathunad Taluk in the North-East of Ernakulam District, central Kerala; the Punnorkode/-code/-kottu/Punnoorkkote Swarnath(u) Mana is located in Pazhamthottam, Pattimattom village. The (transcript) R.3408 (76 folios) has itself been copied in a new transcript (199 pages) referred to by A. K. Warder, *Indian kāvya literature*, vol. 5, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988, pp. 338–347, 811.

(near Kaduthuruthy, Kottayam District) and appears to correspond to present ms. KUML no. 5866.³ The *Subhadrādhanañjayadhvani* which has been transcribed as part A of T.281 (= Alph. Index vol. 2, p. 74, s. no. 7841, and vol. 4, 1986, p. 56, s. no. 20306) has its source in the palm-leaf manuscript formerly kept in the Palace Library, Trivandrum,⁴ which is now KUML no. 20609 (uncatalogued

³ Ms. no. 253 in the 1912 Catalogue (*op. cit.* fn. 1), where it is presented as having ‘3 *aṅkāḥ*’ and 2500 *granthas* (compare with 2250 gr. given for ms. no. 5866 ‘i[n]c[o]m[plete]’ and 2050 gr. for T.281-B ‘c[o]m[plete]’ in the Alph. Ind., or 2300 gr. for the latter in the COL descriptive catalogue, p. 3085). Why it is not described in the COL catalogue can be explained by the fact that it did not belong to the COL (his owner was still Govinda Pisharoti), before the COL was, after 1940, amalgamated with the University collection (where such mss. on loan were, on the sly, incorporated), or by the fact that it had previously reached the University library through another way (a gift?). The transcript (‘C.O.L. No. 281’) is described twice in the COL catalogue, as the s. no. 1284 (*op. cit.*, pp. 2972–73, general no. 1977; *Dhanañjayasaṃvaraṇadhvani*), and, for its second part only, as the s. no. 1342 (pp. 3084–86, general no. 2054; *Samvaraṇadhvani*).

⁴ K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in H. H. the Maharajah’s Palace Library*, Trivandrum: V. V. Press Branch, vol. 7, 1938, pp. 2635–37 (shelf-)no. 1604 (general no. 2267; 1425 *granthas* [compare with 1500 gr. given by the COL catalogue, p. 2972, for what corresponds to T.281 part A only], “the Ms. begins [mistake for ‘ends’] on a fragment of the 2nd Act”). This manuscript was previously listed by the same in his *Revised Catalogue of the Palace Granthappura (Library)*, Trivandrum: Government Press, 1929, p. 79 no. 1604. This is the same ms. as the one bearing the no. 237 in T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī’s 1912 Catalogue (*op. cit.* fn. 1, p. 26; *Dhanañjayadhvani*, 1600 *granthas*, ‘2 *aṅke* 5 *ślokāntaḥ*’—the text indeed ends abruptly with a few *ślokas* in the 2nd *aṅka*), where it is said to have been “obtained” from Govinda Pisharoti. In this case, as it was usual in the making of editions, it was kept provisorily on loan in the Department for the publication of Sanskrit manuscripts in order to prepare a transcript (T.281 was made in 1915); T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī already quoted it in the introduction to his edition of the *Tapatīsaṃvaraṇa* issued in 1911 (TSS no. 11). Thereafter it reached the Palace Library (probably lent rather than donated

in the Alph. Index; a few folios are reproduced by Paulose pp. 66–67).⁵ Contra Paulose’s assertions (p. 67), the latter is not “the only Ms available to us of these [two] texts”, and it does not contain the *Samvaraṇadhvani*. It is the T.281 transcription that has combined the two texts, which were separate in the original manuscripts, and presented them with a common title (*dhanañjayasamvaraṇadhvaniḥ* written on the first page of the transcript reproduced by Paulose p. 68), as if they were forming a single work. The transcriber (viz. the pandit Turavur Narayana Sastri according to Paulose) would have been encouraged to do so following the use of the singular *Vyaṅgyavyākhyā* as a common title, created by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī to designate both works in the introduction to his edition of the *Tapatīsamvaraṇa* published in 1911 (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series no. 11). It is true that, on the one hand, the TSdhv starts abruptly, without any *maṅgalam* and with a very short introduction. On the other hand, the SDhdhv presents an elaborate literary introduction, where we are told how the king brought the Brahmin to him, showed him his *two* plays (*nāṭakadvayī*, p. 70/9, 74/10–12–14), and asked him to set down an explanation (*vyākhyā*, singular, p. 70/12) of them, starting with the SDh. So, whereas

by its owner). Paulose still speaks of this manuscript as “owned by Kailasapurathu Govinda Pisharoti in the palace library (No. 67) in Thiruvananthapuram” (p. 67), without noticing, or referring to, the new KUML number added on the ms.

⁵ The new KUML number is recognizable on the photographs of the manuscript provided by Paulose: the 1st slide (p. 66) presents one leaf-side with the number (20609) and title (“*subhadrādhanañjayadhvani* incomplete”) and the 1st leaf/folio r^o (beg.: *śrīgaṇapataye namaḥ | avighnam astu | laksmīśaś ca śaro...*; end: *mānasodyanmarālaśrīvidyodi[tadigantarah]*); the 2nd slide, reproduced twice (p. 66 and p. 67) gives the 1st leaf v^o (beg.: *-vidyodi[tadigantarah]...*; end: *parampuruṣanāmodyatsallā[pakathayatkatham]*) and the 2nd leaf r^o (beg.: *-sallā[pakathayatkatham]...*; end: *tām vidhāya tatra sa[bhrāṭṛvargas]*); the 3rd slide (p. 67) gives the 2nd leaf v^o (beg.: *sa[bhrāṭṛvargas]...*; end: *yadi tuṣṇīm gatā vayan [] prāya[ścittavidhir yatra]*) and the 3rd leaf r^o (beg.: *prāya[ścittavidhir yatra]...*; end: *bhavann atrastha[yā kayāpi]*).

the TS was composed before the SDh (as stated in the prologue of the latter),⁶ the TS*dhv* appears to have been written after the SDh*dhv* (cf. below fn. 17), forming for its author, as it were, a second part within a single work. It is even possible to imagine that the two manuscripts of Govinda Pisharoti, on which the synthetic transcript is based, were once parts of one and the same manuscript. Nevertheless, each part of the work seems to have been transmitted independently (simply because each one was preferably attached to its related play). Hence, even if the title *Vyaṅgyavyākhyā* (henceforth VV) is artificial, the way according to which the two texts have been put together by the ‘pre-editor’/transcriber is not at all meaningless.

The text of the *Dhanañjaya-dhvani* starts on p. 69 with the first *maṅgala*-verse (beginning with the word *Lakṣmī*-, just as in the very first verse of both SDh and TS; but here the stanza is for Gaṇapati, alluding to the war-chariot, in the Tripura episode, which was made of

⁶ The 1911 TS and the 1912 SDh (TSS no. 13) editions (both with the commentary of Śivarāma) by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī have been reprinted, with an additional 64 pp. introduction by N. P. Unni, in 1987 (Delhi: Nag Publishers). The first 28 pp. of the new introduction are the same in both volumes = N. P. Unni, *Sanskrit Dramas of Kulasekhara: A study*, Trivandrum: Kerala Historical Society, 1977, pp. 21–49, 160–61, 184–205, and then pp. 50–92 for TS, and 93–138 for SDh (note that pp. 175–205 = “Kulaśekhara Varman and Vyaṅgyavyākhyā” in *Highways and Byways in Sanskrit Literature*, Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation, 2012, pp. 526–52). Kulaśekhara’s text and Śivarāma’s commentary of both plays have been retyped (separately) in *The Sun God’s Daughter and King Saṃvaraṇa: Tapatī-Saṃvaraṇa and the Kūṭiyāṭṭam Drama Tradition (Text with Vivaraṇa Commentary)*, and *The Wedding of Arjuna and Subhadrā: the Kūṭiyāṭṭam Drama Subhadrā-Dhanañjaya (Text with Vicāratilaka Commentary, Introduction, English Translation & Notes)*, translated and introduced by N. P. Unni and Bruce M. Sullivan, Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1995 & 2001 (Unni’s intr. 1995, pp. 1–17 = 2001, pp. 41–57 = 1987, pp. 1–17 = 2012, pp. 429–42; intr. 2001, pp. 1–40 = 1987b, pp. 29–64; his note on the commentator Śivarāma, dated after the 12th c.: 1995, pp. 309–13 = 2001, pp. 273–78 = 2012, pp. 443–47 [cf. also pp. 294–96]). A detailed description and analysis of both plays and their commentaries is provided by Warder, *op. cit.* 1988, pp. 321–69.

all the gods, with Viṣṇu-Lakṣmīśa in the form of an arrow), followed on p. 70 with 3 *śloka*s in praise of, respectively, Bhārātī (Sarasvatī), Śambhu (Śiva) and Bharatamuni (10 lines also given in the Palace Libr. Cat). Then 4 *śl.* are devoted to the general scope of the whole work and to the SDh-dhv's specific one, 5 and ½ *śl.* describe poetically the Autumn season, and (pp. 72 and 74) a mix of prose and verses (18 and ½ *śl.*—the last 6 *śl.* also quoted in the Pal. Libr. Cat.) provide the historical context for the composition of the work, concluding the introduction. The last part of the introduction was also given twice (except 5 *śl.*/10 ll.) by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī in his introduction to TS (from the palm-leaf ms.);⁷ Ulloor S. Parameswara Aiyer⁸ (vl. UPA) did the same (omitting 2 ll. only), adding before it the *śl.* on Bharatamuni and the 4 following ones. Compare the variant readings in the latter passage:

Paulose p. 70/9–12: *tenāpi rasacittena racitā nāṭakadvayī |*
yuktā rasalayais sadyaḥ dhvanigarbhair padair api ||
 [yuktyā layarasais samyag (vl. UPA)]
teṣāṃ pradarśayantī yad dhvanyartham rasināṃ nṛṇāṃ |
 [pradarśayantīyaṃ (vl. UPA)]
vyākhyā prayogamārgaś ca sthāyibhāvam mayā kṛtā ||
 [prayogamārggañ ca sthāyibhāvo kṛtaḥ (vl. UPA)]

The slide of the palm-leaf ms. permits the reading: *yuktā layarasais samyag; yaddhvanyartham* (compound); *prayogamārggañca* (= °mārgam ca)

⁷ Following him, M. G. S. Narayanan, *Perumāḷs of Kerala: Brahmin Oligarchy and Ritual Monarchy. Political and Social Conditions of Kerala under the Cēra Perumāḷs of Makōtai (c. AD 800–AD 1124)*, Thrissur: Cosmo Books, 2013³ (1972¹, 1996²), pp. 406–7 fn. 153, gives in transliteration the same extract, omitting 11 ll., and thereafter adds a 14 ll. passage (description of the king, which comes before in the text), obviously taken from Ulloor KSC (referred to in the next fn.).

⁸ Iyer or Ayyar = (Mal.) Uḷḷūr Es. Paramēśvarayyar, *Kēraḷasāhityacaritram*, vol. 1, Trivandrum: University of Kerala, 1953¹, pp. 128–29, 1990², pp. 151–52. K. Kunjunni Raja, *The Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature* (henceforth CKSL), Madras: University of Madras, 1980² (1958¹), pp. 9–10 fn. 45, follows Ulloor, omitting the 12 ll. describing the king.

sthāyībhāvammayā (= °*vaṃ mayā*) *kṛtā*. Translation:

That [king] himself, with his mind [full of] *rasa*, composed a couple of plays, endowed with rhythm (*laya*) and taste (*rasa*), together with words full of *dhvani*. For men of good taste, I have composed an explanation (*vyākhyā*) illustrating the *dhvani*-meaning of those [words] (*teṣām... yad-*), the mode(s) of enacting/ways of performance (*prayogamārga*) and the state(s) of mind/basic emotions (*sthāyibhāva*, written *sthāyī°* in the palm-leaf ms.).

And, at the very end of the introduction:

Paulose p. 74/14–21: *etasmād dhvaniyuktā sā racitā nāṭakadvayī |*
draṣṭavyā bhavatā seyaṃ nāṭyalakṣaṇavedinā ||
tām paśyann avadhāryaiṣā sad asad veti kathyatām |
sādhuś cet prekṣako bhūyād bhavān asmi naṭas tathā ||
prayogamārgaṃ bhavate darśayiṣyāmi tattvataḥ |
bhūyaś cāropayiṣyāmi raṅgam etat kuṣīlavaiḥ ||
iti tena proktas taddarśitaprayogamārgo['Jham adhunā tatkrte 'smin
[mārgaprayogo (vl. UPA)]
dhanañjayanāmnī nāṭake sthāyibhāvaprayogamārgaprāveśikāś ca
[pra° (vl. UPA)]
pradarśyante |
[pradarśayāmi (vl. UPA)]

In this case, the quotation of T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī (1911), which stops after 'ham, confirms Paulose (and T.281) reading *prayogamārgo*; like the slide of the palm-leaf ms., which, however, reads *in fine sthāyī°* and °*praveśikāś ca darśyante* (or possibly *drśyante*). A pause (‘|’) was not put here between ['Jham and *adhunā* in the transcript (the original ms. is in *scriptio continua* without any *daṇḍa*) probably because of the use of *ca* to connect the two sentences through their subjects in the nominative case. Translation:

(the King, concluding his speech:) “Therefore, this couple of dramas was composed as endowed with *dhvani*; this [couple of plays as such] must be examined by you who know the characteristics of dramatic art. Having examined and reflected upon it, [you] should tell whether it is good or bad; if it is fine, be a spectator and I am the actor. I will show you the mode(s) of enacting in the proper way; moreover, I shall have this [play] staged by professional actors.”—having told me so, he showed me the mode(s) of enacting; and now, in the drama entitled *Dhanañjaya* composed by him, the state(s) of mind, mode(s) of enacting and (characters’) entrances (*praveśika* = *praveśaka*) are shown.

The beginning of the *Samvaraṇa-dhvani* is given, isolated, on p. 300. The text provided by Paulose (with a translation), supposed to be based on T.281 (B), presents slight variants with respect to the text of the transcript as given by the COL catalogue:

*athāhaṃ keralabhūbhṛtkṛte 'smin nātake sthāyībhāvaṃ prayogamārgaṃ ca
tatsahrdayaḥ pradarśayāmi | katham iti cet
bhūbhṛt svayaṃ bhūmikayā niretya nijāṃ alaṅkṛtya tanur manasvī |
yaṃ darśayitveti viniścītātmā prayogamārgaṃ **pradarśayāmīmam** ||
tena mayā mahīsureṇāpi tatsahrdayena piṣṭapeṣaṇaṃ kriyate | tathāpi
mahatkaver abhiprāyaṃ jñātum etat kṛtaṃ mayā |
tatpradarśitamārgeṇa **vicchinnaśyopadeṣṭari** ||
nāṭakanāyakaśaṇaṃ sarvaṃ daśarūpake draṣṭavyam | atra tanmātram
eva darśayāmi | atrāḍau samvaraṇanāmni nātake vidūṣakasya sthāyībhāva-
prayogamārgau drśyete |*

The COL (p. 3085) variant readings (up to *draṣṭavyam*) are: *sthāyībhāva-* (twice), *tanuṃ* (better), ***rahasi...mīmām*** (instead of *pradarśayāmīmam*), ***mahākaver*** (better). No description of palm-leaf ms. is available here for comparison, but the description of the GOML transcript gives the variant readings: *'pi* (for *'smin*), *svāvirbhāvaṃ* (misreading for *sthāyībhāvaṃ*), *tanuṃ* (confirmed), *yad* (for *yaṃ*), *rahasi śrumīmām* (with the suggested *śrutīnām?*), *ma(hā)kaver*, ***vicchinne 'syopadeṣṭari***, *nāṭaka...nāyaka°* (as if there was something lost between the two words), *vidūṣakasthāyībhāva°*. It can be understood, therefore, that *pradarśayāmi* is a (unmetrical, since this is an *upajāti* metre) conjecture (the place is here cautiously left blank by Kunjunni Raja, CKSL p. 10 fn. 46, quoting from the GOML ms.); in keeping *rahasi* and the final long *mām*, it is difficult to propose something acceptable: *rahasi bruvan mām* (or *raha ābravīd/uktavān mām*; logically, the predicate should be at the 3rd person singular, with the king as subject)? The reading *vicchinne 'syopadeṣṭari* of the GOML ms. seems also better than *vicchinnaśyopadeṣṭari* (translated by Paulose as “to the actors who are cut off from the tradition of preceptors”). Translation:

Then, sharing his good taste, I shall illustrate the state(s) of mind and the mode(s) of enacting in this drama composed by the king of Kerala. How is it?

The king resolved to give up his own role and, mindful, to adorn his body [with other characters (cf. below)] and to show the[ir] mode(s) of enacting. Those [modes], in secret (i.e., privately), †he told/taught (?)† me.

Therefore by me, although just a Brahmin sharing his good taste, a mere repetition is here made (viz. the grain having already been ground by the king, for me—even if an ‘earth-god’ and not an ‘earth-king’—remains the humble grinding of his flour).

Nevertheless, this work has been composed by me, to whom the mode(s) of enacting were shown by him, for [making] the intentions of this great poet known, [at a time] when the instructor (stage-manager of those plays) will be disconnected from him.

The whole typology of dramas and heroes is displayed in the *Daśarūpaka*.⁹ Here I will show only what is necessary. To begin with, the state(s) of mind and mode(s) of enacting of the *vidūṣaka* in the drama entitled *Samvaraṇa* are shown.

These two *Dhvanis* are not word-by-word commentaries as usually found in the Indian scholarly tradition. Only selected words or sentences of the original dramatic text are quoted in the course of the development, and they are embedded within an elaborate dissertation on the acting of the successive main characters, in which frame their implied/suggestive meaning is explained. The necessary background or previous events related to the characters are narrated in length through *pūrvasambandha* (“relations to what has preceded”, tr. Warder) passages.

After the general introduction referred to before (provided with a translation, pp. 69–75), the *Dhanañjaya-dhvani* starts with a long passage giving the background for Arjuna’s exile (pp. 76–86, with a *vis-à-vis* translation up to p. 88 and intertitles no. 5.1–6 added within the Sanskrit text). This follows the quotation of the original stage direction introducing Arjuna in the first act (*tataḥ praviśati dhanurbāṇapāṇir dhanañjayaḥ*), which comes after the prologue (*sthāpanā*)

⁹ A reference to the 18 (or 20)th chapter of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* so entitled or to Dhanañjaya’s work (discussed p. 53).

and interlude (*viṣkambhaka*), themselves not dealt with in the *Dhvani*. This pure narrative portion mixing *śloka*s and prose presents the interaction of the characters of Nārada, Arjuna, Draupadī, the Brahmin Kauṇḍinya (serving as the *vidūṣaka* in the drama), the Vṛṣṇi Gada, and an ascetic. Thereafter (from p. 89 onwards) in the first act, the text of *Dhanañjaya-dhvani* is put back after successive portions of the dramatic text itself (with the Prakrit often rendered into Sanskrit) given together with Unni and Sullivan's translation (supposed to be in italics, except that on p. 90/ll. 1–3, 109/ll. 1–2, 111/ll. 6–25, 126 etc. it is not). These portions are followed by the corresponding 'translated' portions (artificially cut off) of the *Dhvani*, which are rather paraphrases or short extracts chosen in accordance with Paulose's dramaturgical views, omitting most of the original commentarial material (see pp. 89–96, 103–111 and 125–138, with the progressive disappearance of the *Dhvani* portions). So for the first act, the Sanskrit text of the *Dhvani* is to be found on pp. 96–102 (the beginning forms the *praveśika* of the actor 'whose body is adorned with the character of Dhanañjaya', *dhanañjaya-bhūmikālaṅkṛta-tanuḥ*), pp. 111–124 (entry of the jester, his background, etc.) and pp. 138–150 (entry of the heroine, her background, etc.). [Thereafter follows, at the end of the first act, a first excursus, with a rendering of the Malayalam stage manual, *āṭṭaparakāram*, for the first act, on pp. 151–174; and a new version of the same, pp. 175–188.] For the second act, again after portions of the original text of the drama and their translation (pp. 189, 202–204, 230–238), the Sanskrit text of the *Dhvani* is spread over pp. 190 (the introductory scene with Subhadrā's maid-servant, *ceṭī*; translation p. 191), pp. 204–214 (entry of the chamberlain, long *śloka* passage recapitulating how Subhadrā was kidnapped and saved; the *vis-à-vis* translation ends on p. 215)¹⁰ and pp. 238–249 (entry of Arjuna disguised as a mendicant; entry of Kṛṣṇa, with a long *pūrvasambandha*

¹⁰ Note p. 212/11 the variant reading *jaṭāvaktṛcaraṇatayā punar yatividambanā samvṛttā* of the *Dhvani* versus *jarāvaktavyacaraṇatayā punar iyaty ativilambanā samvṛttā* of the original text (and Śivarāma's commen-

on his plans for marrying his sister, concluded by the *praveśika* of the actor ‘whose body is adorned with the character of Kṛṣṇa’, *kṛṣṇa-bhūmikālāṅkṛta-tanuḥ*; the text ends abruptly since the original palm-leaf ms., of which the very end is also given by the Palace Libr. Cat. pp. 2636–37, is incomplete; for this last part of the *Dhvani* the English rendering has been given previously, that is, with the original dramatic text and its translation, as in the first act). [Then follows an excursus on the *nañnyārkūttu*, pp. 192–201, relying on the unproven hypothesis that there was such an interlude performance elaborating on the maid-servant’s entry at the beginning of the second act; a second excursus, pp. 216–229, with a new performance text elaborating on the *kañcukīya-ceṭī* scene (*viṣkambhaka*); a third one with a new production of the recapitulation of Subhadrā in the fifth act, pp. 250–257, followed, pp. 258–297, by the Sanskrit text of the drama not yet provided, viz. the rest of the second act up to the end of the fifth and last one.]

Except for its short introduction (quoted before), the Sanskrit text of the *Tapatīsaṃvaraṇa-dhvani* is systematically given after the original dramatic text *cum* (Sullivan and Unni’s) translation of the first three acts (respectively, pp. 301–317, 355–373, 414–431; only the Sanskrit text of the acts 4 to 6 is added pp. 450–474, with a short ending note on the performance of the drama), and before its English rendering (pp. 346–354, 404–413, 446–449; compare Warder’s abstract, *op. cit.* pp. 338–346), that is pp. 318–346 for the first act (words quoted from the play are not always marked as such in bold type; *sthāyībhāva* of the *vidūṣaka*, *pūrvasambandha*, *prayogamārga*, *prāveśika* of the queen etc., and the concluding *evam prathamō* [*’ñka-sthāyībhāvaḥ prayogamārgaś ca darśitaḥ*: all these Sanskrit original mentions are omitted in the abbreviated rendering which takes the artificial form of a dialogue between the jester, the king and, later, the queen),¹¹ pp. 374–403 for

tary), mixed by Paulose within his English rendering p. 213: *jarāvaktavya caranātayā punaḥ yativiḍambanā saṃvṛttā*.

¹¹ Note that the quotation from the *Vaijayanī*, though important for the dating of the work (cf. Unni 1977, p. 39), is left unmarked p. 341/10

the second (same remarks as for the 1st act; the concluding *evam dvitīyo[]ñka-sthāyībhāvaprayogamārgau darśitau*, which should have been written at the end of p. 403 is to be found at the beginning of p. 432),¹² and pp. 432–446 for the third.¹³ The very end of the text (p. 446), where the author states that it is not necessary to go further because there is no *dhvani* thereafter (except the scene in the 6th act alluded to), is also provided twice (cf. fn. 3 before) by the COL catalogue (pp. 2972, 3085) according to T.281 (B), as well as by the GOML ms. description:¹⁴ *evam tṛtīyāñkaparyanta-sthāyībhāva-prayogamārgau darśitau* (COL p. 3085 writes *sthāyi°*, as in the beginning quoted before; *tṛtīyāñka-sthāyībhāvaḥ prayogamārgaś ca darśitaḥ* GOML) | *ataḥ param dhvanir na syāt | śaṣṭhāñke* (śaṣṭhe GOML) *nāyakasya menakārūpadhārinyā nāyikāyā*

(quotation marks are here added): *atrākhunā samīkaraṇam etad artham ‘ākhur mūṣikapotrīnor’ iti Vaijayanī* [= ed. Oppert, p. 214/13] | *atrākhur iti mūṣika uktaḥ* |.

¹² An example of the *Dhvani* author’s own *śloka*s (?; wrongly transcribed pp. 374–75, here corrected): *racite bhar[at]ākhyena śāstre[]smin muninā purā | darśito nṛttamārgo[]yam dvidhā vedasamanvitaḥ || tāṇḍavam tv iti vijñeyam ekaṁ lāsyam athāparam | puṁsā yat kriyate nṛttam tāṇḍavam tad vidur* (instead of *vidhur*) *budhāḥ || aṅganā raṅgamadhyasthā sakal-endriyahārīṇī | sukhā sundarā vācā* (*sic*, unmetr.) *lāsyam sā yat karoty adah ||*. This is not similar to what is found in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* ascribed to Bharatamuni (as pointed out by Paulose, p. 375 fn. 1)—such a gender-division is found in Dhanañjaya’s *Daśarūpaka* (1.10 or 15 Haas) and in the later *Sanḡītaratnākara* (7.6cd–7ab) and *Abhinayadarpaṇa* (śl. 5).

¹³ Another important quotation for the debate on dating (cf. Unni 1977, p. 39, and Paulose’s introduction p. 53) is p. 443 (last two lines): *vānarajātibhir [= chāyā] ity atra vāśabdasyaivety arthaḥ | “vā-śabdaḥ samuccaya-vikalpa-nirṇayeṣv” iti bhojasūtreṇoktam | atra nirṇaye* | (with the problem that this quotation giving the meanings of the particle *vā* is not traceable in the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharāṇa*, the grammar in *sūtra* form ascribed to Bhoja).

¹⁴ There is no reason to view this concluding remark as an interpolation as it is considered by K. Vijayan, “A new perspective on *Vyaṅgyavyākhyā* and *Naṭāñkuśa*”, *Journal of Manuscript Studies* (of the KUMIL) 26/1–2, 1985, pp. 90–101 (p. 93); see Paulose, p. 320 fn. 3.

darśane kim api dhvanir drśyate | iti niṣkrāntāḥ sarve | tṛtīyo 'ñkaḥ
(one could here add *samāptah*) |.

Both the *SDdhv* and *TSdhv* concentrate on the first two or three acts only of each play, and, in both cases, comment on the whole first act only (without the prologue). It can be guessed that, in the same manner as the *TSdhv* stops in the middle of the 3rd act, the ‘complete’ *SDdhv* stopped somewhere in the 2nd or 3rd act (cf. Warder, p. 361). Despite Paulose’s view of the two *Dhvanis* as ‘performance texts’, following Warder (p. 346) they do not seem to have been composed for actors in order to enrich the show (like the later *āṭṭa-prakāraṃ*s in Malayalam for the *Kūṭiyāṭṭam*).¹⁵ They were intended for (royal or brahmanical) literates and stage-managers, providing them with the characters’ backgrounds and explaining the characters’ inner states of mind and basic emotions that the directors had to make explicit to the audience through the acting of the performers, especially at the respective entrances of the different characters.

It is a pity that the Sanskrit text of the *Dhvanis* is so poorly presented and lost within a patchwork of various other, more or less relevant or interesting, dramaturgical and performance considerations (the aim of the book as a whole is far from being clear; at least it reflects Paulose’s own theatrical interests, presented in his preface, pp. vii–x), as also in the (general) Introduction (in four parts by, respectively, K. D. Tripathi, Radhavallabh Tripathi, N. P. Unni [“Introducing VV”, the most relevant portion, pp. 21–26] and P. K. N. Panikkar; pp. 2–32) and Paulose’s long “Part III—Epilogue” (pp. 477–526; note in this part the chapter on “Post-Kulaśekhara reconstructions”, which are mostly the author’s own imaginative ones;

¹⁵ For instance the Sanskrit verse from the *SDh āṭṭa-prakāraṃ* quoted by Unni in the introduction (p. 23) and which is not in the original text of the play, is also not in the *Dhvani*. At the same time, Paulose stresses the fact that there was no *Kūṭiyāṭṭam* at the time of Kulaśekhara, whose “innovations revitalised a stagnant Sanskrit stage and paved the way for the emergence of *Kūṭiyāṭṭam*” (p. 46, a sentence repeated in the fn. p. 47).

and the “Living traditions of VV” full of lyrical statements).¹⁶ His own introduction is entitled “Part I—Prologue” (pp. 35–64; to which pp. 66–68 introducing the manuscripts should be added, erroneously introduced in “Part II—Performance Text”),¹⁷ in which the “Textual Analysis” portion again completely lacks a minimum of philological method in failing to provide precise references in the text for the quoted extracts (e.g. on *bhāva*, the VV extract with 3 *śloka*s p. 63 is to be found in TSdhv p. 319; the additional sentence p. 64 cannot be traced); moreover, p. 57, the *śloka* with the definition of the *prekṣakas*¹⁸

¹⁶ On p. 479 fn. 4 (cf. also pp. 43, 487 fn. 16), Paulose ascribes Śaktibhadra’s play *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* to the 12th century without any good reason (this is criticized by P. K. N. Panikkar in the introduction p. 30; for an 8th–9th centuries dating, see Warder, pp. 1–23, cf. Kunjunni Raja, *CKSL* pp. 12–13, 209–10).

¹⁷ On p. 66 Paulose’s conjecture about the prologue of the SDhdhv, that “by the ‘api’ in ‘Dhanañjayepi’ in the introductory verse he [the author] indicates that the TS has already been covered [by the TSdhv]” (cf. also p. 70 fn. 2), seems wrong (the possible ‘also’-meaning of this *api* is not even rendered by Paulose in his translation). This refers (without given reference) to the *śloka* directly following the two quoted earlier (p. 70/13–14): *dhanañjayāhvaye tena racite nāṭake ’pi tat | anayā darśayiṣyāmi tanniyukto ’khilaṃ rasī ||*, which can be literally translated: “As a man of good taste directed by him (*tan-niyukta*), I shall illustrate all that (= the *dhvani*-meaning, etc.) through this [explanation, *anayā* = *vyākhyayā*], at least in (= starting with) the *nāṭaka* composed by him under the title *Dhanañjaya*”; the title of the other play is given for the first time only later, by the king himself (p. 74/10–11: *racitādya mayā vidvan katham cin nāṭakadvayī | ekaṃ saṃvaraṇaṃ nāma dhanañjayam itītaram ||*); cf. also the GOML ms. variant *’pi* for *’smin* in TSdhv beginning *atha... keralabhūbhṛtkṛte [saṃvaraṇanāmni comes later] ’smin nāṭake*, parallel to SDhdhv *adhunā tatkrte ’smin dhanañjayanāmni nāṭake*, both sentences translated here before.

¹⁸ *aṣṭau daśa ca vidyās tāḥ* (as written on p. 57, better than *tān* as given in the edited text p. 319) *nāṭyavedo yathāvidhi | smaraśāstraṃ ca yair jñātaṃ tān viduḥ prekṣakān budhāḥ ||* It has to be understood here that *nāṭya*- and *kāma*-śāstras are included within the 18 *vidyā*(*sthāna*)s known by the *prekṣakas*.

is wrongly ascribed to TS (it is in TS*dhv* p. 319; two more sentences from the VV follow on p. 58, among which: *abhinayena nānālokān, bhāvena prekṣakān* |, again without any location); p. 64, the VV description of the *navarāsa*s in the MBh (this refers to a *śloka* passage of the SD*dhv* to be found on p. 241) is presented as telling that there is “*adbhuta* in the people who see the Pāṇḍavas fighting to take back the cows”, whereas in Paulose’s rendering, p. 233, it is said that “Vīrarāsa, heroic, is shown in the battle to retrieve the cows carried away by the Kauravas”: here the Sanskrit text shows that the rendering (p. 233) is wrong (it forgets both *bhaya* and *adbhuta*). The five lines (p. 55) devoted to the “Author’s Erudition” (with a five line footnote roughly listing the sources quoted in the VV) leave open to further research the unsolved problem of the dating of both Kulaśekhara’s two dramas and their respective *Dhvanis*, which ranges from the 9th (Paulose, p. 53; cf. also Kunjunni Raja and Warder) to the 12th (Unni) centuries, since only a close look at all these quotations, most of them remaining untraced, and how they serve the main issues of the VV, could contribute to shed better light on both the nature and the date of this atypical work. A short bibliography and a word-index (unfortunately not of the text of the *Dhvanis*) close the book which, in conclusion, has to be used with caution until, as it can only be hoped, a real critical edition of the VV text is published.