Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 15 (1962)

Heft: 3-4

Artikel: The art medium of aubhikas and its nature

Autor: Varma, K.M.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-145864

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 03.12.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

THE ART MEDIUM OF ŚAUBHIKAS AND ITS NATURE *

DR. K. M. VARMA, BERLIN

«*iha tu katham vartamānakālatā kaṃsaṃ ghātayati baliṃ bandhayatīti, cirahate kaṃse cirabandhe ca balau | atrāpi yuktā | katham | ye tāvad ete Śobhanikā nāmaite pratyakṣaṃ kaṃsaṃ ghātayanti pratyakṣaṃ ca baliṃ bandhayantīti | citreṣu katham | citreṣv apy udgīrṇā nipatitāś ca prahārā dṛśyante kaṃsakarṣaṇyaś ca | granthikeṣu katham yatra śabda-gaḍu-mātraṃ lakṣyate | te'pi hi teṣām utpattiprabhṛtyāvināśād ṛddhīr vyācakṣāṇās sato buddhiviṣayān prakāśayanti | ātaś ca sataḥ | vyāmiśrā hi dṛśyante | kecit kaṃsabhaktā bhavanti kecid vāsudevabhaktāḥ | varṇānyatvaṃ khalv api puṣyanti | kecid raktamukhā bhavanti kecit kālamukhāḥ |*»[1].

This passage occurs in *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, where there is a mention of two categories of professionals – *Śaubhikas*[2] and *Granthikas*. Ancient grammarians like Haradatta, Kaiyaṭa, Nāgeśa, etc. explain it in their own ways in usual course of commenting on the whole text. It is, however, in the modern times that this passage specially attracts the attention of some researchers – Albrecht Weber[3], Sylvain Lévi[4], Berriedale Keith[5], Sten Konow[6], Heinrich Lüders, etc.

* Thanks are due to Miss Grace Marjorie Allen for her kindness in going through the MS.

1. *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* [(= V.M.B.) by Patañjali, edited by Franz Kielhorn, Vol. II, (Bombay, 1882) p. 36] on socalled *vārttika*, "*kurvataḥ prayojaka iti cet tulyam*" to Pāṇini's *sūtra*, "*hetumati ca*", 3.1.26.

2. Here Kielhorn's edition reads *śobhanika*. Lüders in one of his articles (whose particulars are given in note 7) has discussed the details of different readings and preferred the reading *śaubhika* (see *Philologica Indica*, p. 406 and pp. 407–408, foot-note 3). We too accept this reading.

3. "*Das Mahābhāṣya des Patañjali*" (Benares, 1872), published in Indische Studien, XIII, edited by Albrecht Weber, Leipzig, 1873, pp. 353–354 and 488–490.

4. *Théâtre indien*, Paris, 1890, 315ff.

5. "*The Origin of the Indian Drama*", Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Vol. 64 (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 535–536. "*The Child Kṛṣṇa*", Journal of Royal Asiatic

Although the nature of the subject matter of our discussion, is clear from the title of the paper itself, yet it is not possible to confine it to this alone without making some occasional reference to *Granthikas* also, since Patañjali mentions both of them (i. e. *Śaubhikas* and *Granthikas*) in the same context as the performers of two arts of different natures, but with same content, i. e. two stories, viz. *kaṃsavadha* and *balibandha*. For this reason it has been a tendency of majority of modern scholars to bring both categories of these professionals into their discussion. A few of them have discussed the subject in some detail, while others have touched on it only in passing; yet, no doubt, all of the above mentioned scholars with their varying interests, have tried according to their inclinations to clarify the nature of those two professions. But it is Lüders who makes a more detailed investigation of the matter in his long paper, «Die Śaubhikas»[7]. He takes into consideration all that ancient commentators and modern scholars, with the expection[8] of Konow, have to say on the subject.

Konow takes *Śaubhikas* to be jugglers[9]. Without giving any reference he says that lexicographers supply such a meaning. Even if such a meaning is found in lexicons, one must look into the matter of whether it would suit the context or not, which Konow does not seem to do. Therefore there is nothing to discuss in this regard, except to state that the meaning given by him is too arbitrary.

Society, London, 1908, pp. 171–172; "*The Vedic Ākhyāna and the Indian Drama*", ibid., 1911, p. 1008 and "*The Origin of Tragedy and the Ākhyāna*", ibid., 1912, pp. 416, 418–419 and 422.

6. "*Zur Frühgeschichte des indischen Theaters*", published in "Aufsätze zur Kultur- und Sprachgeschichte vornehmlich des Orients" [(Ernst Kuhn, zum 70. Geburtstage am 7. Februar 1916, gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern, München, 1916), Breslau, Verlag von M. und H. Marcus, 1916], p. 114.

7. This paper was originally published as "Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften" (XXXIII, 1916) and later it was reprinted in "*Philologica Indica*" (Ausgewählte kleine Schriften von Heinrich Lüders), Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1940. In the present paper references are given to the latter publication with the abbreviation, P. I.

8. Lüders (P. I., p. 428, foot-note 1) could not make use of Konow's paper, as this was published only shortly before Lüders'.

9. Op. cit.

So far as the other – ancient and modern – views are concerned, Lüders has summed[10] them up, showing their shortcomings. Hence any mention of them here would prove mere repetition. If we come to his investigation, admittedly it gave impetus to the present writer. But the present paper cannot be described as being based on that of Lüders, for the two papers differ on essential points. The material collected by Lüders is of immense value and that will help to a great extent in deciding the meaning of the passage quoted above. Consequently Lüders' paper will be mostly referred to here, but it may be worthwhile to make a point clear at the outset. Like most of the modern scholars Lüders, too, tries to interpret this passage in order to shed light on the beginnings of Sanskrit drama. In the present paper no attempt will be made to assess how far Lüders succeeds in this endeavour; it will only be observed to what extent he is correct in interpreting the passage.

In presenting the stories – *kaṃsavadha* and *balibandha* – *Granthikas* use a different medium from that which is adopted by *Śaubhikas*. If it were not the case there could not have been any point in Patañjali's raising the question twice – firstly relating to *Śaubhikas* and then to *Granthikas*. What are, then, these media? The answer is to be sought in Patañjali's questions themselves. In the case of *Granthikas* he formulates the question: «*granthikeṣu kathaṃ yatra śabdagaḍumātraṃ lakṣyate*»? Contrary to this, in the case of *Śaubhikas* he puts the same: «*citreṣu katham*»? but not *śaubhikeṣu kathaṃ*. This reveals that the art medium of *Granthikas*, is words, that is to say recitation, and so is not an external aid. The art medium of *Śaubhikas*, is, however, *citras*, which are obviously external. Wether or not these two categories of professionals used any other things along with those mediums specified here, is a different question. The *main* art medium of *Śaubhikas*, is *citras* and that of *Granthikas*, is recitation, as is evidenced, beyond any doubt, by the very formulation of the questions. No scholar seems to realize the full significance of the question formulation. There is another point which ancient

10. P.I., pp.408–414.

commentators and modern researchers seem to miss. This point is that the meaning given to the word, *citra* must be in conformity with the nature of the profession of *Śaubhikas*.

Had Lüders been enough aware of the fact that the *main* art medium of *Śaubhikas*, is *citras*, he could not have clung to the principle of narration *(tadācaṣṭe)*. One of the key notes of Lüders interpretation of this passage, is the principle of narration. As a matter of fact this principle cannot be applied to this passage. Why? That needs some explanation.

The suffix, "*ṇic*" is added to the verbs when the causative sense *(hetumān*, i.e. *preraṇa*, *adhyeṣaṇā*, *anumati*, *upadeśādi-prayojakavyāpāra)* is to be expressed. If so, there are certain usages such as *kaṃsaṃ ghātayati*, *baliṃ bandhayati*, etc. which contain "*ṇic*", but in these cases an actual causative agent, in its real or usual sense, did not exist at all. In order to save such usages Kātyāyana tries to explain them on the basis of principles of narration and others. So he makes some *vārttikas* to that effect, among which "*ākhyānāt kṛtas tad ācaṣṭe*, *kṛlluk*, *prakṛtipratyāpattiḥ*, *prakṛtivac ca kārakam*" is one[11]. Under this *vārttika* Patañjali supplies the two sentences quoted above. While doing so he respectively puts the sentences, "*kaṃsavadham ācaṣṭe*" and "*balibandham ācaṣṭe*" in apposition (though these are literally arranged in first place). In this place Patañjali does not mention either *Śaubhikas* or *Granthikas*. After commenting on some *vārttikas* and just at the beginning of the socalled[12] *vārttika*, "*na vā sāmānyakṛtatvāt hetuto hy aviśiṣṭam*", he poses a question: "*tat tarhi idaṃ bahu vaktavyam*"?[13] and answers: "*na vā vaktavyam*" (as an elucidation of the first part of the socalled *vārttika*, just quoted above). It is then clear that Patañjali rejects the narration and similar principles

11. V.M.B., Vol.II, p.34. This as well as the other *vārttikas* are to be seen under the same (Pāṇini's) *sūtra*, i.e. *Hetumati ca*.

12. Generally speaking Kātyāyana's *vārttikas* are supposed either to supplement or to amend Pāṇini's *sūtras*. In view of this a doubt arises whether the present one, as well as following three, are really *vārttikas* or not, for they, containing discussion, appear like commentary. Only those who made a special investigation of the matter, can shed the light on this question. This writer means nothing decisive, when he describes them as "socalled".

13. V.M.B., Vol.II, p.35.

proposed by Kātyāyana in several of his *vārttikas*. But it remains to the former to explain, in some way or the other, the correctness of all those odd usages which the latter tries to save by accepting several principles.

Patañjali tackles the problem by a very particular way of interpreting Pāṇini's *sūtras:* "*svatantraḥ kartā*" (1.4.54) and "*tatprayojako hetuś ca*" (1.4.55) which are the definitions of the agent and the causative agent respectively[14]. It should also be noted that while interpreting those *sūtras* he refers to two of the socalled *vārttikas* (viz. *na vā sāmānyakṛtatvāt*, etc. and *svatantraprayojakatvāt*, etc.) that are found in the present context. That both these contexts are interrelated, is a fact on which whatever he concludes in the present context, is based.

In conclusion Patañjali says[15] the following: If one acts, one does so without depending on anyone else *(pravṛttir hy ubhayatrānapekṣyaiva)*. No one acts because of mercy for others; everyone acts in his own interests *(neha kaścit paro'nugṛhītavya iti pravartate | sarva ime svabhūtyarthaṃ pravartante)*. If everyone acts at own will or wish, who then would be the *prayojya?* i.e. whom a causative agent would make to act or do anything? *(yadi tarhi sarva ime svabhūtyarthaṃ pravartante kaḥ prayojyārthaḥ)*. The *prayojya* is the one who fits into somebody else's intention *(yadabhiprāyeṣu sajjante)*[16].

Though this is only a short account of what Patañjali has to say in this context, yet this much is essential. Again in this, the key point is his interpretation of the *prayojya*. In order to show mainly the correctness

14. Ibid., Vol.I (the same edition, Bombay, 1880), pp.338–339. Also in regard to many of the *vārttikas* found under these two *sūtras* there arises the same doubt as explained in note 12.

15. Ibid., Vol.II, pp.35–36.

16. Neither here nor elsewhere did we try to translate the relevant sentences of V.M.B. literally. In some quarters there is a tendency to insist on literal translation. We are not in favour of this, but it is not the place to explain the grounds for our view. It is enough to say that for a number of reasons we hold that a real literal translation is almost impossible, especially when only a few relevant passages or sentences are to be handled. So we explained those sentences as we understood them in their context. If there are errors in this explanation, they can be detected as in the case of translation, since the correct understanding of the text is the decisive factor everywhere.

of the previous examples (given under various *vārttikas*) in the light of his interpretation of *prayojya*, he repeats some of them now under the *vārttika*, "*kurvataḥ prayojaka iti cet tulyam*".

In this connection the sentences, "*kaṃsaṃ ghātayanti*" and "*baliṃ bandhayanti*" reappear, but with additional matter which did not occur when these sentences were mentioned for the first time (i. e. under *vārttika*, "*ākhyānāt kṛtaḥ*", etc.). There is a reason for adding new matter in the second place (i. e. under *vārttika*, "*kurvataḥ prayojaka*", etc.). In the first place these sentences are supposed to be explicable by the principle of narration, and consequently no question regarding the correctness of the tense arises[17]. But in the second place there is no such possibility, for here such a principle is rejected. Hence one has to explain the correctness of tenses. For this reason Patañjali puts the question for himself, "*iha tu kathaṃ vartamānakālatā*"? In order to answer this question he brings additional matter, such as *Śaubhikas*, *citras*, *Granthikas*, *śabdagaḍumātra*, etc. This explanation makes it clear that the sentences, *kaṃsaṃ ghātayanti* and *baliṃ bandhayanti* in the second place with additional matter such as *Śaubhikas*, etc. cannot be explained on the basis of the principle of narration. Lüders is interested in interpreting them in their second place, but he missed the point that one cannot explain them with the principle of narration, and so throughout he repeats the same[18] without making any distinction between the first and second places.

As the principle of narration is no longer held to be valid, the meaning of the word, *citra* should be decided in that light, i. e. the meaning given to it should be in conformity with the sense of causative agent and present tense[19]. Lüders takes it to mean painting and at the same time he rejects

17. In no way does this necessarily imply that the *main* art medium of Śaubhikas, is narration, because this principle is accepted only for the sake of argument. This matter is proved very well by Patañjali's rejection of all those *vārttikas*.

18. P.I., pp.411–413.

19. Kaiyaṭa takes *Śaubhikas* to be those who train the actors, though it is not clear on what grounds he says so. But the word, *citra* goes against this view, for *nāṭyācāryas* have

the view of ancient commentators like Haradatta and Nāgeśa and also along with them Weber, who bring the painter onto the stage[20] (which should implicitly mean that they take *Śaubhikas* to be painters). This creates some difficulty to Lüders, because he takes *Śaubhikas* to be shadow players, although he is not sure enough in this respect[21]. Consequently he says that *Śaubhikas* might have used two kinds of things for their play, one is immovable object (subject), i.e. painting, and the other is movable, i.e. leather figures that are used in shadow play[22]. When Patañjali himself has mentioned only *citras* as the art medium of *Śaubhikas*, Lüders has no ground at all for bringing leather figures here in addition to *citras*. If he had interpreted *citra* to be only leather figure, that could have been a different matter. Of course he is correct when he rejects to consider *Śaubhikas* as painters. But he too, like the others, is unaware of the difficulty which arises when *citra* is taken to mean painting.

In this context *citra* does not mean painting or painted scroll, because in this case there can be no causative agent. If the recitation were the *main* art medium of *Śaubhikas* and they used the painted scroll as a visually helping medium, then they, like *Granthikas*, might have been taken to be causative agents. But that is not the case and their *main* medium is *citras* themselves. As a matter of fact a painter cannot be a causative agent here, for he is not mentioned in those sentences. Only for the sake of argument even if we accept painter as causative agent, the present tense would be incorrect, because a painter cannot paint at the moment when *Śaubhikas* perform the play. According to Patañjali's

nothing to do with *citras* and no theory can be acceptable which cannot show proper relation between *Śaubhikas* and *citras*. In one respect, however, Kaiyaṭa's view is of some interest. He seems to be of the view that causative agent and present tense (?) should be explicable in these sentences also and in order to show this he seems to interpret *śaubhika* as *nāṭyācārya*, because, otherwise, i.e. when it is interpreted to be either actor or painter, this could not have been possible.

20. P.I., pp.413–414.

21. "Ich bin trotz alledem bereit, zuzugeben, daß es nur als wahrscheinlich bezeichnet werden kann, daß die śaubhikas Schattenspieler waren; der absolut sichere Nachweis läßt sich vorläufig kaum erbringen." Ibid., p.427.

22. Ibid., p.415.

intention both causative agent and present tense should be justifiable. Then *citra* must mean such a figure, which itself and whose limbs also, could be moved. In this case *Śaubhikas* can be taken to be causative agents and from the point of view of their show not only the present tense but also all the three tenses would be possible.

A leather figure of the sort which is used in shadow play, may come into our consideration, because it has the necessary qualifications. But the word, *śaubhika* goes against this possibility. From a passage of *Therīgāthā*[23], which is earlier than Patañjali[24], it is clear enough that the word, *sombhā* means a puppet (made of wood). Lüders himself is fully aware of this fact[25], but for quite unsatisfactory reasons he concludes that *sombhā* means leather figure, which is used in shadow play; he does not, however, insist on this point[26]. The fact that in the same passage *sombhā* is described to be movable through the threads tied to it, certainly goes against Lüders conclusion, since shadow play of the kind known to India[27], is not conducted with threads and at the same time that very description proves that it is a puppet which is moved through the threads that are tied to it. The word, *śaubhika* is, as Lüders shows[28], formed out of the Sanskrit word, *śobhā* which in Pālī sounds *sombhā*. If so, according to the derivative meaning of their name, *Śaubhikas* are puppet players.

Therefore the *citras*, i. e. the movable figures that are used by puppet players cannot be leather figures; on the contrary they must be three-

23. "*diṭṭhā hi mayā sucittitā sombhā dārukacillakā navā*
tantihi ca khīlakehi ca vinibaddhā vividhaṃ panaccitā"

Thera – and – Therī – Gāthā, edited by Herrmann Oldenberg and Richard Pischel respectively, The Pālī Text Society, London, 1883, verse 390, p. 161. Lüders quotes the same, see P. I., p. 426.

24. M. Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Literatur* (C. F. Amelang Verlag, Leipzig, 1913), Vol. II, Pt. 1, pp. 87–89.

25. "Aus dem Zusammenhang geht aber mit Sicherheit hervor, daß hier von einer Puppe die Rede ist." P. I., p. 426.

26. Ibid., p. 427.

27. Perhaps from time immemorial shadowplay has been performed with leather figures in India. That Lüders has the same in view is clear from many places, as for example ibid., pp. 412, 415, etc.

28. Ibid., p. 427.

dimensional figures. In the passage of *Therīgāthā*, referred to above, *sombhā* is also stated to have been painted (*cittitā* = *citritā*). All this clearly indicates that *citra* used in *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* in this particular context, means a polychromatic three-dimensional figure.

It is true that so far as it is used in connection with fine arts, the word, *citra* is usually or widely known to mean painting. But this should not stand in the way of interpreting Patañjali's use of the word, *citra* in this particular context as a three-dimensional figure, since an unquestionably technical use of it in this sense, is known from some ancient sources. In a host of *Āgama* texts of different sects a well defined classification of art objects is found, and according to this a round or three-dimensional statue is called *citra*, while relief and painting are designated respectively as *ardhacitra* and *citrābhāsa*[29]. Although *Āgama* literature, as such, may be some centuries later than *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya*, yet this fact would not seem to be a handicap, since the authors or compilers of *Āgama* literature, as a rule, are not supposed to be responsible for the creation of terminology of art. On the contrary they are responsible only for recording material of previous and contemporary ages. If so, we can assume that this classification is not of such a late origin as it appears to be. Moreover, the designation of a round statue as *citra* presupposes the wide spread practice of polychromy on statues[30]. Exactly this is the point that could be concluded on the basis of *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* with the conjunction of the *Therīgāthā* passage. The usage of *Āgama* literature denotes a statue while that of *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* a puppet. This differ-

29. As for example see *Vimānārcanākalpa* (edited by Prayāgadāsaji, V. Raghunāthacakravarti Bhaṭṭācārya and S. Mādhavācārya, printed in Śrī Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, Madras, 1926, the same work was published in Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. CXXI, with the title, *Vaikhānasāgama*, edited by K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstri, Trivandrum, 1935, p. 36), pp. 70–71 and *Kāśyapaśilpa* (edited by Kṛṣṇarāya Vajhe, published in Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series No. 95, Ānandāśrama Press, Poona, 1926), p. 167. These two works belong to the Vaikhānasa and Śaiva sects respectively.

30. In an article, *The Rôle of Polychromy in Indian Statuary*, we have discussed the effects that were caused by polychromy as a whole. This subject also has been dealt with at some length; see the same article, section IV, Artibus Asiae, Vol. XXIV, No. 2, (Ascona, Switzerland, 1961) pp. 125–128.

ence is after all confined to the size and purpose of the object, but not to the figure as such. Therefore it would not be wrong to conclude that Patañjali's use of *citra* in this context means a three-dimensional polychromatic statue or figure.

Then it is not out of place to show that the sort of meaning which we here tried to give to the words, *citra* and *śaubhika*, fits very well in the context where they occur. After interpreting *prayojyatva* as "to fit into one's intention" *(abhiprāyasajjana)* Patañjali takes a few of the previous sentences of a somewhat different nature, in order to illustrate the all embracing character of this interpretation. The first of this series is: *[Devadattas] sūryam udgamayati* (Devadatta makes the sun to rise) which he explains in the following way. [Being *prayojya*, i.e. *prayojyakartā* in this sentence,] the sun fits into the intention of Devadatta *(ādityaś cāsya abhiprāye sajjate)*. When Devadatta starts from Ujjayinī his intention is that the sun should rise by the time he will reach Māhiṣmatī *(eṣa tasva abhiprāya ujjayinyāḥ prasthito māhiṣmatyāṃ sūryodgamanaṃ sambhāvayeyeti)* and the sun does so *(taṃ cāsya abhiprāyaṃ ādityo nirvartayati)*. It does not mean that the sun has obeyed Devadatta's commands, but that Devadatta planned that he should reach Māhiṣmatī by sunrise and he did so.

Thus Patañjali settles the meaning of the suffix, *ṇic*. Even then doubts may arise regarding the correctness of the present tense in some cases. So in order to remove such misunderstandings, too, he again enters into the discussion and says: If we accept this, i.e. above interpretation *(bhavet)*, then according to this the present tense would be correct in this particular example *(iha vartamānakālatā yuktā syāt ujjayinyāḥ prasthito māhiṣmatyāṃ sūryodgamanaṃ sambhāvayate sūryam udgamayatīti)*, because the sun rises when Devadatta reaches Māhiṣmatī *(tatrasthasya hi tasya āditya udeti)*. Shortly to explain it, in this as well as in all other similar cases the present tense can be correct, for the simple reason that the sunrise is an everyday affair. But how can the present tense be explicable *(kathaṃ vartamānakālatā)* in the case *(iha)* of *kaṃsavadha* and *balibandha*, which are the happenings of remote past *(cirahate kaṃse cirabandhe ca*

balau)[31]. Well! here too the present tense is correct *(atrāpi yuktā)*. How *(katham)?* Those professionals, called *Śaubhikas* are making Vāsudeva kill Kaṃsa, and Vāmana tie up Bali, before our eyes *(pratyakṣa) (ye tāvadete śaubhikānāmaite pratyakṣaṃ kaṃsaṃ ghātayanti pratyakṣaṃ ca baliṃ bandhayanti)*. After all *Śaubhikas* perform the play with *citras* (puppets), how then is the actuality possible in *citras (citreṣu katham)?* Fighting, killing etc. are actualized in *citras* too [i. e. wether or not they are real, is a different question] *(citreṣvapy udgīrṇā nipatitāś ca prahārā dṛśyante)*. Because the actions are taking place at the very moment of performance, there is no difficulty in using the present tense in this case too. If this is so, no question of correctness of causative sense arises, because *Śaubhikas* are making the puppet representing Vāsudeva kill the other one (i. e. puppet) which stands for Kaṃsa, so also in story of *balibandha*.

Then follows another question. Here the reader should be warned against taking this question as completely independent. In other words this question is directly connected with the above illustration and thus presupposes it. The reason is this: The stories of *kaṃsavadha* and *balibandha* are presented by another category of professionals, viz. *Grathikas* who, unlike *Śaubhikas*, do not use any external objects as visual aids in order to show the actual killing of Kaṃsa and tying of Bali. So, seemingly, there is no possibility of justifying the present tense. Hence the question: How is the present tense justified *(granthikeṣu katham)* in the case of *Granthikas* when their art medium is simple recitation *(yatra śabdagaḍumātraṃ lakṣyate)*. The answer is as follows. Here too, the present tense is justifiable, because through their narration *Granthikas* make the details (i. e. imagery) of the stories, stand out in the minds of audience as if they were happening at that very moment *(te'pi hi teṣāṃ utpattiprabhṛtyāvināśād ṛddhīr vyācakṣāṇās sato buddhiviṣayān prakāśayanti)*[32]. Therefore here too, Kaṃsa Vāsudeva, etc. and their actions are actual or

31. This question is confined only to the present tense, but it does not concern the causative sense, because one is ready to accept the new explanation of the latter, when the

present *(ātaś ca sataḥ)*. Thus *Granthikas*, too, make the image of Vāsudeva that is brought about in the minds of audience by the words, kill (the image of) Kaṃsa. Then no difficulty arises in the use of the present tense in the case of *Granthikas* also.

In this way the present tense is explicable in the case of *Śaubhikas* as well as *Granthikas*. *Śaubhikas* cannot command nor convince their lifeless puppet Vāsudeva to kill such a Kaṃsa. But they wish that a puppet Vāsudeva should kill a puppet Kaṃsa, and they move the puppets skillfully in such a way. By moving accordingly puppets fit into the intentions of *Śaubhikas*. The same is true in the case of *Granthikas* also, with the only exception that their images are brought about by the words. Thus the single principle of *abhiprāyasajjana* explains all the odd examples of this sort.

Finally, the fact that the respective main arts media of *Śaubhikas* and *Granthikas*, are puppets and recitation, may be explained further. When it is stated that the *main* art medium of *Śaubhikas*, is puppets, that does not in any way deny the use of any accompaniments. The present writer knows that puppet shows are still in vogue in some Indian provinces such as Rājasthān, Karnāṭaka (i. e. Mysore) and Bengal, too, but he is not aware if they exist elsewhere also. Music – song and drum – accompanies for the most part present day puppet shows and similarly, at times, also

tense also is properly explained. This is a very important point to be noted carefully, since it is a vital stage in the process of Patañjali's explanation.

32. This is one of the most vital places in the grammarians' philosophy and on the basis of these statements Bhartṛhari composes well-known *kārikā:*

"śabdopahitarūpāṃstu buddher viṣayatāṃ gatān
pratyakṣamiva kaṃsādīn sādhanatvena manyate"

According to grammarians *śabda* and *artha* are *abheda*. They are *abheda* in the sense that without the meaning there is no word and *vice versa*. Such a meaning and word, however, are not external or physical, but mental; it is on this plane that they are *abheda*. Hence the images (i. e. *artha*, meaning) will simultaneously reflect on the mental plane *(hṛdi)* along with the words *(paśyantī vāk)* after the given sounds (i. e. *vaikharī vāk)* are heard. Such a theory has been prevalent for a long time and a poet like Kālidāsa seems to be lead by it when he says the following at the beginning of *Raghuvaṃśa: "vāgarthāviva saṃpṛktau ... pārvatī-parameśvarau"*.

prose passages. The prose is not, however, spoken like dialogue or conversation, or in short, not spoken normally, but is somewhat mixed with music. To put it in another way, it is chanted. It may be assumed that the same might have been the case in ancient times too. Either song or prose, used in this way, can, by no means, be stated as recitation. It can only be stated to be recitation, when the effect is achieved solely through the words. But that is not the case here. This is one point. Secondly here song and prose are accompaniments, that is to say, that they only enrich the effect to be sought by the use of puppets. This means that when they are omitted the effect of the puppet show is admittedly somewhat diminished. Even then one can perform the show without them. This matter clarifies that song and prose are not the art media of *Śaubhikas*. The medium is the very puppets. If so, it is all the same whether an adjective, "main" is employed or not. Nevertheless we have used it, only in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding.

So far as *Granthikas* are concerned, some facts such as the very word *granthika*, Patañjali's mention of *śabdagaḍumātra* and his further observation *(granthikasya śṛṇoti)*[33] made elsewhere, leave no room for any doubt that the medium of their art, is recitation. *Granthikas* narrate the story in a group, some taking the side of opponent *[pratināyaka]* while others that of hero *[nāyaka] (vyāmiśrā*[34] *hi dṛśyante | kecit kaṃsabhaktā bhavanti kecid vāsudevabhaktāḥ)*. They even paint[35] their faces according

33. See V.M.B. (Vol.I, p.329) on Pāṇini's *sūtra*, 1.4.29.

34. Lüders discusses different readings found here and prefers the reading, *vyāmiśratā hi dṛśyate* (see P.I., p.408, foot-note 4). It seems to us that here original reading might have been *vyāmiśrās te hi*.

35. Lüders tries (P.I., pp.418–420) to interpret *varṇānyatva* to be *vaivarṇya*, one of the eight *Sāttvikabhāvas*, known in the aesthetics and says that it is not *Granthikas* that paint their faces, but the colour of the faces of audience changes according to the feelings they get through hearing the recitation from *Granthikas*. It seems unnecessary to go to that extent. As a matter of fact it is impossible to say this. The intensity of the reaction of spectators witnessing a given show or of an audience hearing the recitation of a particular piece of literature, may vary from case to case. Owing to lack of sensitiveness or for other memontary personal reasons this or that individual may not react at all. But to say that by witnessing or hearing the same event in a piece of art some people react in one way while the others do

to the character of the hero or of opponent whose side a particular group takes *(varṇānyatvaṃ khalvapi puṣyante | kecid raktamukhā bhavanti kecit kālamukhāḥ)*[36]. It is hardly to be believed that when sides were taken and faces painted accordingly, some kind of physical movements were absent. Despite this, the medium of their art is nothing but recitation which is quite different from the dialogue. Neither the use of colour on the face nor the possible employment of gestures, can be taken respectively as *āhārya* and *āṅgika abhinayas* in their proper sense. A number of people paint their faces according to the character of one person whose side they take. The plurality of such persons clearly indicates that the function of colour here is not similar to that when it is used as a part of *āhāryābhinaya*. On the contrary the colour only distinguishes the persons of a group from those of another. If there were any gestures they might have been monotonous ones and similar to those generally made by singers, but not, any way capable of conveying something independently. This shows that they are not even auxiliary media, which in turn means that they are simple accompaniments. Then here, too, there is no necessity for using the adjective, "main", but for the sake of safety we have used it. Therefore the art medium of *Granthikas* is recitation.

To sum up: In any attempt at interpreting the *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* passage where two professionals – *Śaubhikas* and *Granthikas* – are mentioned, one must be clear about the following points. The first of which is the nature of Patañjali's formulation of the sentences which

in a different way, is totally against any aesthetic theory ever known in India, for a *bhāva* is an impersonal experience. If the art of *Granthikas* is similar to cock or bull fighting or horse racing, their audience may divide themselves into parties. But it is to be established first that the former does not differ from the latter in essence. If it can be established, one cannot, then, speak of *bhāvas*, since the feelings which arise from such happenings are of a different nature and hence have other designations.

36. A kind of art, called "*kabīr gān*" or "*kabigān*" (i.e. *kavigāna*) is prevalent in Bengal and the present writer is not competent to go into the details of it, for it seems to have many local forms. But it may be pointed out that some features appear common to both "*kabīr gān*" and the art of *Granthikas*. Whether or not these common features will prove anything, is a question to be answered only after a careful investigation.

question the correctness of the present tense in certain usages. Those sentences are: *citreṣu katham* and *granthikeṣu katham* which give the clue as to the arts media of *Śaubhikas* and *Granthikas*. Secondly, instead of accepting several principles to explain the meaning of *ṇic* in certain usages where a causative agent in its popular sense, is absent, Patañjali interprets *prayojyatva* as *abhiprāyasajjana*. Thirdly, there is no scope for explaining the sentences, *kaṃsaṃ ghātayanti* and *baliṃ bandhayanti* on the basis of the principle of narration, so the meaning given to the word, *citra* should be in conformity with the sense of causative agent and present tense. Fourthly, the meaning given to the word, *citra* should also be in conformity with the profession of *Śaubhikas*. Fifthly, the question, *granthikeṣu katham* in its logical stage presupposes the illustration of *Śaubhikas*.

When the relevant passage is interpreted according to these principles, the following would be the conclusion: The art medium of *Granthikas* is recitation. The same in the case of *Śaubhikas* is *citras*. The word, *śaubhika* is formed out of *śobhā* which means puppet, hence *Śaubhikas* are puppet players. The medium of their art, viz. *citra* does not, or should not, mean painted scroll. In this case, because the *main* art medium of *Śaubhikas* is not recitation, painter should be taken to be causative agent. If this is so, the present tense would be inexplicable. *Āgama* literature designates a three dimensional figure as *citra* which designation presupposes the practice of polychromy on statues. This meaning would be in conformity with *Therīgāthā* description of *śobhā* to be made of wood and to be painted. Therefore *citra* in this context means nothing but the three dimensional polychromatic (wooden) puppet.