

Article-12

Global Media Journal-Indian Edition/ISSN 2249-5835

Sponsored by the University of Calcutta/www.caluniv.ac.in

Winter Issue/December 2013/Vol. 4/No. 2

A HISTORICAL STUDY OF ANCIENT INDIAN THEATRE-COMMUNICATION IN THE LIGHT OF NATYASAstra

Malyaban Chattopadhyay

Lecturer

PG Department of History

Fakir Chand College

University of Calcutta

24 Parganas(South)-74331, West Bengal, India

Email: mr.malyaban@gmail.com

Website: www.fccollege.net

Abstract

Theatre in ancient India was an important medium of communication. There were several dramatists in ancient India like Kalidasa and Bhasa who wrote many dramas. They wrote several dramas which made them immortal in the mind of Indian audience. Richard Salomon while discussing his typological analysis of inscriptions in *Indian Epigraphy* has mentioned that in the literary inscriptions we can find the reference of drama. It proves that drama was popular in ancient India. For that reason it can be said that drama was also referred in an important medium of mass-communication of ancient world i.e. inscriptions. Here lies a question. Who made the drama so much popular? Here lies the importance of the performers. They had played an important role in popularizing dramas in ancient India. What were their ways of thinking? What was their vision towards acting? How they tried to communicate with the audience? How they tried to analyse the society? We cannot get answers of these questions from any inscription because these only had the reference of the dramas and the dramatists not of those who made the dramas popular i.e. the performers. *Natyasastra* is a text which tried to depict the mind of the

performers for the first time in the history of Indian drama. This paper will try to understand the mind and mentality of the theatre workers of ancient India in the light of *Natyasastra*.

Keywords:

Natyasastra, *Natyaveda*, *Silpasatra*, Kutilava, Siddhi, Panini, Pliny, Brahminism, Theatre Group, Theatre-communication .

Theatre in ancient India was an important medium of communication. There were several dramatists in ancient India like Kalidasa and Bhasa who wrote many dramas. They wrote several dramas which made them immortal in the mind of Indian audience. Richard Salomon while discussing his typological analysis of inscriptions in *Indian Epigraphy* has mentioned that in the literary inscriptions we can find the reference of drama. It proves that dramatic performance was popular in ancient India.¹ For that reason it can be said that drama was also referred in an important medium of mass-communication of ancient world i.e. inscriptions. Here lies a question. Who made the drama so much popular? Here lies the importance of the performers. They had played an important role in popularising dramas in ancient India. What were their ways of thinking regarding communicating the audiences through performance? How they tried to communicate with the audience? We cannot get answers of these questions from any inscription because these only had the reference of the dramas and the dramatists not of those who made the dramas popular i.e. the performers. *Natyasastra* is a text which tried to depict the mind of the performers for the first time in the history of Indian drama.

Before going to the detail description of ancient Indian theatre workers mentality towards theatre communication, it is important to understand who were the theatre workers in ancient India. In the thirty fifth chapter of the *Natyasastra*, there is a list of members of a theatre group, which helps us to understand about the people who were considered as theatre workers or theatre related persons in ancient India. A theatre group (according to *Natyasastra*) should have persons specialized in seventeen types of works like Bharata (stage manager or producer or a person who can perform everything related to a production. A multidimensional person), Vidusaka (person to make fun i.e. Jester), Tauripta (Person skilled in music, expert in all musical instruments.), Nata (person perform as an actor-Dancer), Sutradhara (person specialized

in applying the songs and music during the performance) , Natyakara(one who in accordance with the *Natyasastra* expresses the various rasa-s ,bhava-s natural to the the people though different character), Nandi (person praising in Sanskrit or Prakit), Nayaka(person engaged in directing dance during a performance),Mukutakara,(person engaged in making head-gears for every character),Abharanakara(person engaged in making ornaments for a performance), Malyakara (person engaged in making garlands for the characters of a performance),Vesakara(person engaged in making costumes for a performance), Chitrakara(person engaged in painting for performance),Rajaka(person engaged in cleaning the costumes), Karukara(person engaged in decorating hall with wooden idols or sculpture),Kusilava (person who can dance and play musical instrument during performance. M.L Varadpande² transliterated the term Kusilava as actor-dancer also. Apart from this list *Natyasastra* also mentioned that the person helping the performance in another way, should be honoured as a member of a theatre group.³ This list helps us to understand the components of a theatre group. Interestingly *Natyasastra* not confining itself to the discussion of the work of acting, includes name of each and every allied works considered necessary for a performance. For that reason the Rajakas or Malyakaras were honored as a member of a theatre group, although they were not directly related to the performance. Those who are doing this can be symbolized as a theatre worker or persons related to the theatrical performance. *Natyasastra* was written to clarify the *Natyaveda* which was considered as a manual for the theatre workers to help the performers of ancient India.⁴ So it can be said that *Natyasastra* also says something about people's mind and mentality, their problem, their needs and their sorrow too which I will try to unearth in this article.

Before going to the details study of the ancient Indian theatre workers' attitude towards communication it also important to trace the date and the time of the first Indian dramaturgical text. Like the Indian epics and other texts of antiquity, the task of assigning a particular date for the composition of *Natyasastra* is impossible and we can at best get an approximate idea about the period of its composition by way of examining the contents of the text.

M M Ghosh, well-known for his translation of *Natyasastra* argued that *Natyasastra* was written before Kalidasa as Kalidasa had used the name of Bharata(related to the text *Natyasastra*)in his plays which shows that he was familiar with the works of Bharata.⁵ In the play Vikramavarsia,

the name of Bharata was mentioned and there is a conversation which proves that Kalidasa had also accepted Bharata as a master in the field of dramaturgy.⁶ Since by all token, Kalidasa was a poet and a play-writer of fourth/fifth century A.D. and attained a reputation as one of the literary masters by the seventh century, as indicated by the presence of his name along with the name of Subandhu and others in the Aihole inscription(634 A.D) as a famous poet,⁷ it can be assumed that *Natyasastra* predated Kalidasa's time. M M Ghosh further argues that *Natyasastra* was written before Bhasa and does not accept that Bhasa was much earlier than *Natyasastra*. It is interesting to note that Bhasa did not follow the play structure, which was mentioned in the *Natyasastra* in his plays but this as M M Ghosh feels is not adequate to prove that Bhasa was an author of pre- *Natyasastra* India, as it was not mandatory for every play writer of India to follow *Natyasastra*'s structure of play writing and there were no such uniform rules as such. Manmohan Ghosh says that even though Bhasa did not follow the structure of *Natyasastra*, there are various similarities between Bhasa's and *Natyasastra*'s concept regarding the concept of gesture and dance. He dated *Natyasastra* around the second century A.D whereas Bhasa as a poet was placed by him in the third century A.D.⁸ However it is important to note even though *Natyasastra* can be placed, on tangible grounds, before Kalidasa's time, Dr.Ghosh's assumption regarding Bhasa's time is not well accepted. It has been reasonably argued by Anupa Pande that Kalidasa's several plays accepted *Natyasastra*'s tradition and thus *Natyasastra* can be placed as a pre-Gupta text because Kālidāsa, who was a poet of Gupta era, mentioned *Natyasastra* as an earlier text⁹ but historians find it difficult to accept Dr.Ghosh's argument in placing Bhasa after *Natyasastra* in the field of Sanskrit drama related writing. There is a debate regarding the date of Bhasa as well and critics like V.Venkatachalam says that Bhasa was the earliest play writer of Sanskrit language and even though he was aware of a debate, in conclusion he says, "It will therefore, be safe to conclude until any decisive proof to the contrary is unearthed by future research that Bhasa lived somewhere between the two clear landmarks ,Buddha and Kautilya, nearer the former than the latter." For a conclusion he mentioned that Bhasa did not live before fifth century B.C¹⁰ and added that there are several things prevalent in *Natyasastra* which actually depict the footprints of Bhasa's style upon *Natyasastra*. So *Natyasastra*, in his view, was not written before Bhasa's plays.¹¹ So it can be said that according to Venkatachlam, the *Natyasastra* was a text written after at least fifth century B.C. To get the answer regarding the time of *Natyasastra*, some scholars tried to

compare the grammatical texture of *Natyasastra*'s language with Panini's (fifth century B.C)¹² grammar. The antiquated usage and the pre-Paninic remnant in the *Natyasastra*, as Bharat Gupt argues, only confirm that its writer was a close successor to Panini.¹³ Sukumari Bhattacharji mentioned that drama is the earliest known classical literary type of poetry, a modified and different type followed close behind. The early drama was a combination of mime, poetry, prose, dialogue, humour songs and occasionally also dance and that with the time the use of songs and dance gradually disappeared.¹⁴ In the *Natyasastra* drama is Natya, while examining the meaning of Natya, Adya Rangacharya mentioned that in *Natyasastra* the term Natya is used to depict a performance with dance & music¹⁵ and it can therefore be said that *Natyasastra* is a creation of the early days of Sanskrit language. *Natyasastra* describes Natya not merely as a set of dialogues but of music and dance too. In the introduction of the book *Approaches to Bharat's Natyasastra*, Amrit Srinivasan mentioned that this text was not written after second century A.D.¹⁶ After dating the *Natyasastra*, it is also important to get an idea regarding the authorship of the text. It is difficult to get a definite idea about the individual identity of the ancient Indian scholars as they had shown an apathy to divulge their own identity and Kapila Vatsyayan rightly says that it is evident from our scholastic tradition which started from the earliest time, that "I-ness" is not reflected in the works of our ancient scholars. They were interested to place their knowledge within the ambit of wider perspective of universe.¹⁷ It is mentioned in the Oxford Companion to the Theatre and Performance that *Natyasastra* is the earliest known Sanskrit collection on Indian theatre attributed to the sage Bharata.¹⁸ In The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musician Bharata is depicted as a sage (muni) in ancient Indian legend.¹⁹ So it is difficult to get an idea regarding the identity of that 'sage'. Kapila Vatsyayan tried to read this problem in a different way. In this context she took a linguistic approach. She mentioned that 'Bharata' is only an acronym or eponymous for the three syllables Bha(bhava), Ra(raga), Ta(tala). So it is possible that Bharata is a symbolic name, depicting symbolically a community devoted to the performing arts. It is correctly mentioned by Vatsyayan that before *Natyasastra*, the term Bharata was not used to symbolize the theatre person/persons²⁰. In *Natyasastra* we can also find the definition of the term Bharata. In the thirty fifth chapter of *Natyasastra* we find a list of theatre workers where the role of each person in the theatre was mentioned and Bharata was mentioned here as a general actor, a person able to play musical instruments, a stage manager who can provide accessories for a play production. Here we also

get the names of other members of a theatre group.²¹ It is evident, therefore, that in the *Natyasastra* the term Bharata was portrayed as a multifaceted theatre-worker. The manner in which *Natyasastra* uses the term Bharata make him either a part of the theatre group or identifies him with the producer or a person of a super personality, who can provide everything important for a performance. It is mentioned in the *Natyasastra* that Bharata was an authority in the field of theatre but *Natyasastra* nowhere mentioned that Bharata was the author of this text. *Natyasastra* is such a text where everything was depicted during the course of a long conversation between a sage and Bharata and it can be said that *Natyasastra* is a representation of a community's way of thinking like Therigatha or Therogatha. The arrangement of the chapters in the *Natyasastra* also indicates that a common wave of thinking was present in the entire text So it is clear that *Natyasastra* is not a work of several authors of different ages.²² But following Adya Rangacharya one can also state that *Natyasastra* was written at different times and that this process was active till the seventh/eighth century, creating a possibility of its being affected by contemporary developments also.²³ It is reflected in the *Natyasastra* that the theatre workers of ancient India had an urge to satisfy the audience and for that reason they wanted to make their communication with the audience much more effective. For that reason they tried to decorate the theatre hall, tried to use music and emphasised upon acting to make a performance successful and were interested also to schedule the performance on the basis of the mood of the content of the performance. Prem Lata Sharma in her essay has clearly mentioned the mentality of *Natyasastra* regarding the use of music and dance for a better performance. She had mentioned that *Natyasastra* had treated music much more essential than dance.²⁴ Except from the time of prayers ,meals and at the noon and midnight ,a play can be performed at any time of a day or night (early morning, forenoon, afternoon, and evening). According to *Natyasastra*, a performance could be done at a period of day or night which was most appropriately suitable to communicate, the mood of the performance. For example it can be said that a play based on virtue should be performed in the forenoon while a play evoking erotic sense ,based on Kaiśikī mode of acting, full of dance ,instrumental music and songs, should be performed in the evening, although it was further mentioned that theatre may be performed at any time of the day, on the basis of the patron or the producer of the performance.²⁵ The theatre workers of ancient India were also interested to understand the mind of the audience and it was mentioned in the *Natyasastra* that the response from the audience was important to measure the success of performance.

Natyasastra mentioned that the ideal spectator should be a good critic of the performance. After mentioning *Natyasastra* also tried to depict the psychology of the audience of different age groups and insisted that the performers should keep in mind the psychology and the mentality of the audience as on the basis of their mentality, audiences from different age groups react to different types of acting and scenes. According to *Natyasastra*, to cite one example, young spectators were usually interested in the portrayal of love ,devout in the philosophical and religious aspects. However, unlike the younger generation, the aged audience would enjoy the tales of virtue and the *Puranic* legends. The seekers of money would enjoy dramas in which the way out to achieve prosperity is described, whereas the heroic persons would delight in the terrible and horrible rasas generated through the scenes of the battles and combats. *Natyasastra*, while mentioning the choice of the children and the fools regarding performance, took 'common women' within the same category and mentioned that these types of audience would like comic situations, appreciate good costumes and good make up.²⁶ So it is clear that theatre workers of ancient India wanted to understand the psychology of the audience to fulfil that. In this way we can able to understand that the ancient Indian theatre workers were interested to understand the psychology of the audience to make them satisfy through content of acting.

It can be said that the quality of acting is also important to satisfy the audience . Only a good actor can communicate with the audience properly. To understand to quality of acting the theatre workers of ancient India were comfortable to rely upon the judgment of audience. As a part of this aim *Natyasastra* in the twenty-seventh chapter mentioned how performers would be able to understand that they had made a successful performance(i.e. Siddhi) also. There it was stated that a theatre production can achieve two types of success, human and divine success. If the audience, influenced by the acting, lough or get upset and then express their emotion vocally(by saying sadhu or god, aho or wonderful , pravridha nada or loud applause etc.) or physically (for example throwing garland or rings on the stage)then the actors could say that they achieved the human success.²⁷ It was mentioned in the *Natyasastra* that a performance would achieve divine success when it would be free from any noise, disturbance, calamity and when the auditorium would be full.²⁸ It is clear from this that ancient Indian theatre workers were interested to use the reaction of the audience as a parameter to measure their success in communicating a piece of drama.

A good communication in case of theatre could be done with the help of good acting only. The theatre workers of ancient India had their own idea regarding acting, which helps us to understand their way of thinking towards acting and their mentality towards woman also. In the case of *Natyasastra* or ancient Indian tradition, we have to keep in mind that to the ancient people meaning of acting was something different from the modern one. To a modern spectator performance of a drama (except dance and music dominated tradition Indian theatres like Yatra,²⁹ etc.) is a dialogue based performing art and therefore meaning of acting(in the theatre) is mainly confined to the dialogue and its representation. But the concept of acting at the time of *Natyasastra* was quite different from the modern perspective. Acting is understood in contemporary idiom to symbolize a communication where an actor suitably represents the words of the playwright taking them as an artistic unity complete in itself with appropriately spontaneous gestures, movements, facial expressions and use of voice speech. Unlike that, the term Abhinaya in *Natyasastra* suggests a much more complex process of an actor's art which was highly systematized and exactly worked out.³⁰ The definition of the term Abhinaya(acting), as given in the *Natyasastra*, says us about that ancient concept. The term Abhinaya was etymologically explained by *Natyasastra*. According to *Natyasastra* Abhinaya is that which carries the performance of the audience and that was highly systematized, where the use of several parts of an actor's (male and female) body were mentioned. According to *Natyasastra* there were four types of Abhinaya which are Angika (Body movements), Vachika(spoken expression), Aharya(communicating through ornaments and dresses), Sattvika(the emotive expression).³¹

While explaining the term Abhinaya, Adya Rangacharya usually translated it as 'acting' but according to Bharata it is not correct. He says that the term *Abhinaya* is derived from the term *ni*(to carry) with a prefix *Abhi*(meaning of the play) and thus the term *Abhinaya* is something which is carrying the meaning of the play.³² So whenever the performers tried to say something on acting they actually depicted their mind and mentality towards communication indirectly. The detailed stratification of *Abhinaya* also helps us to construct a history of the methodology of *abhinaya*(acting) and the history of the nature of performance of the ancient Indian theatre.

Natyasastra tells us the Indian identity of the Indian theatre. This Indian identity is reflected in the concept of construction of indoor stage which is mentioned in the *Natyasastra*. In the second

chapter of the *Natyasastra*, concept of stage & theatre hall along with its importance and the methods of its construction were described which also helps us to understand the mind and mentality of the theatre workers of ancient India to communicate the audience properly. They were interested to construct an audience-friendly theatre hall to satisfy the audience. Three shapes of the theatre hall were mentioned in the *Natyasastra*'s second chapter which are oblong (Vikrista), square (caturasra) and triangular (tryasra) which were again sub divided into another three types. These are large (Jyestha), middle (Madhya), small (Avara). *Natyasastra* also gives us the measurement of these theatre halls. The length of the large hall should be 108 hasta and the middle one should be 64 hasta long and the small one should be 32 hasta long. In this way *Natyasastra* gives us an idea of the shape of the theatre hall of ancient India.³³ So technically *Natyasastra* is saying about 9 types of theatre hall. While explaining this measuring unit, Adya Rangacharya says that four hasta maybe taken as equivalent to one danda,³⁴ R.P Kulkarni³⁵ and others also supported Rangacharya's decision. Following *Natyasastra*, it can be said that 8 angula is equal to one hasta and 4 hasta is equal to one danda.³⁶ Analysing the measuring units as mentioned in the *Natyasastra*, Tarla Mehta tried to give a measurement of the theatre hall in modern parameters.³⁷ In the second chapter of the *Natyasastra* we have the description of the Madhya type theatre hall but it was not clearly mentioned which Madhya (Vikrista, caturasra or tryasra) type it was. In the last part of the second chapter, two other types of theatre hall (caturasra and tryasra) were described separately which help us to think that the description of the Madhya type theatre hall is the description of the Vikristamadhya theatre hall. It is clear from the *Natyasastra* that it suggested Vikristamadhya type theatre hall as an appropriate hall for any human being because it would help audience to listen to the dialogues clearly and to watch the actor clearly. It is mentioned in the *Natyasastra* that a large theatre hall maybe helpful for the Gods but in the case of human being. Vikristamadhya type theatre hall is appropriate because it helps the actor to communicate with the audience vocally and physically.³⁸ This logic proves that the theatre workers of ancient India had an urge to communicate with the audience. If the theatre hall became too large, it would be impossible for each and every audience to recognize the actor's role. It is interesting to note that like India, Greeks also faced this problem but unlike Indian theatre workers, to solve this they decided to use large coloured masks which actually helped each and every audience to recognize the actor's role in the performance.³⁹ But Indians were not interested to use masks, they decided to decrease the size of the theatre hall

only. This proves that Indian theatre workers tried to think in their own ways to communicate the audience. Actually art is a human activity where one man consciously, by means of certain external signs, hands on to others feelings he has lived through, and others are affected by these feelings and also experience them.⁴⁰ This mentality of Leo Tolstoy regarding the art of communication can also be seen in the concept of *Natyasastra* in which we come across attempt to touch the mind of the audience (i.e. to appreciator of art) .

Natyasastra also gives a detailed description regarding the decoration of the theatre hall. It is mentioned that the wall of the theatre hall should be decorated by the wall painting and the painting of wall should be done after doing the wood-work and many beautiful sculptures of women can be placed within the theatre hall and several features may be sculptured on the columns of the theatre hall.⁴¹ These depict that the theatre workers of ancient India had an urge to make the theatre hall attractive. While describing the seating arrangements it is interesting to note that *Natyasastra* had suggested to arrange the columns or pillars and the seats of the audience in such a way that it would not disturb the vision of the audience.⁴² This again proves the urge of the theatre workers of ancient India to satisfy the audience. This also proves their mind and mentality towards successful communication too.

If we look at the *Natyasastra*, we will find that a group of people, who belong to the theatre community, thought about the concept of entertaining theatre, which will be able to satisfy the audience properly. It is also evident that they were interested to communicate with the audience properly. The tradition of Acting in India certainly developed before *Natyasastra* but these type of conscious thinking regarding theatre-communication to make an effective communication with the audience was not depicted before *Natyasastra*. A relevant question which strikes our mind is the possible reason that might have led a group of people to think so much about the need of theatre and in this context, the social demand theory of art comes up. Devangana Desai, while discussing the factors behind the composition of a series of *Silpasatras* (during c.10th and c.12th century) mentioned that the demand for temple construction was responsible for that.⁴³ *Natyasastra* is a text which can be placed between c.500 B.C and c. 200A.D. and if we look at the economic scenario between c.200 B.C and c.300 A.D, we will find that India during this period witnessed massive development in the field of trade and commerce. Romila Thapar observes in Early India that, 'The Mauryans had begun to explore the potential for activities

,not only in various parts of the subcontinent but also in areas situated in the western part of the India. The need to extend the horizon and considered participation in new ventures was recognized by the successor states'. During this time the Kushanas and the Shakas tried to control the trade routes approaching west Asia. During c.200 B.C and c.300 A.D, we can see the development of Indo-Roman trade which was immensely profitable for India. Romila Thapar has also referred to the Greek historian Pliny's argument who had mentioned that trade with the East caused a serious loss for Roman economy. The frequency of hoards of Roman coins in southern India and the Deccan help us to realize that this trade played a very important role in Indian economy and resulted in the emergence of several urban trade centres like Muziris , Barygaza Arikamedu etcetera . North India also witnessed economic change during this time with the help of the *Arthashastra* and Pliny's text, Romila Thapar has argued that coastal shipping was very common in India during this time and like western coast, eastern coastal economy was also influenced by the Indo-Roman trade which resulted the development of several urban trade centres like Tamralipta.⁴⁴ As a consequence of the economic advancement, India, as Professor Thapar argues, witnessed the development of urban culture and the demand for a total entertainment package in the form of the theatrical performance was indeed a consequence of this changing urban milieu. To meet urban need of the urban culture, the theatre workers were compelled to think sincerely of ways to make a theatre much more attractive but this explanation too has proved to be inadequate. In this context it is important to discuss in brief the nature of the religious development in India during this period which witnessed the rise of Buddhism and Jainism and their ever-growing popularity resulting in a marked transformation in the religious life of the common people. Consequently the challenge posed to Brahmanical region made it imperative that they look for possible ways to win over those who had been drawn to the liberal Buddhist philosophy and one useful means to combat the new threat was to communicate with them through the performance of theatre where everyone, irrespective of their caste and social hierarchy, would be given entry. There are certain references in the *Natyashastra* which point to the fact that theatre had undoubtedly become an instrument in the hands of the Brahmanical leaders to communicate with those who had been disgraced and deprived during the heyday of Brahminism.⁴⁵ In *Natyashastra*'s first chapter when Bharata Muni was describing the origin of theatre, he had mentioned that once Mahendra as the leader of all deities approached Brahma and requested him, 'please give us something which would not only teach us but be pleasing both

eyes and ears. (True) the Vedas are there but (some like) the sudras are prohibited from listening to (learning from) them. Why not create for us a fifth Veda which would be accessible to all the varna-s(castes)?⁴⁶ So it is evident that there was a need of Brahmanism to communicate with those who were sudras and their aim was to state the philosophy of *Veda* to the sudras (who were not allowed for a long time to listen to or read the *Vedas*) and by opening the theatrical performance for all, Brahmanical religion, in all likelihood, used theatre as a device to communicate with the neglected and downtrodden.

Theatre workers of ancient India were not only used they were controlled too. *Arthashastra* says that the performers (Kusilava) should be controlled and ‘they may hold their performance to the liking in accordance with the producer of their country...’.⁴⁷ So there is a silent dictation in *Arthashastra* that the performance should be controlled. Actually they were good communicators, For that reason they were controlled. But *Natyashastra* was not interested to control performers mind. Last chapter of *Natyashastra* says ,‘Things which are not stated here should be learnt by attentively watching the talking and behaviour of the people and should be used in the performance.’⁴⁸ So, it is evident that *Natyashastra* was not interested to say the last word regarding theatre-communication and performance . The mentality of the theatrical performers was not to set some rigid rules regarding performance for their successors but to encourage successors to innovate new trajectories to make effective communication to satisfy the audience.

References

1. Richard Salomon ,*Indian Epigraphy*,Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt . Ltd.,New York,1998.p.123.
2. M.L Varadpande , *Religion and Theatre* , Abhinav Publications ,New Delhi,1983,p.7.
3. Adya Rangacharya(translator), *The Natyashastra:English Translation with Critical Notes*, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi,2010,pp.339-340(chapter 35,Hymn no. 88-108)
4. Ibid. ,pp.1-2,(Chapter.1,hymn 1-20).
5. M.M Ghosh, *The Natyashastra ascribed to Bharata-Muni*,vol.1,Asiatic Society of Bengal,Calcutta,1951,p.LXXIII.

6. Chandra Rajan,(translator),*The Complete Works of Kalidasa*,vol.2,Sahitya Akademi,Delhi,2002,p.160.
7. Unpinder Singh, '*The Power of a Poet: Kingship ,Empire and War in Kālidasa's Raghuvamśa*'
-Basudev Chatterjee(edited),*Indian Historical Review*,(vol.38,number.2),ICHR & Sage,New Delhi, December 2011,p.179.
8. M.M Ghosh, op. cit. , pp. LXXXIV-LXXXVI.
9. Anupa Pande, *A Historical and Cultural Study of the Natyasastra of Bharata*,Kusumanjali Prakashan , Jodhpur,1992,p.2.
10. V.Venkatachalam, *Bhasa*, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi,1995,P.26.
11. Ibid., pp. 45-46.
12. R.C Majumder, *Ancient India*, Motialal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd.,Delhi,1994,p.190.
and
Sukumari Bhattacharji ,*History of classical Sanskrit Literature*, Orient Longman,Calcutta,1993,p.4.
13. Bharat Gupt, *Dramatic Concepts :Greek and Indian*, D.K Printworld (P) Ltd., New Delhi,1994,pp.19-20.
14. Sukumari Bhattacharji, op. cit. , pp.5-6.
15. Adya Rangacharya, *The Natyaśāstra :English Translation with Critical Notes*, op.cit.,p.1(Chapter.1,Hymn.1-20).
16. Amrit Srinivasan(edited), *Approaches to Bharat's Natyasastra*, Sangeet Natak Akademi & Hope India Publications,Delhi,2007,p.1.
17. Kapila Vatsyayan, *Bharata:The Natyasastra*, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi,2001.,pp.2-5.
18. Kavalam N Panikkar on *Natyasastra*-Dennis Kennedy (edited),*The Oxford Companion to Theatre and Performance*, Oxford University Press, New York,2010,p.420.
19. Jonathan Katz on Bharata -Stanly Sadie (edited),*The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, vol.3,op. cit., p.503.
20. Kapila Vatsyayan, *Bharata:The Natyasastra*, op.cit., p.6.
21. Adya rangacharya,*The Natyasastra:English Translation with Critical Notes*,op.cit.,pp.399-340(Chapter 35,Hymn 88-108).

22. K.Vatsyayan, op. cit., pp. 6-7.
23. Adya Rangacharya, *The Natyasastra:English Translation with Critical Notes*, op. cit.,p. xvii.
24. Prem Lata sharma, “*Is Music and Dance an Integral Part of Natya?*”,
- Amrit Srinivasan(edited), *Approaches to Bharata’s Natyasastra*, Sangeet Natak Akademi & Hope India Publications,Delhi,2007.pp107-119.
25. Adya Rangacharya, op. cit., pp.216-217(Chapter 27,Hymn no.91-98).
26. Ibid.,pp.215-216.(chapter 27 ,Hymn 50 -62).
27. Adya Rangacharya, Ibid., p.213(chapter no.27,hymn no.4-15a).
28. Adya Rangacharya, Ibid., p214(chapter no.27,hymn no. 15b-18a).
29. For detail discussion on the history and origin of Yatra,
See Kapila Vatsyayaan, *Traditional Indian Theatre: Multiple Streams* ,National Book Trust,New Delhi,2007,pp.133-143(chapter on Yatra,).
30. Tarla Mehta, *Sanskrit Play Production in Ancient India* , Motilal Banarasidas,Delhi, 1995,p131-132.
31. M M Ghosh(translator), *The Natyasastra* ascribed to Bharata-Muni,vol.1, op. Cit.,p.149(Chapter.8 Hymn 8-9).
32. Adya rangacharya, op. cit.,p.185 (footnote on Abhinaya).
33. M M Ghosh(translator), *The Natyasastra* ascribed to Bharata-Muni,vol.1, op. cit.,p.19 (chapter.2, Hymn no.7-11).
34. Adya Rangacharya(translator), *The Natyasastra:English Translation with Critical Notes*, op. cit., pp.7-8.
35. R.P Kulkarni, *The Theatre According to The Natyasastra of Bharata* , Kanishka Publishing House,Delhi,1994,p.20.
36. M M Ghosh(translator), *The Natyasastra* ascribed to Bharata-Muni,vol.1,op. cit., p. 20(Chapter.2,Hymn 12 -16.).
- 37.

<i>Shape</i>	<i>Sizes</i>		
	<u>Large</u> (<i>Jyeṣṭha</i>)	<u>Medium</u> (<i>Madhya</i>)	<u>Small</u> (<i>Avāra</i>)
	E-W × N-S	E-W × N-S	E-W × N-S
Rectangular (<i>Vikṛṣṭa</i>)	162' × 81' 108H × 54 H	96' × 48' 64 H × 32 H	48' × 24' 32 H × 16 H
Square (<i>Caturasra</i>)	162' × 162' 108 H × 108 H	96' × 96' 64 H × 64 H	48' × 48' 32 H × 32 H
Triangular (<i>Trayasra</i>)	Measurements not given.		

Source:

Tarla Mehta, *Sanskrit Play Production in Ancient India*, Motilal Banarasidas, 1995.
p.44

And

Here she mentioned that in the traditional measurements one angula is equal to 17.86 mm. (according to Vishnudharmattara Purana)& twelve angula can make one Tala. Tarla Mehta, *Sanskrit Play Production in Ancient India*, op. cit.,p.65.

38. M M Ghosh(translator), *The Natyasastra ascribed to Bharata-Muni*,vol.1, op. cit., pp. 20 - 21(Chapter.2,Hymn no.18-23).

39. Bharat Gupt, *Dramatic Concepts :Greek and Indian: A Study of the Poetics & the Natyasastra*, D.K Print World (P) Ltd., New Delhi,2006,p 131.

40. Leo Tolstoy ,*What is art? And Essays on Art*,(translation by Aylmer Maude),Oxford University Press,London,1962,p.123.

41. M M Ghosh(translator) , *The Natyasastra ascribed to Bharata-Muni*,vol.1, op. cit., pp.28-29(chapter .2 Hymn 75-80).

42. Adya Rangacharya ,op. cit., p.10(chapter.2,Hymn89-100).

43. Devangana Desai, '*Social Dimensions of Art in Early India*', P.Pattanaik (ed.), Social Scientist, Vol. 18, No. 3 (March,1990),New Delhi,1990, p. 21.

44. Romila Thapar, *Early india*, Penguin Books, New Delhi,2003, p.209 &pp.235-244.
and

Romila Thapar, '*Cultural Transactions and Early India*', *History and Beyond*,Oxford University Press,New Delhi,2001,pp.28-29.

45. M.C Byrski, '*The Myth of the Origin of Theatre and its Socio-Historical Import*',

-Amrit Srinivasan(edited), *Approaches to Bharata's Natyasastra*, op. cit. ,pp.172-174.

46. Adya Rangacharya,op. cit., p.1(chapter .1).

47. R.Shamasastry(translator), *Kautilya's Arthasastra*, Mysore Printing and Publishing House,Mysore,1961, p.231 (chapter 4).

48. Adya Rangacharya ,op cit.,p.344.