

Clarifications on *Lokadharmī* and *Nāṭyadharmī*

BHARAT GUPT

The concept of *dharmis*—*lokadharmī* and *nāṭyadharmī*—is peculiarly Indian and has no parallel in the dramaturgy of Aristotle. *Dharmis* are ways of manipulating dramatic production with respect to acting and the handling of the story. As Aristotle has said little about production modes, we do not know anything about the techniques which may have been used in Greek classical theatre. However, even though the *dharmis* are clearly defined in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and the commentary of Abhinavagupta is sufficiently illuminating on them, still the *dharmis* have been subjected to the gravest misinterpretations by present-day exponents of Indian theatre. It is not the kind of error that results in clouding some marginally functional aspect of performance. The *dharmis* make up the overall approach to mimesis as envisaged by Bharata.

The three words *loka*, *nāṭya* and *dharmī* have to be viewed first as general Sanskrit words and then as definitive terms as given in the text. This shall emerge soon from the analysis of verses that I shall undertake. But first to the misunderstandings that prevail. There is first of all the modern Hindi meaning of *loka* which has caused a change of meaning by substituting the original Sanskrit intent. In Hindi, and a good many other modern Indian languages, *loka* has come to denote folk. *Loka-kala*, *loka-sangeeta*, etc. have come to mean folk art and folk music. *Lokadharmī* is thus taken to mean the folk mode (of theatre), and *nāṭyadharmī* is interpreted to denote classical theatre. To make matters worse, there is no dearth of Indian theorists who have accepted certain European and Orientalist classifications of Indian cultural and historical life into slots of binary opposites like folk versus classical, popular versus elitist, Aryan versus Dravidian, Brahmin versus unvedic, Great Tradition versus Low Tradition and so on, to which the addition of *lokadharmī* versus *nāṭyadharmī* is made by drama theorists. What is more, a set of medieval terms, *mārgī* and *deśī*, used in a very different context in manuals on music and dance, have been interpreted to mean folk versus classical music, dance and culture¹. In truth, such a division of art forms or culture could not have existed before the process of industrialization had come to create modern conditions. Was

Greek tragedy a classical art form with its poetry in choicest metric forms, or was it folk because a whole city watched it along with slaves? In ancient India too, there seems to have been no difference between the acting styles of the companies that performed in towns and those which played in the villages. As all performance in those days was a caste job, there is little possibility that there was one caste of rural actors and another of the urban. Neither the caste rules nor the ancient economy could have allowed it. Certainly the *kuśilavas*, *bharatas*, and *naṭas* must have had their schools (*sampradāyas*), but there could have been no classification along rural and urban lines.

There is the vast panorama of popular theatre in India which still retains much of its traditional character. That it has acquired a few things from cinema and westernized urban theatre can also be hardly denied. But still forms like Bhavai, Yakshagana, Jātrā, etc. have been able to retain an identity which can be safely called traditionally Indian. Nowadays, this kind of theatre is being called folk, hence *lokadharmī*, to distinguish it from *aṣṭapadī* dances like Odissi, Bharatanāṭyam, and the more dramatic ones, Kudiyaṭṭam and Kathakali, which were long ago christened classical. This spurious distinction has led many to believe that Jātrā, etc. are rustic art forms different *sui generis* from Kudiyaṭṭam, etc. It is conveniently forgotten that these were not rustic till the industrial revolution in India made them so and till the urban middle class banished them from towns. In terms of performance technique and methodology there seems to be little difference between Jātrā and Kudiyaṭṭam. The elements of *nāṭya* such as Purāṇa muthoi, *abhinaya* as codified gesture, stage conventions and typified characters, all of which are to be found in rural forms today, are to be found in *aṣṭapadī* dances as well as in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* meant for ancient *daśarūpakas*. To call the rural forms of the present 'folk' and hence *lokadharmī* is not correct.

The other major misconception about *lokadharmī* is to interpret it as realistic histrionics. To the student of theatre history realistic acting is known as a European phenomenon appearing for the first time in the 18th century. Before that no theatre in the world had any place for it. The 20th century Indian theatre, revived and nurtured under the shadow of the Western stage and cinematic realism, has lost sight of its own non-realistic methodology and taken realism for its own inheritance. It has not been able to establish a link with the ancient Indian or the present-day traditional theatre, and it can simply not envisage a production in which dialogue-dominant verbosity does not throttle the inherited codes of *āṅgikābhinaya* or body language. The recent efforts of some modern Indian playwrights to include song and dance in plays have resulted in patchwork only. In their

productions, neither dance nor music reshapes or succeeds in modifying the realistic mode of acting but instead remain a forced insertion. Realism continues to dominate the vision of playwrights, audience and scholars alike. That is why even a profound scholar of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, M.M. Ghosh, translated *lokadharmī* as realistic in his English translation of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. His translation, and the support of many others, has given a sanctioned accommodation to realism in our ancient dramaturgy. Even those who have recognized the non-realistic quality of ancient drama have defined the concept of *lokadharmī* as realism. In her *Classical Indian Dance in Literature And Arts*, Kapila Vatsyayan says: "The basic approach of this drama is 'idealistic': an elaborate stage convention (*nāṭyadharmī*), meticulous to the last detail, dispenses with the need of realistic presentation (*lokadharmī*) or portraiture" (p. 191). Whereas Vatsyayan has admitted that ancient Indian production was far from realistic, *lokadharmī* is all the same, for her, realistic rendering. Eugenio Barba has mistaken *lokadharmī* for something not even of the stage but of the world. He is unable to distinguish between *lokadharma* and *lokadharmī*: "We have two words, Sanjukta Panigrahi says to me, to describe a man's behaviour: one, *lokadharmī*, stands for the behaviour (*dharmī*) of man in daily life (*loka*); the other, *nāṭyadharmī*, for his behaviour in dance (*nāṭya*)" (pp. 5-32). Thus Barba calls all offstage behaviour *lokadharmī* and all stage activity *nāṭyadharmī*. But the NS has clearly laid down that both the *dharmis* exist in *nāṭya*, that is, in performance. Barba's use of *lokadharmī* and *nāṭyadharmī* is an obvious case of misinformation. Let me now turn to the text for the definitions given:

That which shows normal and abnormal behaviour of people rendering their actions as they have been narrated in the popular stories, without enacting on the stage any embellished movements of the body [is called *lokadharmī*]. That which seeks to render through acting [*abhinaya*] the usual ways of various kinds of men and women, such a *nāṭya* is called *lokadharmī*. Where speech, action, nature and expression are all exaggerated, where playfulness, embellished body movements [*angahāras*] are employed, techniques of drama are used [that is, *nāṭyadharmī*]. Where unusual characters are employed, embellished forms of *svara* [in song and speech] are used, such a drama is called *nāṭyadharmī*. When people [sitting or standing] close by cannot hear each other, but can hear words not spoken by anybody, that is *nāṭyadharmī*. When mountains, vehicles, air vehicles, skins, armour and flags are shown symbolically [as stage props] this is *nāṭyadharmī*. Having acted one role, when an actor takes up another role, either because no other actor is available, or if one has the skill to do many roles, this [convention] is called *nāṭyadharmī*. When a [socially] uncohabitable woman is made into a cohabitable character or vice-versa, such a [dramatic freedom] is called *nāṭyadharmī*. When one walks dancingly, raising one's feet, employing embellished body movements, this is *nāṭyadharmī*. That which is the natural behaviour of people depicting their happy or sorrowful acts, and that which is expressed by intricate gestures, is *nāṭyadharmī*.

Traditional stories [*itihāsa*] and the meaning of *Vedas* which has been spoken by Brahmins for the delight of men and gods is also *nāṭyadharmī*. *Nāṭya* should always be produced as *nāṭyadharmī*—without body gestures [*angābhinaya*] there is no delight. The spontaneous expression of all [living things] and all acting [*abhinaya*] to express meaning through embellished body movements is called *nāṭyadharmī*. [NS 13: 71-2]

First of all, it should be noted that there are only two verses about *lokadharmī*. The text gives the impression that it is something obvious. On the other hand, it is *nāṭyadharmī* which needs to be explained in detail. Broadly speaking, the representation on stage of *lokadharma* or the usual behaviour of the world on stage is *lokadharmī*. The *dharma* of the *nāṭya*, the actor, which is specifically stage behaviour, is *nāṭyadharmī*. It may be asked, why make a classification, when all activity in drama is on the stage and hence *nāṭyadharmī*? It seems that a distinction has to be made primarily to show the difference between the simple and the embellished. It is like the distinction between the raw and the cooked. The raw here is not just providing a realistic or naturalistic representation of worldly behaviour. But it is the choice of keeping to the well known story, behaviour, characterization and events as they have come down, without altering the roles through poetic imagination into *udātta* or *lalita nāyaka*, without embellishing the story with fantastic events. The mode of acting even for *lokadharmī* cannot be realistic. It would use *angikābhinaya* and *śatvika* and *āhārya* as well, to avoid the use of embellished movements that are expressive of intense or erotic feelings. Thus it is clear that *lokadharmī* has a specific use and a rather limited one in ancient drama. It is also to be noted that no production can be exclusively *lokadharmī* or *nāṭyadharmī*. Certain movements, some characters and some situations, very often the low and the comic ones would incline towards *lokadharmī*. But a good many situations, particularly in the *nāṭaka* and *prakaraṇa*, must follow *nāṭyadharmī*. Wherever there is room for *kaiśiki vritti* only the intense and fanciful world of *nāṭyadharmī* would suffice. Again, it is clear from the text that all stage conventions are make-believe and the *dharma* of *nāṭya*. Even pictures or models of mountains, air vehicles and the total paraphernalia of costume (*āhārya*) are theatrical fiction. To represent, thus, animals, furniture and buildings made out of the usual material of gum, wax, cloth, etc. available to the ancient producer was not a *lokadharmī* device, as some scholars have suggested, but was a *nāṭyadharmī* way. It is the belief of some specialists that anything placed on the stage is *lokadharmī* if inanimate and physical. For instance, a model of whatever kind, realistic or symbolic, of a chariot is *lokadharmī* but if a chariot is suggested through hand gestures and body movements then the production would be called *nāṭyadharmī*. The text, however, does not bear out this view. The verse quoted is explicit (78). A cardboard

mountain or other models are *nātyadharmi*. Such a model is not realistic but symbolic for Bharata. Stone is the *dharma* for a mountain and hence the piling of stones on stage could be called *lokadharmi*, but a cardboard mountain is *nātyadharmi*. In the Indian theory of drama, the unreality of the dramatic world is taken for granted. Here, there has been no need to first make things look real, and then to indulge in a willing suspension of disbelief. *Nāṭya* was meant to be a toy (*kriḍanīyakam*), which could not but be unreal. Hence, even *lokadharmi* cannot claim to be real or realistic; it is only a dramatic transmutation of worldly things and forces (*lokadharmā*) into stage phenomenon. When put on stage only a fraction of the worldly (*lokadharmā*) survives, the rest gets converted into *lokadharmi* (if it retains simplicity and similarity to the original) or into the *dharma* of *nāṭya*, *nātyadharmi* (if it is highly embellished and ornate). That is what Bharata implies in verse 81 when he says that the happy and sorrowful actions of men, when shown on stage through body movements of *abhinaya*, become *nātyadharmi*. It is the basis, the *lokadharmā*, on which the edifice of embellishment is raised. Let us now turn to Abhinava for his analysis.

Although there is no *dharma* except that of the world (*loka*), for the sake of entertainment, when worldly actions are made to undergo exaggeration and embellishment by the poet and the actor, then they are called *nātyadharmi*. *Dharmi* has been earlier defined as of two kinds. By 'earlier', the place indicated is the chapter on *rasa* and *bhāvas*. By saying *svabhāvopagatam*, it is meant that *lokadharmā* is primary, that it is like the wall on which embellishment is done like carvings. Some *dharmis* are of the *loka* kind, some are of the *nāṭya* kind.

Whatever happens to be the *svabhāva* [natural habit], it should be made to reveal itself, *sthāyī* and *vyabhicārī bhāvas* included. What is the right way to include them? The right way is to include them by showing normal actions. *Lokavārtā* is the story that is well known. Now, when the actions of the story are represented in their purity, without change, and acted upon the stage thus, then it is called *lokadharmi*. Here no distinction should be made between *nāṭya* which is the *dharma* [of the stage] and *dharmi* [that which follows this *dharma*]. Embellished gestures should be avoided here. But even in *lokadharmi*, natural actions like falling, striking and quarreling, etc. should be shown by gestures like *patāka*. For feminine roles women should do the acting and for masculine, men only [in *lokadharmi*]. Thus, where there is no acting [of the opposite sex] through gestures acquired by training to express the opposite sex, but an expression of gestures natural to one's own sex, that mode is called *lokadharmi*.

All this means—if the poet only describes the story barely as it has come down [as myth] and the actor enacts it without embellishment according to his own imagination, then *that part of the play*, being dependent upon *loka*, is *lokadharmi*. [NSAb, 13: 85]³

The thrust of Abhinava's argument is that the unembellished stands for *lokadharmi*. The story, when left unaltered, acting when done by men for masculine roles and by women for feminine roles, when the poetic and histrionic imagination is given no scope or rein, the production is called

lokadharmī. Moreover only that much of the play in which this occurs is called. Also, acting in *lokadharmī* cannot be done without the semiotic code of *nritta hastas* like *patāka*, etc.

About *nātyadharmī* there is less of a debate. The problem here is not its definition but of its execution. It was easy for modern producers to do *lokadharmī* realism and follow the dictates of European practice, all the while believing that this had *sāstric* sanction. But once it is realized that *nātyadharmī* stands for all kinds of very intricate and embellished acting, the modern producer is faced with a nearly insoluble problem. Some of the conventions of the ancient stage like *janāntika* are easy to recreate, nor is it difficult to design ornate costume, but the total creation of a performance script in a non-realistic mode demands a knowledge of various body stances (*karaṇas*), ways of walking, (*cāris* and *gatipracāra*), hand gestures (*nritta hastas*), speech inflexion (*kāku*), facial expressions (*uttamāṅga abhinaya*) and finally, the most difficult to surmount, the problem of recreating the ancient system of music for the sake of dramatic songs (*dhruvās*) and instruments. The interrelatedness of all these elements in a performance was once a matter of living practice. But now the deep structure of the performance can only be theoretically reconstructed from the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Some of the surviving traditional modes can provide a few clues. From the *aṣṭapadī* dances we can take *āṅgikābhinaya* of the various *karaṇas*, *nritta hastas*, *cāris* and facial expressions. From theatres like Kudiyaṭṭam and Yakshagana, some clues may be gathered about stage space (*kakṣa vīdhānā*).

Now, whereas *nātyadharmī* is artifact and improvisation, stage convention and exaggeration (*atibhāvakam*) of the given normal action of *lokadharmā*, it is also true that this exaggeration comes most naturally at the moments of erotic passion. This engenders in the body movements a peculiar change which has been called *angalīlā*. The *kaiśikī vritti* is an expression of this. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to presume that *nātyadharmī* is made up of *kaiśikī* only. Exaggerated and imaginative movements can also be in the service of sentiments other than *śringara*; they can be employed for the heroic, the terrible or the wondrous. Let us once more turn to *Abhinavabharati* for an elucidation of *nātyadharmī*. Commenting on the verse 72, it is said:

Now, *nātyadharmī* is defined as *ativākyakriyepetam*, that is, provided with exaggerated episodes. *Vākya* means the story that has come down to us; when the story is improvised for the purpose of greater delight, this effort of changing is called *kriyā*. For instance, the poet Rājasekhara has done the *kriyā* of adding to the episode of Rama's banishment a Rakṣas who takes the form of Daśaratha. *Satva* means normal behaviour and *bhāva* in this verse means normal feelings. These are here superimposed upon by the actions and feelings

imagined by the poet [in *nātyadharmī*]. For instance, the normally fickle and shallow character of the *vidūṣaka* has been turned into a serious and thoughtful counsellor, such as Vasantaka, in the play *Tāpasavatsarāja* and the normally Prākṛita-speaking queen is also made to utter Sanskrit. [NS Ab, 13: 85]⁴

The inner wishes of characters are sometimes made to appear on the stage in personified forms (as described in the verse 75). Abhinava gives the example of "then enters the Curse of Brahmin" from the play *Māyāpuṣpaka* (*yathā māyāpuṣpake tatah praviśati brahmaśāpa iti*). This is a curious example of *nātyadharmī*.

At another place in *Abhinavābharatī*, the great commentator has pointed out that both *lokadharmī* and *nātyadharmī* are of two kinds each. This division has not been stated by Bharata. But while analyzing the nature of *abhinaya* as representation of external objects and as expression of inner feelings, he says:

Abhinaya is to be performed in two ways, *lokadharmī* and *nātyadharmī*. The first is of two kinds, internal and external. There (in *lokadharmī*) the gestures expressive of mental states may be shown. For example, placing *patāka hasta* on the forehead shows inner pride. Or it can be an *abhinaya* of purely external nature, such as *padmakōṣa hasta* trying to denote an object. So is *nātyadharmī* of two kinds. It can be for the purpose of employing the *kaiśikī vṛtti*, which is instrumental in producing out of the world beauty in *nātya*. This is done by using four kinds of *karaṇas* [dance stances] such as *avastita*, etc. The second kind of use of *nātyadharmī* is by taking support of things which are to be found in the world. For example, by imitating the position of a hand engaged in painting. [NS Ab, 9: 2]

Here, by pressing the point that even *nātyadharmī* is of two kinds, Abhinava reveals that the truth about the process of dramatic mimesis is not so easy to grasp. He has made a fine point about the transition from reality to art. Of the two kinds of *nātyadharmī*, one is purely an artifact, *alaukika*, out of the world, not based upon an attempt to indicate anything of the world. It is *angalīlā* or fantasy, purely self-made. The other kind of *nātyadharmī* is that which draws upon worldly things and achieves ornate mimesis. The latter kind depends for its sustenance (*upajīvati*) on *lokadharmā*. The process here is the same as we had noticed earlier. *Nātyadharmī* transforms the *dharma* of the world (*loka*) into the illusion of *nātya*. To summarize, the way of the world is *lokadharmā*; this is the unembellished state of normal behaviour, normal action, and the prevalent story form makes up the material that theatre draws upon. When it is presented on stage as it is, the mode is called *lokadharmī*. But the production is neither realistic nor folk. It is achieved through the channels of *nātya* codes. As for *nātyadharmī*, it is the furthest take-off into imagination and adornment, expressed through intricate gestures to create for *nātya* a world of its own. □

NOTES

1. *Mārgī* and *Deśī*: *Sangīta Ratnākara* of Śārṅgadeva (circa 1265 A.D.) has been often quoted in support of the high-low categorization.

मार्गो देशीति तद्वेष्टा तत्र मार्ग स उच्यते।
 यो मार्मितो विरजच्याद्यैः प्रयुक्तो भरतादिभिः ॥२२॥
 देवस्य पुरतः शंभोर्नियताभ्युदयप्रदः।
 देशे देशे जनानां यद्रुच्या हृदयरजजकम् ॥२३॥
 गीतं च वादनं नृत्यं तद्देशीत्यभिधीयते।
 नृत्यं च वाद्यानुगं प्रोक्तं वाद्यं गीतानुवर्ति च ॥२४॥

Kallinatha comments:

मार्गित्वामार्गः। मार्मितत्वं च विरजच्याद्यैर्ब्रह्मादिभिः 'नाट्यसंज्ञमिदं वेदं सेतिहासं करोम्यहम्' इति प्रतिज्ञाय चतुर्षु वेदेष्वन्विष्य कृतत्वात्। मार्गित इति 'मार्गं अन्वेष्टे' इत्यस्माद्धातोः कर्माणि निष्ठायां रूपम्। मार्ग इति तु तस्मादेव धातोः कर्माणि घञन्तम्। देशीति देश शब्देन तत्रत्या जना लक्ष्यन्ते। तैर्यथेच्छं क्रियमाणायां गीतादिक्रियायामाचार्यकृता संज्ञा। (p. 14 — 15)

Mārgī here is defined as music which has been set as an example (the way) by Bharata Muni and others. *Mārgī* music is performed before Śiva for spiritual elevation. *Deśī* is the song, instrumentation and dance which is pleasing and in accordance with the taste of people in various regions. Kallinātha adds that music as envisaged by Bharata was the result of a search (*anveṣaṇa*) and it was enshrined in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, the fifth *Veda*. From these definitions one gathers that *mārgī* is meant to indicate a rather archaic form of musical practice which was surviving in the 14th century, as songs of old repertoire meant for devotional practices. The dramatic employment of music as given in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* had become, along with the total theatre, a thing of the past. *Mārgī* then, is nothing classical, nor elitist, nor something that widely entertains, but it is the music of a ritual for earning unseen benefit (*adriṣṭa phala*), as was *sāmagāna* in the age of Bharata. Śārṅgadeva has made no attempt to categorize music as classical versus folk, that is, exclusive to the upper classes, as different from the music of the lower strata, even though he describes every kind of musical practice that he could set his ears and eyes on. By admitting music as of two kinds, he only indicates that one is archaic and the other widely contemporary.

2. The verses in the 13th Chapter are as follows:

धर्मो या ^३द्विविधा प्रोक्ता मर्या पूर्व द्विजोत्तमाः^४।
 लौकिकी नाट्यधर्मो च तयोर्वक्ष्यामि लक्षणम् ॥७०॥
^५स्वभावभावोपगतं शुद्धं तु विकृतं तथा^६।
 लोकवार्ताक्रियोपेतमङ्गलीलाविवर्जितम्^७ ॥७१॥
 स्वभावविधिनयोपेतं^८ नानास्त्रीपुरुषाश्रयम्।
 यदीदृशं भवेत्नाट्यं लोकधर्मो तु सा स्मृता ॥७२॥

¹अतिवाक्यक्रियोपेतमतिस्त्वातिभावकम्²।
लीलाङ्गहारभिनयं नाट्यलक्षणलक्षितम्³॥ ७३
⁴स्वरालङ्कारसंयुक्तं⁵ मस्वस्थपुरुषाश्रयम्।
यदीदृशं भवेन्नाट्यं नाट्यधर्मी तु सा स्मृता॥ ७४
¹लोके यदभियोज्यं च पदमत्रोपयुज्यते।
²मूर्तिमत्साधिलार्थं⁸ च नाट्यधर्मी तु सा स्मृता॥ ७५
आसन्नोक्तं च यद्वाक्यं न शृण्वन्ति परस्परम्।
अनुक्तं श्रूयते यच्च नाट्यधर्मी तु सा स्मृता⁵॥ ७६
शैलयानविमानानि चर्मवर्मायुधध्वजाः।
मूर्तिमत्तः प्रयुज्यन्ते नाट्यधर्मी तु सा स्मृता॥ ७७
य एकां भूमिकां कृत्वा कुर्वीतैकान्तरेऽपराम्⁶।
⁷कौशल्यादेककत्वाद्वा नाट्यधर्मीति⁸ सा स्मृता॥ ७८
यागम्या प्रमदा भूत्वा गम्या भूमिषु युज्यते¹।
गम्या भूमिष्वगम्यावा नाट्यधर्मी तु² सा स्मृता॥ ७९
³ललितैरङ्गविन्यासैस्तथोक्लिप्तपदक्रमैः।
नृत्यते गम्यते⁴ चापि नाट्यधर्मी तु सा स्मृता॥ ८०
⁵योऽयं स्वभावो लोकस्य सुखदुःखक्रियात्मकः।
सोऽङ्गाभिनयसंयुक्ते नाट्यधर्मी प्रकीर्तिता⁶॥ ८१
⁷यश्चेतिहासवेदार्थो ब्रह्मणा समुदाहृतः⁸।
⁹दिव्यमानुषरत्यर्थं¹⁰ नाट्यधर्मी तु सा स्मृता॥ ८२
यश्च कक्ष्याविभागोऽयं नानाविधिसमाश्रितः¹¹।
रङ्गपीठगतः प्रोक्तो नाट्यधर्मी तु सा भवेत्॥ ८३
नाट्यधर्मीप्रवृत्तं हि सदा नाट्यं प्रयोजयेत्।
न ह्यङ्गाभिनयात्किञ्चिद्यते¹ रागः² प्रवर्तते॥ ८४
सर्वरस सहजो भावः सर्वो ह्यभिनयोऽर्थतः³।
अङ्गालङ्कारचेष्टा तु नाट्यधर्मी प्रकीर्तिता⁴॥ ८५

3. यद्यपि लोकिकधर्मव्यतिरेकेण नाट्ये न कश्चित् धर्मोऽस्ति, तथापि स यत्र लोकागतप्रक्रियाक्रमोरजननाधिक्यप्राधान्य-
मधिरोहयितुं कविनटव्यापारे वैचित्र्यं स्वीकुर्वेत् नाट्यधर्मीत्युच्यते।

तदेतदाह धर्मी या द्विविधेति। प्रोक्ता उद्दिष्टेत्यर्थः। पूर्वमिति 'रसा भावा' इत्यादिसंग्रहविभागावसरे (अ ६-१०)
लौकिकस्य धर्मस्य मूलभूतत्वात्नाट्यधर्मं वैचित्र्योल्लेख्यभित्तिस्थानत्वादिति लोकधर्मोमेव लक्षयति स्वभावभावोपगत-
मित्यादि। काचित्तद्विपया धर्मी, काचिन्नटविषया। यो यस्य स्वभावतो भावः स्यात् स्थायिव्यभिचार्यादिः तेनोपेतम्।
कथमधिकृतत्वादित्याह (शुद्धमिति)। शुद्धत्वात् स्वविकल्पितेन व्यामिश्रत्वात् तथेति शुद्धं कृत्वा। लोकवार्ता
लोकप्रसिद्धिः तस्यां या क्रिया व्यवहारो वृत्तान्तस्तया शुद्धमेव कृत्वा युक्तं यन्नाट्यं नटनीयं कार्यं सा लोकधर्मी
धर्म्यास्तद्वतश्चाभेदोपचारात्सामानाधिकरण्यम्। अङ्गलोलया वर्तनादिकया वर्जितं कृत्वा। स्वभाववत्पतनप्रहरनादाव-
सरविवादादाविव पताकादिना योऽभिनयस्तेनोपेतम्। नानात्वेन च स्त्रीपुंसोः स्त्रियां प्रयोज्यायां योषिदेव प्रयोक्ता पुरुषे तु

पुरुष इत्येवंभूतं यन्नाभ्यस्तचेष्टितं सा लोकधर्मी तद्धर्मव्यपदेशात् यदि वा समुदायरूपस्य काव्यं ताभ्यां मनसो एकदेशभूता धर्मी।

एतदुक्तं भवति—यदा कविर्यथावृत्तवस्तुमात्रं वर्णयति नटश्च प्रयुङ्क्ते, न तु स्वबुद्धिकृतं रङ्गनावैविध्यं, तत्रानुप्रवेशयन्तदा तावान् स काव्यभागः प्रयोगभागश्च लोकधर्माश्रयः तत्र धर्मी।

4. अथ नाट्यधर्मी लक्षयति अतिवाक्यक्रियोपेतमिति। इतिहासादि-वाक्यमतिक्रम्य या उचितरञ्जकेतिवृत्तकल्पनात्मिका क्रिया। राजशेखरेण रामनिर्वासना दशरथवेपथुसखिचिन्तितत्वकल्पना, तथा यदुपेतं भावसत्त्वं स्वभावचित्तवृत्तिमतिक्रम्य यत्तिष्ठतं कविकल्पितचित्तवृत्तयन्त्रयुक्तमित्यर्थः। यथा स्वभावचपलविदूषकचित्तवृत्त्यतिक्रमात् यथा वस्तराजेन मन्त्रिसमुचितगाम्भीर्यावहित्ययोजनं वसन्तकस्य तथा, स्वभावभाषितमतिक्रम्य यत्तिष्ठतं यथाराज्याः संस्कृतम्*।
5. अभिनयस्य द्विविधा इति कर्तव्यता लोकधर्मी नाट्यधर्मी च। आद्या द्विविधा—चित्तवृत्त्यर्पकत्वेनानुभावस्य, यथा “गर्वेऽप्यहमिति तज्जैर्ललाटदेन्योच्छित” (9/19) इति। केवल बाह्यावयवरूपा वा, यथा-पद्मकोशस्य कम्पि निरूपणे। नाट्यधर्म्यापि द्विविधा—नाट्योपयोगमूलभूतकैशिकीसम्पादनोचितालौकिकशोभाहेतुः यथा-आवेष्टितादि चतुर्विधकरणरूपा। कचित्त्वंशेन लोकभुपजीवति, यथा-वर्णारतुरेण हस्तेन तत्र व्यवहितेन लोक उपजीव्यते।

WORKS CITED

- Barba, Eugenio: 'Theatre Anthropology', *The Drama Review* 26.2 (Summer 1982), 5-32.
- Bharata Muni: *Nāṭyaśāstram with Abhinavabhāratī*, ed. Rama Krishna Kavi, 4 vols., GOS, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1934-64.
- Sārṅgadeva: *Sāṅgītaratnākara*, The Adyar Library, Madras, 1943-53.
- Vatsyayan, Kapila: *Classical Dance in Literature and the Arts*, Sangeet Natak Akademi, Delhi, 1968.