Le théâtre de l'Inde médiévale entre tradition et innovation :

Le Moharājaparājaya de Yaśaḥpāla

ENGLISH SUMMARY

In 1789, people in Europe discovered with enthusiasm Indian theatre through William Jones's English translation of one of its most remarkable masterpieces, Kālidāsa's *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. Along with many translations into other European languages of the latter play, other chefs-d'œuvre by the most renowned Indian dramatists were brought to light in the following decades, the most important contribution being Horace-Hayman Wilson's *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus*, published in 1826-1827. Indeed, not only did he translate Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaśī*, Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakaṭikā*, Harṣa's *Ratnāvalī*, Viśākhadatta's *Mudrā-rākṣasa* and two of Bhavabhūti's plays, namely *Uttararāmacarita* and *Mālatī-mādhava*, but he also gave an account of the contents of others dramas, among which Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra*, Bhavabhūti's *Mahāvīracarita* and Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's *Veṇīsaṃhāra*. Translated into French by Alexandre Langlois one year later, under the title *Chefs-d'oeuvre du théâtre indien*, this anthology introduced a large audience to many classical plays produced between the fourth and the eighth centuries, while the remaining ones were to be published and translated in the second half of the nineteenth century, such as Harṣa's *Nāgānanda* and *Priyadarśikā*, or even later in the twentieth century, as were the four short plays known under the collective title *Caturbhāṇī*.

Representing the golden age of Indian theatre, these plays have up to now remained the focal point of research on dramatic Indian literature, so that most studies and translations are still being devoted to them, though many others have been published in the meantime. Some dramatists of the ninth and tenth centuries could also have attracted attention, like Murāri and Rājaśekhara, but interest significantly decreases with the centuries, and the *Prabodhacandrodaya* written by Kṛṣṇamiśra in the eleventh century, which has been translated as early as 1812, stands out as an exception. The only corpus of dramatic texts to have aroused among scholars as much interest as the classical ones is the set of plays discovered at Trivandrum in 1910 and published between 1912 and 1915 by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. By ascribing them to Bhāsa, a forerunner of Kālidāsa, who is said to have flourished by the third century, the learned Indian editor started a passionate debate which still has not been settled, even though it has been proved that some of the plays were composed at a later date. What makes the Trivandrum plays so interesting is that little data is available for elucidating the mysterious origins of Indian theatre. In the nineteenth century, controversies had arisen among Western scholars about an alleged Greek influence on Indian theatre, but positive evidence was lacking, apart

from stray mentions of theatre in early sources. Strangely enough, the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, a monumental treatise on theatre attributed to the legendary sage Bharata, presented around the first-second centuries a coherent dramatic theory that was not illustrated by any previous or contemporary drama. Henceforth, H. Lüders contributed greatly to the debate when he published and analysed the fragments of plays composed by the renowned Buddhist poet Aśvaghoṣa (second century AD) which had been discovered in 1907 in Central Asia, and it was tempting to believe that T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī provided another piece of the puzzle roughly at the same period of time.

The so-called Bhāsa plays have also retained attention because they figure in the repertoire of Kūṭiyāṭṭam, the Sanskrit theatre of Kerala. Indeed, many scholars have dedicated themselves to studying this tradition of performance which, more than recent theatrical forms like Kathakaḷi, could have preserved to some extent the ancient way of staging Sanskrit plays, though it has necessarily undergone some evolutions in the course of time. Even the medieval plays composed especially for Kūṭiyāṭṭam, like Śaktibhadra's *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* (ninth century), or Kulaśekhara-varman's *Tapatīsaṃvaraṇam* and *Subhadrādhanaṃjayaṃ* (between the ninth and twelfth centuries), have been acknowledged a scientific value that is denied to the huge bulk of contemporary or later Sanskrit plays, and consequently they have been translated and studied with regard to their composition as well as their performance.

However it seems rather unfair that the other regional branches of Sanskrit theatre have been hitherto neglected on the ground that they did not survive in the same way as Kūṭiyāṭṭam. Indeed, the tradition of performing Sanskrit theatre may have remained as lively in Northern India as in Kerala: for instance, many texts written in medieval Kashmir, like Abhinavagupta's *Abhinavabhāratī* or Kṣemendra's *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa*, have furnished scholars with arguments for proving that classical plays were intended to be staged, ant it would be strange that plays composed at that very time were not performed in the same way. Besides, medieval dramas have been often said to be mere copies of classical models bereft of genuine dramatic inspiration, but they actually present specific features which could complete, corroborate, qualify or even refute the hypotheses on the evolution of Sanskrit theatre based on literary study of classical dramatic texts and technical analysis of Kūṭiyāṭṭam performances. For instance, several dramas written in Western India in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries stand out against the multitude of others, since their authors belong to the religious minority of Jains, whereas most Indian dramatists profess one of the many creeds subsumed in Hinduism. Given that Buddhist writers have left to posterity nothing more than fragments of dramatic texts or few translations in the languages of foreign countries their coreligionists had subsequently proselytized, like Central Asia or Tibet, the corpus of Jain plays coming from Gujarat provides the opportunity for questioning the religious dimension of Sanskrit theatre.

On the suggestion of Pr. Christine Chojnacki, I began my research in that field by translating and studying for my MA one of these plays, the heroic drama

Satyahariścandra composed by the Jain monk Rāmacandra. Notwithstanding Louis Renou's warnings about the concept of "Jain theatre", it could be easily seen that Rāmacandra had reworked the story of king Hariścandra in order to change this Hindu hero into an incarnation of truthfulness, one of the five Jain major virtues. Besides, Rāmacandra referred throughout the play to a transcendent being by the ambiguous word Nābheya, which could apply to one of the main Hindu gods, Brahmā, as born from Viṣṇu's navel or *nābhi*, but eventually designated the first Jain fordmaker, Ṛṣabha, son of the patriarch Nābhi. Though undoubtedly present, the religious dimension of the *Satyahariścandra* remained nonetheless moderate and allusive in comparison with contemporary Jain plays. Indeed, some coreligionists of Rāmacandra proved to be more innovative by adapting to the stage legends peculiar to Jainism. Besides, they gave up the overused genre of *nāṭaka*, still held in high esteem by both theoreticians and dramatists, for other ones, like the *prakaraṇa* or even irregular one-act plays. For instance, Meghaprabhācārya wrote a short drama on the Jain ordination of king Daśarṇabhadra, an account of which Hemacandra had given a little earlier in the last part of his version of Jain universal history entitled *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita*. This insight into the corpus of medieval Jain dramas gave rise to a series of questions I intended to answer in a PhD research. Did Jain dramatists produce such a diverse range of plays because they tried to find out the most suitable genres and themes for diffusing their religious values? Besides, I wondered which audience they aimed at. Did they get interested in dramatic expression because theatre performance, inasmuch as it involved music, song and dance, could draw a large part of the population fond of entertainments? Or did they only intend to please, by a recitation of the poetic text of their plays, a restricted audience of political personalities who could enforce protective measures for the Jain community? Lastly, I wanted to ascertain whether Jains had tried to justify and theorize the religious use of theatre. Rāmacandra being the co-author with Guṇa-candra of a treatise on theatre, the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* or "Mirror of Theatre", I thought I could find there, as well as in the prologue of the plays, some evidence.

However, I realized that the task was hard to achieve, since it implied a detailed analysis of the dramatic texts, whereas most of them had not been yet translated, and some even not published. Moreover, no systematic account of their contents like Warder's in the seventh volume of his *Indian Kāvya Literature* had been issued at that time. Hence I decided to focus my study on a more restricted set of Jain plays, and I turned to those which derived their plot from contemporary events, like Yaśaścandra's *Mudritakumudacandra* ("Silenced Kumudacandra") and Jayasiṃha's *Hammīramadamardana* ("The Crushing of Hammīra's Arrogance"). This feature appeared to me particularly interesting for highlighting the originality of Jain theatre, since such plots were forbidden by most Indian theoreticians. Yet I became quickly aware that this kind of plot was not exclusively linked with Jain faith, inasmuch as some of these medieval historical dramas had been composed by Hindu writers.

In order to avoid drawing erroneous conclusions from a partial corpus, I eventually preferred to propose a more comprehensive analysis of the dramatic literature of medieval North India, and to deal with the religious dimension of the plays only as one of the original features of the period, others being the use of various genres or the adaptation of contemporary events on stage. As I felt the necessity of developing my reflexion on firmer grounds than merely quoting abstracts or translating stray passages of different texts, I decided to structure the study on a play displaying most of the original features of medieval theatre. Judging Rāmacandra's plays to be too classical on the whole, I chose to prepare the first rendering into a modern language of Yaśaḥpāla's *Moharājaparājaya*, "The Defeat of King Delusion", a Jain heroic drama wherein both historical and allegorical characters come onto the stage. Indeed, its hero is none other than Kumārapāla, one of the most famous kings of Gujarat, who, in the course of action, marries Fair-Compassion and wins over King Delusion, as announced in the title. Moreover, the style of the play was described by the Western scholars as simple and vivid, an appreciation which stands in sharp contrast with the common contempt for pretentiousness and clumsiness of later plays. Yet I did not content myself with translating and studying the *Moharājaparājaya*, I also began to examine most of the other plays, reading at least the prologue in order to find out whether medieval dramatists had given any explanation about their way of writing or made any allusion to how their plays were to be staged. Besides, I decided to make use of other medieval sources, like poems, chronicles and inscriptions, to replace theatre in its historical and cultural context.

After these preliminary investigations into the corpus, I thus redefined the purpose of my research as a study on genres, functions and ways of representation of medieval theatre. In a first section, I wanted to ascertain whether medieval poets slavishly took up the same genres as their forerunners, as often argued, or if they proved more original, either by developing other genres or by modifying the ones that had been already illustrated by classical masterpieces. Then I tried to determine whether, besides aesthetic considerations, the choice of genres was also motivated by new functions of the theatre in the religious or political spheres. Lastly, I decided to tackle in a third section the tricky problem of the representation, which is of major importance to estimate the impact of dramatic literature on society. Did plays, in medieval times, actually become mere poetical texts that were intended to be recited, or, on the contrary, may we think that theatre remained a living art of staging plays?

Medieval dramatists have often been reproached for having imitated illustrious writers from classical times in such a slavish way that their works inspire nothing but a tiresome monotony. In order to ascertain the validity of this prevalent opinion, it was necessary to compare the productivity of the dramatic genres in the first millennium and at the beginning of the second millennium (chapter 1). Even

though these statistics are based on limited sets of plays, the most part of Indian
dramatic literature being probably lost irretrievably, it appears that medieval
dramatists actually went on writing plays of the very genres which had enjoyed the
favour of their predecessors, mostly the *nāṭaka*, the *prakaraṇa* and the *nāṭikā*, and to
a lesser extent the *prahasana* and the *bhāṇa*. It is however noteworthy that the
nāṭaka, though remaining the most important dramatic genre, had significantly lost
ground. Indeed, late writers seemed to have also shown interest in other genres
which were hitherto more or less theoretical ones: in a striking way, many of them
produced plays of the *vyāyoga* genre, while it had not been very productive in the
first millennium. Vatsarāja, a dramatist from the twelfth century, went one step
further and wrote, besides a *vyāyoga*, a *bhāṇa* and a *prahasana*, three other dramas
belonging respectively to the obsolete genres called *īhāmṛga*, *ḍima* and *samavakāra*.
Thus medieval dramatists did not restrict themselves to the genres inherited from
Kālidāsa, Harṣa, Bhavabhūti, etc., they also explored the other genres defined by
theoreticians in the ideal frame of the *daśarūpaka*, the "ten forms" said to
encompass all kinds of dramatic expression. Moreover, it is also in medieval
Gujarat that the oldest extant specimens of another genre called *chāyānāṭya*,
Meghaprabhācārya's *Dharmābhyudaya* and Subhaṭa's *Dutāṅgada*, were composed.
Meaning literally "shadow-theatre", this enigmatic term has given rise to different
interpretations. According to the simplest one, the *chāyānāṭya* was a kind of show
characterized by the manipulation of leather figures the shadow of which was
projected by means of a lamp on a screen. However, the evidence afforded by
medieval plays suggest that "shadow" could not be given a literal sense, since
characters were to be represented by puppets which spectators directly saw, but
rather a metaphorical one. According to some, the *chāyānāṭya* followed like a
shadow a real *nāṭya* performance as a kind of interlude. It may also have been a
"shadow of theatre" inasmuch as it was performed by inanimate objects instead of
living beings. In any way, puppet theatre seemingly enjoyed such a growing favour
among the aristocratic audience in medieval times that many elaborate Sanskrit
plays were written for being staged that way. Similarly, some spectacular genres
began to reach the literary circles of the times although they had been previously
confined to the margins of dramatic theory on the ground that dance and music were
more important in their performance than the art of acting. For instance,
Abhinavagupta classified them in the category of dance (*nṛtta*), while Dhanaṃjaya
created for them the intermediate category of danced spectacle (*nṛtya*). Nevertheless
these genres had to be included in this study on medieval theatre inasmuch as, for
many theoreticians, they were not fundamentally different from Sanskrit plays,
though written in less noble languages like Apabhraṃśa. Even such an authoritative
figure as Kohala, Bharata's legendary son, wanted to modify the pattern of
daśarūpaka in order to incorporate them into it, and some of them appeared to have
been referred to in literary texts at least from the seventh century onwards. Being
attested by about twenty texts, the *rāsa* became the most popular of these genres

among learned writers like Jain monks in medieval times. According to an analysis of the earliest occurrences of the term in literature, it originally referred to a dance which was performed in association with a musical text called *carcarī*, but afterwards had most often been used for designating both dance and song. The great thematic diversity of the extant *carcarī* and *rāsa*, the ones being inspired by Jain legends, the others focussing on Jain doctrine, while other ones even dealt with contemporary events, shows accurately that the sphere of spectacular entertainments was anything but static in those times.

Besides, the examination of a medieval *nāṭaka* such as the *Moharājaparājaya* (chapter 2) reveals that even when adopting the most classical genres, the dramatists of that period did not commit themselves with the utmost servitude to the rules set up by theoreticians and followed by previous writers. According to the treatises, the *nāṭaka* genre differs from the other *rūpaka* by the conjunction of three characteristics: it should derive its plot from a well-known story, have a noble and well-known king as its hero, and be provided with the erotic (*śṛṅgāra*) or the heroic (*vīra*) as its main emotion (*rasa*). With regard to this norm, the *Moharājaparājaya* appears to be a rather irregular *nāṭaka*. If king Kumārapāla appears to have all the required qualities of the hero, he does not belong to a remote past, being the predecessor of the poet's patron. Hence the plot which deals with Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism may not be taken as famous (*prasiddha*) but rather as contemporary (*vartamāna*). Moreover, the allegoric treatment of the story gives way to an interwoven development of the erotic and the heroic, through the hero's love for Fair-Compassion and hostility to King Delusion, but these emotions are eventually subordinated to the quiet (*śānta*), since the plot signifies at a deeper level the striving of the soul for final emancipation.

To determine whether such innovations did appear in medieval times, I felt it necessary to update the definitions of both historical and allegorical plots, since their vagueness had led scholars to classify earlier dramas in opposite ways (chapter 3). The allegory understood as the personification of a concept had appeared in dramatic literature as early as the second century, since the Buddha is extolled by women named Glory, Intelligence and Constancy in a fragment of Buddhist drama attributed to Aśvaghoṣa. Few allegorical characters also figure in other extant plays from the first millennium, but it seems that no dramatist had written a play with most characters being allegories before Kṛṣṇamiśra produced the *Prabodhacandrodaya* in the eleventh century. That the latter devised a new way of writing is indeed highlighted by the tribute paid to him in the title or the text of all the subsequent allegorical dramas, beginning with the *Moharājaparājaya*. Similarly, the use of allegory on a large scale was relatively recent in the field of novel: in the preamble of the *Upamitibhavaprapañcakathā* or "Story of the Manifoldness of Worldly Existence by Comparison" he achieved in 905, the Jain author Siddharṣi took such great pains in explaining how he compared the inner world of human being to the outer world that one may suspect he could be credited with the idea of

generalizing to a whole work the device of allegory. Regarding the adaptation of recent events to the stage, it could also have been an innovation of medieval dramatists, since nearly all the plays based on such plots were written from that period onwards. Admittedly, two earlier plays, Subandhu's *Vāsavadattānāṭyadhārā* and Viśākhadatta's *Devīcandragupta*, could be invoked for refuting this hypothesis, but it is actually impossible to ascertain whether their plot is based upon recent events since the question of their own date of composition cannot be settled. Besides, the fact that Abhinavagupta insisted in the *Abhinavabhāratī* on the impossibility of taking recent events as the subject of a play could be understood as a reaction to a significant increase of historical plays at the turn of the second millennium. In any case, it is noteworthy that these allegorical and historical plots fitted into the existing dramatic genres instead of bringing about the creation of other ones. In all likelihood, most medieval plays were cast in the mould of usual *rūpaka* because their authors concerned themselves with equalling or even surpassing their predecessors in the very genres that made the latter become famous. To some of them, it seemed easier to produce original plays by selecting genres like *prakaraṇa* or *nāṭikā* wherein the plot had to be invented. Some other preferred to take up the overused but more prestigious genre of *nāṭaka* that they tried to renew by treating in a personal way well-known subjects, as did Rāma-candra with the legend of Hariścandra, or by taking liberties with the rules, like Yaśaḥpāla. Hence it is a fertile emulation rather than a slavish imitation that medieval dramatists have displayed in their works.

These innovations brought about by medieval dramatists are not to be merely linked to poetic concerns. They also reveal that theatre, besides being an entertainment, began to be invested with religious and political functions. That aesthetic pleasure ceased to be the only purpose of dramatic performance is actually proven by the adaptation of recent events to the stage. Indeed, such plots were forbidden by theoreticians on the ground that they would prevent members of the audience from forgetting for a while their own everyday life and tasting the universality of human emotions performed by the actors. If medieval dramatists deliberately took the risk of hindering to some extent the process of aesthetic pleasure, it is probably because they made use of theatre as a means of communication in an evolving society which was susceptible to religious conflicts, because of the rise of sectarian movements, as well as political troubles and intrigues that led to enthronement of illegitimate kings.

In order to prove that theatre became a vehicle for religious ideas (chapter 4), I firstly analysed how Yaśaḥpāla borrowed from didactic works many passages of the *Moharājaparājaya*. For instance, he repeatedly quoted, either verbatim or under a reworked form, a treatise on Jain doctrine written a few decades earlier, Hema-candra's *Yogaśāstra*. He even integrated it to the allegorical system of the play as Kumārapāla's diamond amour, along with another religious work by the same

author, a set of hymns in praise of the twenty-four Jina called *Vītarāgastotra*. In all probability, Yaśaḥpāla also drew the contents of the third act of his play from a collection of edifying tales, as proven by the striking similarities with a *Kathākośa* of unknown author. Even the technique of embedding one story into another he made use in that passage, as well as in the first act, is typical of this kind of literature. Besides, he alluded in many places to stories that must have been well-known for a Jain audience. Then I made it clear that Yaśaḥpāla did not only pepper the *Moharājaparājaya* with such learned references: he also devised the very structure of the play in order to highlight the importance of some religious principles. Indeed, the whole play revolves around compassion, a cardinal quality in Jainism. Firstly, it is embodied by one of the protagonists of the main plot, the heroine Fair-Compassion, whom the hero must marry to have a chance of defeating King Delusion. It is also referred to in the embedded stories of the third act: for instance, it is out of compassion that king Satyasāgara decreed the prohibition against killing animals in any place of his realm, and in the same way the twenty-second Tīrthaṅkara Nemi was urged by compassion to free the bewailing animals that were to be slaughtered for his wedding dinner. Situated in the exact middle of the play, the latter story has a pivotal role in the progression of action, since it impels Kumārapāla to put in turn this moral quality into practice. Besides, Yaśaḥpāla exemplified through both characters of the king Kumārapāla and the merchant Kubera several points of the code of conduct that the medieval treatises called *śrāvakācāra* systematically assigned to Jain laymen. In the third act, for instance, he inserted a series of stanzas on the main vows every Jain layman had to respect, beginning with the famous vow of non-violence, *ahiṃsā*. He also concluded several acts with an evocation of the homage that laymen had to pay to Jina at the three junctures of the day, in the same way as Rāmacandra in the *Satya-hariścandra*. Lastly, the *Moharājaparājaya* warns Jain laymen against the false creeds they could be persuaded to adopt. Besides the traditional satire of the main Hindu gods, it contains attacks against Brahmans, and, on the model of the *Āgama-ḍambara* and the *Prabodhacandrodaya*, briefly reviews the different religious systems against which Jainism competed in medieval Northern India, like the influent *śaiva* sects, but also the more mysterious *ghaṭapaṭaka* and *rahamāṇa* creeds, which might correspond to branches of Islam.

Theatre may also have been used for achieving political ends (chapter 5). For instance, it seems particularly obvious that dramatists intended to celebrate the qualities of their patron when they made him the hero of their play. By drawing a comparison between historical plays and panegyrics, I found my first impression doubly confirmed: these genres not only developed common themes, such as moral, intellectual, physical and political abilities of the celebrated person, but could even be preserved under similar forms. Indeed, two historical plays, Somadeva's *Lalitavigraharāja* ("The Gallant Vigraharāja") and Madana's *Pārijātamañjarī* ("Coral-Tree Blossom", which is the name of the heroine) have been found

engraved on stone like panegyrics. Using theatre as a laudatory text was another innovation of the medieval times, since authors of classical plays rarely mentioned their patron, not even in the prologue or the final benediction, while they were entitled to mention at these places in which context their plays had been composed and performed. Looking for an explanation to the development of the laudatory function, I wondered whether the protector of the poet had to justify his being in power. Inspired by the reading of V. S. Pathak's *Ancient Historians of India*, I noticed that the hero of a medieval historical text, either a play or a great poem, was often a king who had come to the throne despite the established rules of succession. For instance, the Cāhamāna king Vigraharāja IV whom Somadeva took as the hero of the *Lalitavigraharāja* had eventually supplanted his elder brother Jagaddeva in the years that followed the death of their father. Similarly, Yaśaḥpāla incidentally legitimized Kumārapāla's accession to power, an endeavour which could also be useful for the latter's successor Ajayapāla. Besides, ministers and other officials might have found an interest in making their political abilities celebrated by playwrights: Jayantasiṃha, the son of the famous Jain minister Vastupāla, gave orders for staging Jayasiṃhasūri's *Hammīramadamardana*, a play wherein his father succeeded in countering simultaneous attacks on Gujarat. Lastly, Yaśaḥpāla may have written his play in order to expound a model of political behaviour to king Ajayapāla. Indeed, the latter is depicted by later chroniclers as hostile to Jains. By representing the life of a king susceptible to the precepts of Jainism as was Kumārapāla, Yaśaḥpāla possibly tried to obtain from Ajayapāla a more tolerant attitude regarding religious matters.

After ascertaining these new functions of theatre, I logically attempted to determine in the third and last section of this work which audience was aimed at either by religious discourse or by royal propaganda. Did medieval dramatists write their plays for the restricted entourage of their patron, or did they address a broader part of society?

To answer these questions to some extent, I first had to figure out in which way the dramatic text was presented to the audience, whether it was merely recited or actually staged (chapter 6). Were theatre interpreted by actors by means of gestures as well as vocal techniques, it would have become partly intelligible even to people of lower condition who were not versed in such literary languages as Sanskrit and dramatic Prakrits. Most of the time medieval theatre has been said to be unfit for performance, on account of dramatic texts being too much intricate and overwhelmed with stanzas. These features would have allegedly hindered the progression of action, and changed theatre into a kind of poetical genre akin to great poems or narrative texts. Yet a methodical comparison of theatre with these genres as well as an internal analysis of medieval plays enabled me to state that they were not at all unsuitable for performance.

Firstly, playwrights themselves alluded in the prologue of their works not only to aural but also to visual aspects of the representation. The members of the audience were to enjoy seeing events enacted on stage as well as hearing beautiful stanzas fashioned by the poet. Besides, when they wrote their plays, dramatists had in mind all the categories of the art of acting (*abhinaya*) and not only the vocal one (*vācikābhinaya*). Thus Someśvara had the director say in the prologue of the *Ullāgharāghava* that he would honour the priests by enacting the play in the fourfold way. As a matter of fact, many passages can be traced in the prologue or the main text of the plays which entails an interpretation by means of both *āṅgikābhinaya* and *āhāryābhinaya*, respectively the bodily and ornamental kinds of acting. The *āṅgikābhinaya* consisted in using the whole body, especially its most expressive parts, as the hands or the eyes, in order to convey the sense of the text. In the prologue of the *Nalavilāsa*, Rāmacandra made an allusion to hand positions (*mudrā*), and it seems that he advised actors to use some of them in several stage directions of the *Satyahariścandra*. Besides, other stage directions from the *Satya-hariścandra* or the *Moharājaparājaya* involve different kinds of gaits (*gati*), for instance when actors had to mime walking in the air, dismounting from a horse or moving around in a vehicle. Dramatists also gave many indications about the way of looking. In some cases, a particular movement of the eyes could enhance bodily acting: when a character was supposed to come down from the sky, the actor had to look downwards while making the aerial combinations of leg movements. Besides, the other actors were invited by stage directions to look upwards in order to make the mime more intelligible. Stray allusions to the *āhāryābhinaya*, which encompassed costumes and stage properties, can also be traced in the play. Thus at the end of the prologue many dramatists mentioned the costume (*nepathya*, *bhūmikā*) that the actor puts on as he is about to enter the stage and begin the action of the main play. Moreover, the spies who figure among the characters of some plays should have worn particular clothes that enabled them to enter the encampment of the enemies without being noticed. For instance, according to Kumārapāla's statement in the first act of *Moharājaparājaya*, Mirror-of-Knowledge put on the dress of an ascetic before going to King Delusion's encampment, while Kuvalayaka and Kamalaka, two spies of Vastupāla's, disguised themselves as Turks in the *Hammīramadamardana*. Regarding the details of such costumes, we are left to mere suppositions, but the characters of king and queen might have been furnished with royal emblems and jewels, as suggested by stage directions from the second act of *Satyahariścandra* and the third act of *Moharājaparājaya*. Besides, the sixth act of *Prabuddharauhiṇeya* contains a detailed description of the costumes put on by the queens for playing celestial courtesans. The make-up is also hinted at in dramatic as well as non-dramatic literature of the time. Regarding stage properties, less infor-mation has been given by dramatists, and it is likely that the scenery was limited to the minimum. Small objects like sticks and so on were seemingly necessary to the enactment of some scenes, such as the dispute between the jester and the spy in the