

A study on the Works On mudrārākṣasa

Ipsita De¹

Dr Dikshita Ajwani²

Ph.D Research Scholar of Sanskrit, Singhania University¹

Assistant Professor at JNV University, Jodhpur²

Abstract:

The distinction between descriptive and analytical research rests on the question he asks. Descriptive research attempts to determine, describe or identify what is, while analytical research attempts to establish why this is so or how it occurs. Descriptive research classifies, describes, compares and measures data. While analytical research focuses on causes and effects. For example, take the numbers on the evolution of trade deficits between the United States and the rest of the world in 2015- 2018. This is descriptive research. The analytical method is a generic process combining the power of the scientific method with the use of formal processes to solve any type of problem issue. Analytical methods help to develop the reasoning power of students. The drama Mudrārākṣasa of Sanskrit origin very powerful poet in Vishakhadatta.

Introduction:

Vishakhadatta was an Indian Sanskrit poet and playwright . Although Vishakhadatta furnishes the names of his father and grandfather as a maharaja Bhaskaradatta and maharaja Vateshvaradatta in his political drama mudrārākṣasa, we know little else about him. Only two of his plays the mudrārākṣasa and the Devi Chandraguptam are known to us . His period is not certain but he probably flourished in or after the 6th century CE. Some Scholars such as A.S.Altekar, K.p.jayaswal and Sten knows theorized that Vishakhadatta was a contemporary of Chandragupta II, and lived in late 4th Century to early 5th Century . But this view has been challenged by other Scholars including . My thought the poet Vishakhadatta was very knowledgeable person. And this book mudrārākṣasa, are big political book . The Analytical Research in this drama such as a good opinion and rule methods to dedicate our political community..

Mudrārākṣasa

Rakshasa's Ring is Vishakhadatta's only surviving play, although there exist fragments of another work ascribed to him . Vishakhadatta has stressed upon historical facts in the mudrārākṣasa has a play dealing with the time of the Maurya Dynasty . The titles of Vishakhadatta's father and grandfather do indicate one point of interest that they came from a princely family, Certain to have been involved in political administration at least at a local level . It seems very possible in fact, that Vishakhadatta came to literature from the world of affairs

*Stylistically he stands a little apart from other Dramatists. A person literary education is clearly no way lacking , and formal terms , he operates within the normal conventions of **Sanskrit literature** , but one does not feel that he cultivates these conventions very enthusiastically for their own sake. It would be a travesty to suggest that one can defect in his writing a clipped, quasi-literary diction as it would be to think of **Kālidāsa** as*

*an untutored child of nature simply because he shows himself less steeped than **Bhavabhuti** in Philosophical erudition. But it is fair to say that Vishakhadatta's prose passages in particular often have a certain stiffness compared to the supple idiom of both **Kālidāsa** and **Bhavabhuti**. In relative, rather than absolute, terms his style includes towards the principle of " **more matter and last art** ."*

*There have been other cases of contributions to **Sanskrit literature** by men of action-for instance, the three plays ascribed to the celebrated monarch, **Harsha**. The ascription is plausible, and the plays are talented and worthy pieces. But unlike the **Mudrārākṣasa**, they adhere closely to conventional literary ideals . **Harsha** no doubt wished to show that he could write as well as he could rule: yet in the last resort, one suspects that he would have been more interesting to know as a man than as a dramatist . we do not know whether Vishakhadatta, on the other hand , if he was some kind of politician, was as such either Original or Successful; but as a playwright, he is both.*

Keynote: online pdf in Mudrarakshasa.

Analysis on Mudrārākṣasa, all Act

Act 1. (Acquiring of Signet Ring)

By means of a Prastāvanā, wherein the Stage manager (Sōtradhāra) converses with his wife, the author hints succinctly at the plot of the play, and prepares the way for the entrance of Chānakya. Chānakya in a long motorboat succinctly outlines his plan of action, affirm what has been done and what residue to be carry off. He has employed spies everywhere, for detection out what is going on in the megalopolis, one of these, Nipunaka by name, enters and respond his location during the tack of his wanderings. Adelaide as a Dominicans he had gone to the house of the vendor Chandanadāsa, with whom the wife and son of Rakshasa's were staying ; there he happened to pick up a ring belonging to Rākshasa , which the plot of the story hangs . In implementation of his plans Chānakya gets a certain letter written by Shakatadāsathen seals it with Rākṣhasa's ring , and gives both the letter and the ring to Siddhārthaka, one of his trusted emissaries, with certain secret instructions. He next tries to induce Chandanadāsa to deliver over the family of Rākṣhasa but Chandandāsa declines and remains firm in his loyalty , even though threatened with capital punishment . For the present Chānakya orders him to be kept under arrest .

ACT II (What Rakshasa Thought)

Rākṣhasa is introduced and is shown as plotting variously for the overthrow of Chandragupta: he, too, has employed spies to wander about in Pātulīputra and collect information. One of these, Virādhagupta by name, who was disguised as a snake-charmer, comes in and narrates how all the plans of Rākshasa had gone wrong, how all his schemes to kill Chandragupta had been invariably foiled by the vigilance of Chānakya, and how all his allies and friends, including Shakatadāsa, had been arrested by Chānakya on a suspicion of being involved in the attempts on the life of Chandragupta. In the meanwhile, Shakatadāsa has been rescued by Siddārthaka acting upon Chānakya's private instructions and brought to Rākshasa takes off some ornaments from his person and gives them as a reward to Siddārthaka, Malayaketu, and will be referred to further in drama V. Siddārthaka takes out a ring- Rākṣhasa's signet-ring – for sealing up the ornaments in a box, and being questioned about it states that he found it near the house of Chandanadāsa, and then restores it at his desire to Rākshasa who gives it in Shakatadāsa's keeping. Siddārthaka outwardly takes service under Rākshasa while inwardly he remains takes service Chānakya's spy.

ACT III (The Concocted Quarrel)

Chānakya secretly arranges a sham quarrel with Chandragupta, meant as a ruse to mislead Rākshasa, Chandragupta was to order the celebration of the Kaumudi festival, Chānakya was to forbid it. This being done, Chandragupta sends for Chānakya to know why the festivities were forbidden. A fine scene ensues between them in which the monarch reproves Chānakya and the latter taunts him as being ungrateful and insolent. Chānakya resigns office and leaves the king in high dudgeon, and the king also proclaims that he would rule independently of him- thus to all appearance that they are thoroughly estranged.

ACT IV (Rakshasas Activities)

The news of the quarrel is brought by Rākshasa's agent to his master who is highly pleased at it and believes that it would be easier to overthrow Chandragupta now that he has no longer Chānakya to advise him. In the meantime Malayaketu, accompanied to create a suspicion about Rākshasa's sincerity in his master's mind by telling him that the deserters from Chandragupta came to him wishing directly to deal with him and not through Rākshasa; the latter, he further suggests, is not so much the foe of Chandragupta; and in case Chānakya were somehow dismissed, there would be nothing to prevent him from allying himself with

Chandragupta . Malayaketu overhears the conversation between Rákshasa and his agent to see Rákshasa, who advises him to lead an expedition against pātuliputra at once .

ACT V. (The Cunning Letter)

The scene now shifts to the camp of Malayaketu near Chandragupta's capital. One Jivasiddhi, who was known as a friend of Rákshasa but was in reality a spy of Chānakya, enters into the presence of Bhāgurāyana, Mala . Minister ostensibly with a request for a permit to leave the camp. When pressed to give the reason for doing so, he says he is disgusted with the conduct of Rákshasa and wants to leave him before it is too late . Malayaketu is overhearing Jivasiddhi's speech, and the latter succeeds in poisoning the mind of the prince against Rákshasa by his allegation that it was Rákshasa and not Chānakya, who employed the poison-maid against Malayaketu's father and killed him . After he has left, the guards bring in Siddārthaka, whom they had caught leaving the camp without a permit on the plea that he was a servant of Rákshasa. On his person are found that old letter which Chānakya had given him in act I and a box of ornaments, both sealed with Rákshasa's seal. The letter is couched in such terms as incriminate Rákshasa while the ornaments are easily recognized by Malayaketu to be same that he had formerly given to Rákshasa . So it was apparently clear that Rákshasa , was in secret communication with Chandragupta. Which deduction is further corroborated by the oral testimony of Siddārthaka . When charge treachery, Rákshasa denies it in to as being the fabrication of the enemy. But he is at a loss to explain the fact of the letter being in the handwriting of his friend shakatdāda. Further, he happened to be wearing at that time an ornaments which he had bought unsuspectingly from a person who was in reality an agent of Chānakya; that ornament had originally belonged to Malayaketu's deceased father and was later in the possession of Chandragupta. Malayaketu's recognizes the ornament, and Rákshasa finds himself in a fix; he cannot well say that he bought it, since Chandragupta was hardly likely to sell it . Finally, Malayaketu taxes him with having murdered his father by means of the posion-maid. All this circumstantial evidence completely overwhelms Rákshasa, whom Malayaketu now disowns and who thus finds himself without an ally. Mala. Has also the indiscretion to order five kings under him to be put to death.

ACT VI. (The Fake Noose)

Malayaketu's expedition proves a failure owing to

dissensions among his own followers, and he is taken captive by Bhagurāyana, Bhadrabhata and others. Rākshasa, goes to pātuliputra to save his friend Chandanadāsa who was ordered to be impaled by Chānakya for sheltering his Rākshasa family.

ACT VII (The Reconciliation)

Chandanadāsa is being lead to the place of execution by the Chandālas who take him into the presence of Chānakya. The latter explains to him how all his plans, including the forged letter, were intended to bring matters to that particular culmination, it being his desire to induce Rākshasa to take up the post of the chief minister of Chandragupta. After some hesitation Rākshasa accepts it, the life of his friend Chandanadāsa is saved; and all ends happily as originally designed by Chānakya.

The student will note that the chief points in the development of the plot are 1. The fortuitous acquisition of Rākshasa's ring by Chānakya; 2. The forged letter and the verbal message; 3. The imprisonment of Chandanadāsa; 4. The successful flight of shakadāsa to Rākshasa's camp with Siddhārthaka, Chānakya's spy and the admission of the latter into the service of Rākshasa; 5. The bestowal of the newly received ornament from Malayaketu on Siddhārthaka by Rākshasa; and the restoration of the signet-ring by Siddhārthaka to Rākshasa; 6. The palming off of the ornaments of Parvataka on Rākshasa; 7. The feigned quarrel between Chānakya and Chandragupta; 8. The arousing of suspicion in the mind of Malayaketu against Rākshasa, and the final rupture between the princes; and that statesman; 9. The unjust murder of the five princes; 10. Malayaketu's precipitate resolve on war and his consequent defeat; 11. The resolve of Rākshasa to surrender himself up to Chandragupta for the sake of his friend; and 12. The final consent of Rākshasa, though given with reluctance, to become the minister of Chandragupta.

Keynote: Mudrarakshasa book of m.r kale. Presentation of Sanskrit Drama-

*In Rigveda we find the various forms of music, dance and poetry, but we donot have any certain proof of the art of drama included in above mentioned forms. In Rigveda Pururava and Urvashi romance is significant. Sanskrit drama got inspiration from these romantic verses. Thus Sanskrit drama got origins in Rigveda. All the Vedas were Written in Sanskrit. Some critics believes that Sanskrit was the dialect as well as the authentic language of india **Bharat Varsha** in ancient times. So as the beginning of the traditional ancient theatre of India is in Sanskrit language. It is also a belief that the Sanskrit*

Drama has its origins in the folk arts of the ancient period. Sanskrit drama and its tradition was faded by the folk traditions continued undertrained.

Keynote: The MA syllabus in ranchi university.

Rasa or Sentiment on mudrārākṣhasa

This is the main theory of Natya Shastra . Nine rasas signifies the nine emotion of human nature. Bharat Muni had mentioned only eight rasas . 1. Shringara(love), 2.Hasyam(mirth), 3.Raudram (fury), 4.Karunyam (compassion), 5.Bibhatsam(disgust) 6. Bhayanakam (horror) 7.Viram (courage) 8. Adbhutam (Surprised) Anand Vardhanam added the Ninth rasa that is Santam (peace) but tenth rasa is added Viswanatha Kaviraja is Vatsalyam (dearest).

Key note: The Sanskrit book of Natya Shastra.

Eight Sthayi bhavas

*Chapter vii of The Natya Shastra goes into great details about the bhavas, which are broken down into three categories . Bharata mentions eight **Durable , permanent, or Constant** emotional conditions called Sthayi bhavas: These emotional states are inherent to humans. They are basic as they inborn, understandable without explanation . On the stage Sthayi bhavas are represented by certain Anubhavas, explained in Natya Shastra proved.*

1. Rati (pleasure) – Smiling face, sweet words , contraction of eye-brows , sidelong glances and the like .

2. Hasa (joy) - Smile and the like, laughter, excessive laughter.

3. Shoka (Sorrow) –Shedding tears, lamentation, bewailing, change of color, loss of voice, looseness of limbs, falling on the ground. Crying , deep breathing, paralysis, insanity, death and the like.

4. Krodha (Malice) – Extended nostrils, unturned eyes, bitten lips, throbbing cheeks and the like.

5. Utsaha (Courage) – Steadiness, munificence, boldnessof undertaking and the like.

6. Bhaya (Fear) – Trembling of the hands and feet, palpitation of the heart , paralysis, dryness of the mouth, licking lips, perspiration , tremor, apprehension of danger, seeking for safety, running away, loud crying and the like .

7. Jugupsa (Disgust)- Contracting all the limbs, spitting , narrowing down of the mouth, heartache and the like .

8. Vismaya (Sunprise)- wide opening the eyes , looking without winking of the eyes and movement of the eyebrows , horriplilation , moving the head to and fro, the cry of well done and the like .

Keynote: The Sanskrit book of sahitya darpanam .

Temperamental states – Sattvika bhavas

Temperamental states are expressed on the stage using Sattvika abhinaya. In fact, all the gesticulation of vmental states may be designated as the Sattvika abhinaya. But the prominence given to the gesticulation of the temperamental states is due to the peculiar mental effort which is necessary for their presentation .

Keynote: The Sanskrit book of Natya Shastra.

Vira is the chief Rasa of the Mudrārākṣhasa . it is of three kinds,1. As it is characterised by mercy as in the case of Jimutavahana in the Nagananda ; 2. Valour as in the case of Rama in the Mahaveercharitam ; 3. Generosity as in the case of Chandragupta, the hero of this play.

चीयते बालिशस्यापि सत्क्षेत्रपतिता कृषिः ।

न शालेः स्तम्बकरिता वसुगुणमपेक्षते ॥ (मुद्राराक्षसः १/३)

वीररसस्य उदाहरणम्

इष्टात्मजः सदपि सान्वय एव देव

शार्दूलपोतमिव यं परिपोष्य नष्टः।

तस्यैव बुद्धिविशिस्वेन भिनद्धि मर्म

वर्मीभवेद्यदि न दैवमदृश्यरूपम् ॥ (तत्रैव २/८)

The Characters of Principal On Mudrārākṣhasa

The play of the characters represented, Chānakya and Chandragupta are real historical persons . Rākṣhasa , too, must important in the play in this Drama . The Drama of Mudrārākṣhas very danger Political high quality Drama this Drama in releted is Nanda dysteny . Chandragupta the king of Gupta capital . Rākṣhasa Malayaketu may also be a historical person.

Chānakya was the name of the sage Chānakya. His own name was Vishnugupta. And he is kutanitingya thus name is Kautilya because he is crooked policy owing then his nick name Kautilya

Analysis on Dhovni –Alankara-Guna

धन्या केयं स्थिता ते शिरसि शशिकला किं नु नामैतदस्या
नामैवास्यास्तदेतत्परिचितमपि ते विस्मृतं कस्य हेतोः।
नारीं पृच्छामि नेन्दुं कथयतु विजया न प्रमाणं यदीन्दु
देव्यानिहोतुमिच्छोरिति सुरसरितं शाठ्यमव्याद्विभोर्वः॥

(मुद्राराक्षसः १/१)

Who is the

blessed one throned on your head ?

Shasikala (moon) what ? Is that her name ? That indeed , is her name . How did you forget it, though it was familiar to you? I ask the woman and not the Moon . If you do not believe in the Moon let Vijaya tell you . May the skill in equivocation of the Lord Shiva, displayed in thus concealing the celestial river(ganga) from his consort, protect you.

Historical Analysis of Mudrārākṣhasa

Mudrārākṣhasa is a political as well as historical play by Vishakhadatta. Original script of the play is written in Sanskrit . The play in this Drama in background of the three had given the same history .

326 B.C Alexander the great invaded India. He defeated the small Kaingdom of Punjab and Sindha. Chandragupta Maurya Dhanananda was the king of Patliputra 322 B.C . Alexander the great return he was attacked by the same Kingdom which were defeated by him previously. Alexander is known as a Sikander also. Many historians wrote that Alexander did not return alivey it is said so .

Which the return of Alexander the rise of Chandragupta and Chanakya prominently occupied the history of India . The established the Magadha empire over the ruin of patliputra. King Dhanananda was cruel he hurt Chanakya. Furious Chanakya a brilliant Brahmine took an oath ti destroy Dhanananda. Chandragupta was illegal son of Nanda and was the student of Chanakya. He trained Chandragupta by all dimensions. He made Chandragupta perfect in warfare . Politics and Social affairs. He has collected all the kings which were troubled by Nanda and formed the army .Nanda was defeated and was escaped. Later on Magadha empire was devlopted and spreaded all over India . Even Afaganistan and Baluchistan were under the control of Magadha . Thus the historical background mentioned by various

historians of his age or of previous age Vishakhadatta employed or incuse in this play and made a play legendary.

Bibiliography

1. Natya Shastra of Bharat Muni, Prasantha Dvivedi, Volume1, Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, Varanasi.
2. Mudrarakshasa by Vishakhadatta, R.S. Pandit, Global Vision Publishing House , Daryaganj , New Delhi .
3. Mudrarakshasa of Vishakhadatta, M.R Kale (1911), MBD, Delhi . 4th edition .
4. Sahitya Darpana, Viswanatha Kaviraj, lakshmitika, Krushna Mahan Shastri, Chaukhamba, Varanasi