

THE EMERGENCE OF TRAGEDY IN GUJARATI THEATRE:

A Comparative Study of Three Dukhdarshak Natak (Plays)

© Bridge Center, 2014
BRIDGE CENTER
Buzau, Al. Marghiloman 245 bis, 120082
Tel. 0728394546
e-mail: editor@euacademic.org
Romania, European Union

Printed in Romania
First published, 2014

ISBN 978-606-93502-3-2

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission. Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The publishers have applied for copyright permission for those pieces that need copyright clearance and due acknowledgement will be made at the first opportunity.

The views and contents of this book are solely of the author. The author of the book has taken all reasonable care to ensure that the contents of the book do not violate any existing copyright or other intellectual property rights of any person in any manner whatsoever. In the event the author has been unable to track any source and if any copyright has been inadvertently infringed, please notify the publisher in writing for corrective action.

DIPAK BARKHADE

**THE EMERGENCE OF TRAGEDY IN
GUJARATI THEATRE:**

A Comparative Study of Three Dukhdarshak Natak (Plays)

Bridge Center

2014

Contents

PREFACE.....	7
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	9

INTRODUCTION

The Development of Modern Theatre in India.....	12
The Development of Modern Gujarati Theatre.....	19
“Women’s Question”: Representation of Hindu Woman and the Issues.....	26
The “Women’s Question” in the Reformist Context of Gujarat.....	32
Methodology of Discussion.....	37

CHAPTER ONE

***Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing Lalita’s Sorrow): Formation of the Genre**

The Plot of <i>Lalita</i>	50
The plot and its Theoretical Background.....	52
The Textual and Theatrical Elements in <i>Lalita</i>	58
Lalita’s Sorrow and its Larger Context.....	70
<i>Lalita</i> and the Making of the Genre of Tragedy.....	82

CHAPTER TWO

***Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage) and *Kanyavikray Khandan Natak* (A Play Denouncing the Practice of Accepting Bride Price): Reconfiguration of the Genre**

The Plot Summary of <i>Kajoda</i> and <i>Kanya</i>	100
<i>Lalita</i> , <i>Kajoda</i> and <i>Kanya</i> : A Comparative Discussion.....	103
The Idea of Sorrow in the <i>Kajoda</i> Plays.....	117

The Tragic End and the Public Discussion.....122

CONCLUSION

Summary of the Main Argument.....135
The Limitations of the Study.....140
Further Scope of the Study.....140

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....143

Preface

This book is a textual analysis of three Gujarati tragedies, *Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing Lalita's Sorrow) (hereafter, *Lalita*) by Ranchhod Udayram Dave (1837-1923) written in the year 1866, *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage) (hereafter, *Kajoda*) by Keshavlal Motilal Parikh written in the year 1872 and *Kanya Vikray Khandan Natak* (A Play Denouncing the Practice of Selling a Girl Child) (hereafter, *Kanya*) by Harilal Vitthalidas written in the year 1888.

The book focuses on the emergence of tragedy in modern Gujarati theatre in the second half of the nineteenth century. It not only highlights both the rupture and continuity of indigenous traditions in the existing literary and cultural sphere where the indigenous forms of lament found a new expression in the process of modernization but also the implications of the new public sphere, printing press and the new reading public. In this process, the present work is a comparative study of three plays to comprehend the ambivalent attitude of the Gujarati playwrights.

The first chapter, "*Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing Lalita's Sorrow): Formation of the Genre" explains how Dave develops theatrical realism by adopting Shakespearean idea of plot structure and highlights the ambivalence in his writing a tragedy in Gujarati for the first time. The chapter highlights the textual and theatrical elements which constituted *Lalita* as a new genre. In this, the chapter discusses Dave's ideological framework in which he situates the sorrow of *Lalita* and explains how Dave is strategic in his aim to develop the mode of realism and a theory of tragic genre. The chapter questions the visibility of Gujarati women in the public sphere to explain the consolidation of caste and gender and highlights the hybrid aspect of the tragic genre by unravelling the appropriation of local forms of representation of incompatible marriage.

The second chapter, "*Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage) and *Kanya Vikray*

Khandan Natak (A Play Denouncing the Practice of Selling a Girl Child): Reconfiguration of the Genre” presents the two other plays that reconfigure the genre based on the concept of dukhdarshak (Revelation of Sorrow) in the discourse of social reform of Gujarati women in the last three decades of nineteenth century. The chapter highlights the comic side of dukhdarshak tradition and compares it with Dave’s framework of Gujarati theatre. It presents a comparative study of the Kajoda plays and Lalita discussing the concept of mimicry as a mode of response to the ideological domain of social norms. The chapter shows the mixture of English, Bhavai and Sanskrit influences in the new theatrical form, prahasan (comic farce) and highlights the role of jester and the new upper caste women’s expression of sorrow. The chapter indicates the parody of Dave’s idea of Hindu bride and criticizes the expression of sorrow. In this, it shows the nature of sorrow discussed in the Kajoda plays. The chapter also shows the similarities and differences between the Kajoda plays and highlights the function of the hybrid nature of Lalita and two Kajoda plays to discuss the implications of modernity. It notes that the writing of Kajoda plays in the last three decades of nineteenth century suggested the appearance of new authors. Dave aimed to mediate the Gujarati culture and literature in new way and the writers of Kajoda plays showed their participation in the writing of modern form.

In conclusion, the book highlights the implication of modernity from a comparative framework. The conclusion also suggests the scope for the further exploration from the present discussion. It states the limitations felt in producing the present work.

Dr. Ecaterina Patrascu
“Spiru Haret” University
Bucharest, Romania

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I wish to extend my earnest thanks to my research supervisor, Dr. Urmila Bhirdikar, Assistant Professor, School of Language, Literature and Culture Studies, Central University of Gujarat for providing me her critical and constructive suggestions during the planning and development of this research work. I am particularly grateful for her genuine criticism, patient guidance and tolerance to bear my limitations during the occurrence of shortcomings in my approach. Her critical assessment has inspired me further to nurture my character as a researcher in the learning process.

I extend my gratitude to Prof. R.K. Kale, the Vice-Chancellor of Central University of Gujarat for his encouragement and support.

I also owe gratitude to Prof. E. V. Ramakrishnan, Dean, School of Language, Literature and Culture Studies, Central University of Gujarat for providing his support and encouragement. I want to thank Balaji Rangnathan, Atanu Bhattacharya, Ishmeet Kaur, Navneetha Muakkil, Niveditha Kalarikkal and Jakia Firdaus for their helpful suggestions. I would like to thank Zarna Maheshwari and for examining my drafts and helping me to overcome the problems in translating the extracts from Gujarati texts.

I am also indebted to the help of the staff-members of CUG library, B.J. library (peon Harshadbhai), Gujarati Sahitya Parishad Library (peon Snehalbhai), Gujarat Vidyapith, Dahilakshmi library, and State and District libraries of Gandhinagar.

I am also thankful to my friends without whose support and help this journey would have been tedious. I wish to thank Divya Shah for going through the proof reading of the chapter and providing important suggestions. I wish to thank Hiren for his helpful presence at the required time and for always making me aware of the important facts. I also thank him for the proof reading of the chapters and helping me in removing the errors. I wish to thank him, Ishan and Divya for their soothing accompaniment during our visits to the library at Nadiad.

I am grateful to my family. I thank my elder brother Umesh, my mother Pankitaben Barkhade and my father, Mangalbai Barkhade for their support and encouragement throughout my study. I thank my younger sister, Tejal for being patient and putting her faith in me during the period of crisis.

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation aims to study the reception of tragedy in Gujarati. To that end, it focuses on the study of the late nineteenth century Gujarati theatre and three plays that were received as tragedy in the reformist context. Here, the generic phrase, dukhdarshak natak is equivalent to the Western form of tragedy and it shows the death of the heroine at the end of the play. Ranchhod Dave, as Sisir Kumar Das notes in his book, *The History of India Literature: Western Impact: Indian Response, 1800-1910*, is noted as the “father of Gujarati drama” for constructing a new tradition in Gujarati theatre (Das 185). Dave criticized the crudities of contemporary drama and brought “a new seriousness to the theatre” (Das 186). Several plays appeared in the form of dukhdarshak genre and in imitation of *Lalita* (186). All the three plays, *Lalita*, *Kajoda* and *Kanya* are centred on the experience of dukh (sorrow) as the playwrights aim to represent in the titles or in the play. *Lalita* by Dave depicts the suffering of Lalita; Lalita, an educated and noble wife suffers because of the bad character of her husband, Nandan who is manipulated and deceived by Priyamvada, a courtesan and Chhaldas, a treacherous friend. The conspiracy plotted by Chhaldas along with Priyamvada and Nandan results in Lalita’s widowhood since Nandan too is killed along with Chhaldas and Priyamvada by Chhaldas’s agent, Pooranmal who kidnaps Lalita. Thus the failure of her marriage as well as many other kinds of experience of betrayal and sorrow lead to the troublesome obstacles which cause suffering on her path at emotional and physical level. The protagonist dies of exhaustion at the end of the play (Dave, *Lalita* 109).

Kajoda by Keshavlal Motilal Parikh is mainly based on an incident of an incompatible marriage between a young boy and an older woman. The protagonist, Chanchal laments for having no fulfilment of her sexual desire. The repression of sexuality makes her suffer. She is frustrated as the child bridegroom is incompatible because of his young age. She commits suicide out of the suppression of her sexuality (Parikh, *Kajoda* 54). The third play, *Kanya* by Keshavlal Harivithaldas is based on the social problem of kanya vikray (the practice of selling a girl child). The play aims to refute this unjust convention.

The protagonist, Chandagauri laments because her parents force her to marry an old man. She becomes a widow at young age as the husband is old and dies of rheumatism. Her widowhood becomes her state of suffering as she cannot marry again to keep the cultural values intact. She rebukes and curses her parents in agony and dies out of frustration (Harivithaldas, *Kanya* 60). In the context of nineteenth century Gujarat, women's sorrow is seen in its relation to their social treatment. In this way, the plays align with the aims of social reforms and locate the nature of dukh in the nineteenth century India to explain how it is understood with the reference to the social reforms for women.

The dissertation aims to study the emerging literary and theatrical discourse and its link to the educated Gujarati society between 1860 and 1890. It tries to understand the processes by which the new genre negotiated the question of women and social reforms. Additionally, the dissertation studies the reception of these plays in the Gujarati public sphere.

The dissertation takes up *Lalita* as the base text (analysed in chapter one) for two later plays, *Kajoda* and *Kanya* (analysed in chapter II) for understanding the development of tragedy in Gujarati. The present introduction attempts to locate these plays in the colonial context of social reform in Gujarat. The introduction is divided into four sections. Section I traces the late nineteenth century history of tragedy in other Indian languages. Section II shows the writing of tragedy in the Gujarati literature. It raises the question why woman became the subject of tragedy. The section III attempts to understand the debates on social reforms with a view to finding out how the reformists considered certain traditions and customs as producing sorrow for Indian women. The debates show that the reformists considered woman as the victim in colonial India and called for rational change in women's social position. Theatre contributed to this view by portraying women as victims and indirectly instructing the audience to change the situation. The last Section explains the methodology of discussing the plays and the theatrical underpinnings of the debates to understand, as Anuradha Kapur explains in her article, "Impersonation, Narration, Desire and the Parsi Theatre", the "mimetic" (94) and as Aniket Jaaware and Urmila Bhardikar explain in their article, "Shakespeare in Maharashtra: 1892-1927: A Note on Trend in Marathi Theatre and Marathi Criticism", the "didactic" aims of this theatre (46). The emergence of tragedy in Gujarati suggests the underlying ideological positions. The equivalence dukhdarshak natak to tragedy suggests the relationship

between the colonizer and the colonized on the one hand and influence and reception on the other.

The Development of Modern Theatre in India

Several studies have highlighted the changes in traditional Indian theatres at the advent of the British imperial rule as well as Western theatre practitioners in India. The earliest references to British theatre in India are about theatrical activities in Bengal. In the introduction to *Modern Indian Theatre*, Nandi Bhatia notes the formation of the cultural life by the British people as early as 1757 in Calcutta under the rule of the East India Company (xv). Sudipto Chatterjee, in his book *Enactments*, records the beginning of the Playhouse (1753) and the efforts of the Russian bandleader Gerasim Stepanovich Lebedeff (1749-1817) and the development of Calcutta Theatre (1775-1808) (89). Poonam Trivedi, in the introduction to her book, *India's Shakespeare*, notes that the famous British actor, David Garrick sent playbooks, men and machinery and received in return "Indian Chintz" and "Madeira" (13). Anand Lal, in his article, "A Historiography of Modern Indian Theatre", notes that Lebedeff also opened his Bengali Theatre (Calcutta, 1795) to cater to the small part of British population in the harbour town (32). Rangana Banerji, in her article, "'Every college student knows by heart': The Uses of Shakespeare in Colonial Bengal" notes that the establishment of Hindu College and the beginning of English education in Bengal are also important precursors to the development of theatre (29). The Bengali people began to read English literature after the establishment of Hindu College in 1817 (P. Trivedi, *Intro* 20).

Jyotsna Singh, in her article, "Different Shakespeares: The Bard in Colonial/Postcolonial India" notes that Shakespeare was a fashion among the elite Bengalis that "created in the minds of the students-the intelligentsia of modern Bengal- a literary taste" when they came in contact with the English professor of Hindu College, Henry Louis Vivian Derozio (1809-1831), D. L. Richardson (1801-1865) and the English actors of Sance Souci theatre (1844) (84). R. K. DasGupta, in his article, "Shakespeare in Bengali Literature", notes that the Bengali intelligentsia established the first theatre in Calcutta simultaneously staging selected scenes from *Julius Ceaser* and an English translation of Bhavbhuti's *Uttarramcharit* at Prasanna Kumar Tagore's Hindu Theatre in

December 1831 both to appreciate Shakespeare criticism and to recite and act scenes from his plays (20; Banerjee 34). Banerji records the annual recitation of selected passages from Shakespeare by the students of Drummond's Dhurumtollah Academy in 1822 and the Jorasanko Theatre that staged *Julius Caesar* in 1854 as an excellent production (35). Rakesh H. Solomon, in his article, "Towards a Genealogy of Indian Theatre Historiography", notes that Horace H. Wilson published the three-volume, *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus* in 1827 in Calcutta (8). In her article, "Impudent Imperialists: Burlesque and the Bard in the Nineteenth-Century India", Poonam Trivedi notes the demand of a public theatre and the advancement of native in civilization and taste after European luxury for Indians in Calcutta in 1832 (8).

Similar developments can be noted on the Western coast of India, with the establishment of Bombay Theatre (1776) and Elphinston College in 1857. Somnath Gupt, in *The Parsi Theatre Its Origins and Development*, notes the construction of Edward Theatre in 1850-60 and the performance of Gujarati plays in it (36). The Student's Amateur Club performed *Romeo and Juliet* in 1858 (143). Ranade, in his monograph on Marathi theatre, *Stage Music of Maharashtra* notes that the students of the schools also found the annual staging of a reading of *Julius Ceaser* and the *Merchant of Venice* in English in Anandobhav Theatre in Pune in 1872 (7). Dr Kumud Mehta surveyed the English Theatre in Bombay from 1860 to 1890 attended by students in large numbers (12).

Like Bombay and Calcutta, Madras (Chennai) was the third main colonial city where the early modern Indian theatre movement arose after the establishment of Madras University in 1857. Sugimoto, in his article, "'Boys be Ambitious': Popular Theatre, Popular Cinema and Tamil Nationalism", notes that T. R. Govindasamy Rao formed the Mohana Theatre troupe in 1870 and Pammal Sambanda Mudaliar later established an amateur theatre in Madras in 1891 under the great impact of Parsee theatres and Marathi troupes which toured South India (232). Ka. Naa. Subramanyam, in his article, "Shakespeare in Tamil" notes that the Parsi theatre was more or less Shakespearean in character with five acts, clear climaxes and expression of strong emotion (120). In the case of Kannada, A.N. Moorthy Rao, in his article, "Shakespeare in Kannada" gives his account of his first witness of the Trial scene in *The Merchant of Venice* enacted for the students in 1913 when the Maharaja's College in Mysore had a very active Dramatic Association (63). Subramanyam claims further in his article that his grandfather, Rao Bahadur S. Appu Sastry, the twenty-sixth

graduate of the Madras University recited to him quite a number of soliloquies and speeches of characters from *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, and *Measure for Measure*, *The Merchant of Venice* and *The Tempest* resounding voice in a most dramatic manner (120).

In other locations in colonial India, Sandria Freitag, in her book, *Culture and Power in Banaras: Community, Performance and Environment 1800-1980*, notes the dividing line in the development of the modern Hindi theatre in the Hindi Urdu belt of north India because the Parsi theatre did not use “a bastion of linguistic purity” but it favoured the Hindustani forms of speech which were most readily understood to entertain the widest cross section of society (75). Vasudha Dalmia, in her book, *Poetics, Plays and Performances: The Politics of Modern Indian Theatre*, notes that Wajid Ali Shah, who had led the new theatre, died in 1857 in Lucknow (31). Banaras became the centre of urban literary theatre to bring about a national theatre of Hindus associated with Shakespeare when the owners of Parsi theatre companies were attracted to the Indian legends, epics and mythological tales in 1860 (31). These early developments soon gave rise to theatre and Indian languages. However, theatrical activities were not limited to Shakespeare. Some of the important trends in the emerging Bengali, Marathi, and Parsi/Gujarati theatre are discussed below.

The first ‘modern’ Indian play entitled *The Persecuted or Dramatic Scenes Illustrative of the Present State of Hindoo Society in Calcutta* in English by Reverend Krishna Mohan Banerjee criticized the living conditions of Indian society for the first time in an explicit manner in 1831 (Lal 32-33). Tanika Sarkar, in her book, *Rebels Wives, Saints*, notes that the estate holders announced “awards for writing plays on peasant and gender issue, the two critical political themes of 1850s” (175). Amaresh Datta, in his book, *Encyclopaedia of Indian Literature: Devraj to Jyoti*, records that Michael Madhusudan Dutt (1824-1873) took Shakespeare’s plays in regard to “plot construction, characterization and tragic effect” (1067). Dutt contextualized the newly emerging dramatic literature in the light of Shakespearean plays and wrote two full length tragedies *Krishnakumari* (1860), a historical tragedy (1067) and *Mayakanan* (The Magic Forest, 1873) (S.Chatterjee 110). Dinbandhu Mitra (1830-1873) was influenced by the themes of Madhusudan’s farces but he did not use mythology, legend and history like him in his plays (Datta 1067). He was involved in the people around him (1067). Mitra’s first play, *Nildarpan* (The Mirror of Indigo planting 1860), was a political play which represented the tragic aspect of the life of the Indigo plantation

workers (1067). Its Bangla version and its translation in English criticized the British rule for its legitimacy or illegitimacy in Bengali society (Sarkar, *Rebels* 154). It dealt with the inhuman tyranny of the Indigo-planters and filled the hearts of the audience with pity and sympathy (Datta 1067).

R.K. Das Gupta, in his article, "Shakespeare in Bengali Literature", considers the preface of the play, *Shakuntal*, which was published anonymously as *Kirtibilas* (Pleasure of Fame) in 1852, as one of "the most important documents in the history of the nineteenth century Bengali Renaissance" because it defended tragedy, criticized the mentality which did not sanction it, and the crudities of the popular Yatras (23). Ajit Ghose, in his article, "Modern Bengali Literature", notes that it was Umeshchandra Mitra (1840-1907) who wrote *Bidhvabivahanatak* (A Play on Widow Remarriage, performed in 1873) and made the first attempt "to introduce the regular tragedy into Bengali drama" in 1857 and the tragic end of the drama to intensify its effects on the sympathetic audience (76). Ramnarayan Tarkaratna (1822-1886), a learned Sanskrit scholar followed the form and structural devices of the plot but retained farcical elements in his reformist plays, *Kulinkulasarbaswa* (Caste is Everything to a high Caste Brahmin, 1854) and *Naba Natak* (New Play, 1867) to attack the prevailing custom of polygamy (S.Chatterjee 92; Lal 33; T. Sarkar, *Saints* 175). Das Gupta gives the account of the failure of Bengali playwrights to create a national theatre because "a great deal of English theatre (including Shakespeare in original)" was found in the early phase of Culcutta theatre between 1831 and 1856 and it did not produce "the tradition of typical indigenous plays" (21).

The reverence for English plays was lamented "in the Bengali newspaper *Samachar Chandrika* of 9 February 1857" (Banerji 35) because, as Das Gupta further argues, the playwrights attempted to record their appreciation of English literature out of the early theatrical enterprise that was not part of the literary movement which produced the Bengali classics of the sixties (22). Such a trend continued up to 1880 in Culcutta. Girish Ghosh's *Chaitanyaleela* (Play of Chaitanya, 1884) was based on the life and times of the medieval Baishnab and the celebrated actress, Binodini played the title role in it (S. Chatterjee 182). The "prostitutes" started to act on the stage the new patriotic, romantic, charitra (life story), plays and tragedies (182).

In Marathi, the dramatic genres developed differently because Marathi theatre had strong indigenous source right from the 1850s. The Bhave troupe toured toward Pune and Bombay around 1850 (Ranade 5). Bhave initiated and

inspired the formation of several professional theatre groups or Natak mandalis (5). Poonam Trivedi, in the introduction to *Shakespeare in India*, notes that under the large influence of the existing Parsi theatre in Bombay, the emerging playwrights like Bhave started to incorporate the new order by imitating “the seating arrangements, the curtains, the scenery etc of the Grant Road Theatre” (14). Datta records the performance of first Marathi play, *Sita Swayamvar* (*The Marriage of Sita*) in 1843 in Sangli, small princely state in southern Maharashtra (1087). Ranade notes that the first ‘hall’ was built in Bombay in 1842 and in Pune in 1854 (5). He marks the phase of Bhave group (1843-62) “a necessary precondition for the successful debut of stage-music in Maharashtra” (5). Bhave developed the aakhyan (narrative) plays or Puranic plays with music and staged the “first ‘ticketed’ dramatic performance” of his Marathi play, *Raja Gopichand* (The King Gopichand) at Grant Road Theatre of Bombay in 1853(Ranade 4) Bhave’s performance influenced “the democratic wave in the public” (Lal 32). Amarchandvadikar Natak Mandali started to perform the farces as the prose genre to its repertoire in 1856 (Ranade 22).

Rajadhyaksha, in his article, “Shakespeare in Marathi”, notes that Vinayak Janardan Kirtane (1840-1891) wrote “the first ‘modern’ Marathi play”, *Thorale Madhavrao Peshwe* (The Elder Madhavrao Peshwa, 1861) which led to the discussion of tragedy in Marathi (83; Jaaware and Bhirdikar 44). It depicted “a Peshwa ruler known for his glorious military victories” that acted as remedy for the Marathas (Ranade 12). *Narayanravanacha Mrutyu* (The Death of Narayanrao Peshva) was another example of historical tragedy (Jaaware and Bhirdikar 44). In Marathi, the development of stage was set into two forms: “prose drama and music drama” (Ranade 13). In this sense, Annasaheb Kirloskar (1843-1885) began a new tradition of Marathi music drama when he wrote and produced *Sangit Shakuntala* 1875 (27). On the prose side, Krishnaji Prabhakar Khadlikar (1872-1909)’s *Kichakvadh* (The Assassination of Kichak, 1907) was based on mythological theme while his *Bhaubandaki* (Infighting, 1909) showed the political rivalry in the Peshwa family of warriors and rulers (Jaaware and Bhirdikar 45).

At this point, the discussion will again turn to Shakespeare with reference to the translations and adaptations, as also to the incorporation of elements from Shakespeare’s plays into Indian plays. The playwrights and critics kept the presence of Shakespeare a live issue. Rajadhyaksha further notes in his article referred as above that the Marathi intellectuals sought to answer

the question whether one could “change the name of the places and characters and yet be faithful” to Shakespeare and whether “the translation should be literal or will the mere sense of the passage do” (84-85).

S.K. Das, in his article, “Shakespeare in Indian Languages” notes that translations and adaptations from Shakespeare showed the development of certain remarkable issues in the cultural context of Indian languages (60). Shakespearean tragedies were at the centre of literary interpretations and admiration to understand the form of tragedy (55). Harchandra Ghosh (1817-1840) produced the first *Bhanumati Chhitavilash* (Grace of Bhanumati’s Mind, 1853), a version of *The Merchant of Venice*, which was “the move toward Indianization of Shakespeare” and was intended to be a text book while his *Charumukha Chittahara-Natak* (A Play on Enchantment of Charu’s Face) a translation of *Romeo and Juliet* (1864) was intended for the stage (47; DasGupta 23). Suresh Awasthi, in his article, “Shakespeare in Hindi”, considers *Rudrapal* (Rudrapal) as “the first Bengali adaptation of Shakespeare play” written in 1874 and notes that Girish Chandra Ghosh produced the rendering of *Macbeth* in 1893 (52). Satyendranath Tagore’s *Shushila Virshingh Natak* (A Play on Shushila and Virshingh, 1867) was translation of *Romeo and Juliet* and Tarinicharan Pal’s *Bhimshingha* (Bhimshingha, 1874) was translation of *Othello* in Bengali which were staged too (DasGupta 23).

In Marathi, Mahadevshastri Kolatkar’s translation of *Othello* (as *Othello*, 1867) is considered to be the first translation of a Shakespeare tragedy into Marathi (Rajadhyaksha 83). Deval’s adaptation of *Othello* (*Zunzarrao*) was published in Marathi 1890 and was staged in 1891 by the well known “prose company”, Shahungarvasi Mandali (Ranade 28). Gopal Ganesh Agarkar (1856-95) translated *Hamlet* as *Vikaravilasita* (1883) and recommended the play for the broadening of the mind as a “tragedy of thought” in the preface to his translation (Rajadhyaksha 87). In the larger context, S. K. Das, in his article, “Shakespeare in Indian Languages” insists on taking the influential role of English language as “the most serious problem” in Indian society (42). He considers the translation of tragedy a “conceptual problem” (54). S. M. Ranade’s *Atipeeda Carita* (1880) did not show the sorrowful ending which, according to Das, was “the translator’s crisis emerging out of psychological resistance to a foreign dramatic structure” (54).

In Hindi, Bharatendu Harishchandra’s play, *Durlabh Bandhu* (Rare Fellow, 1880) is considered the first Hindi rendering of *The Merchant of Venice*

(Awasthi 53). Lal Shri Nivasdas' *Randhir Prem Mohini* (1878), the Hindi adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*, served as an example of a play with a tragic end (Dalmia, *Poetics* 36). In Kannada, M.S. Puttanna's version of *King Lear*, *Hemachandraraja Vilasa* (Play of the King Hemchandra, 1899) was another example of early adaptation that transplanted the English play in Indian soil throughout in prose (Rao 64-65). The Maharaja of Mysore desired to see some English plays difficult to stage in Kannada and "supported the existing 'Palace Company' to perform *Othello* translated in *Surasena Charitre* (The Life Story of Surasena, 1881) and *Romeo and Juliet* translated in *Ramavarma Lilavati* (Ramavarma and Lilavati, 1881) (63). Rajamannar, in his article, "Shakespeare in Telugu", notes A. V. Vasudeva Shastri's selected Telugu variations for the English proper names although he made a literal translation of *Julius Caesar* in 1876 including the blank verse (127).

On the other hand, there was a simultaneous project of translating Sanskrit plays by the Orientalists such as William Jones (1746-1794) who was the first to identify the genius of Kalidasa with Shakespeare and announce "the discovery of the national drama of the Hindus to the Occident in the preface to his translation of the Sanskrit play, *Shakuntala* ([1789] 1979:vol.9)" (Dalmia, *Poetics* 28). This served at once to elevate Kalidasa to national status, as well as provide key critical concepts in matters of playwriting and appreciation (29). Dalmia observes the politics in the Orientalist interpretation of Hindu theatre which reflected the influence of romantics on the contemporary Indian writers in the nineteenth century (30). H.H. Wilson made the comparison between Shakespeare and Kalidas and noted Kalidas as the legitimate descendent of European classical tradition on the ground of comparison of Kalidas with the romantics (30).

In Calcutta, Bankimchandra, in his essay, "Shakuntala, Miranda and Desdemona", compared Shakespeare to the sea and Kalidasa to a garden because he found Kalidas excessive in the beauty, sweetness, soundness and cheerfulness of mind and body (DasGupta 25). He found Shakespeare superior to Kalidas, particularly, through a comparative study of *Shakuntala* and *Desdemona* when he wrote an essay on the Shakespearean tragedy, *Othello* in 1873(25). He marked "the sublimity of tragic universe" in Shakespeare's protagonists (25). Bankimchandra believed that Shakespeare excelled in characterization and in portraying passions such as terrible anger, hatred and jealousy which rage like waves of the sea in a stormy wind (26). In his article,

“Modern Bengali Literature: A Study in Indian-Western Relations”, Buddhadev Bose points to the attainment of a new dimension after 1860s in comparing Shakespeare with Kalidas (50). Bose notes that Bankimchandra found the innocence of “a child of nature” more visible in Shakespeare’s Miranda instead of in Shakuntala and considered Othello’s fury after Desdemona’s death superior to Ram’s misery in Bhavbhuti’s *Uttararamcharitam* (51). According to Bose, the Bengali playwrights could adopt the literary forms which were unknown to them in their “revaluation of past, conjoined with acceptance of the new and foreign” in the nineteenth century (51). The next section develops the themes considered so far with reference to Gujarati theatre and the emergence of the dukhdarshak natak.

The Development of Modern Gujarati Theatre

Madhusudan Parekh, the historian of Gujarati literature, in his book, *Arvachin Sahityano Aswad* (The Appreciation of Modern Literature), considers the Parsi playwrights to be the first to write the playscripts and perform in modern Gujarati between 1840s and 1850s in Bombay, Surat, and Ahmedabad (176). Dhirubhai Thakkar, in his book, *Abhigyan* (Recognition), traces the development of Gujarati theatre in terms of “asmita” (identity), “sanskarik sampragyata” (cultural awareness) and “samvrudhi” (progress) (2). He notes that Rambhau, the Marathi actor and his team performed *Draupadivastrahara* (Disrobing of Draupadi) in Ahmedabad in 1850 (192). Kathryn Hansen, in her article, “Language, Community, and the Theatrical Public”, notes that amateur Parsi theatre clubs and professional companies in Bombay made use of English, Gujarati and Urdu in 1853 to 1890 (62).

The contemporary Gujarati stage developed under the high influence of Shakespeare. Chandravadan Mehta, in his article, “Shakespeare in Gujarati”, mentions Dinshah Ardeshir Talyarkhan’s *Nathari Firangiz Thekane Avi* as the earliest known adaptation of *Taming of the Shrew* in Gujarati (41). It was staged by Kunvarji Nazar in the Andrews Library in Surat in November 1852 to show “how a bad Firangiz woman was brought to her senses” (Mehta 41). One of the Parsi theatre companies staged the tragic play in Gujarati, *Rustam and Sohrab* which was based on Firdausi’s *Shahnama* and composed by Edalji Khorji (1847-1917) in five acts; it also staged the farce, *Dhanji Gharak* on 29th of December in

1853 in Bombay (Parekh 176; Gupt 43). Bahamji N. Kabra (1860-1925) wrote and performed the plays, *Jebanejar* and *Shirin* (based on *Othello*) in Gujarati and wrote *Faramaraz* (based on *Hamlet*) in Gujarati in 1860s (Gupt 53). Nana R. Ranina's (1832-1900) *Othello* was published by Akshara Press into Gujarati for the Shakespeare Theatrical Company (41). When he published a translation of *Romeo and Juliet* in 1876, he made one Irish woman, Mary Fenton act the role of Shirin in his play which was a new step (Parekh 178; Gupt 42). But Kaikhushro N. Kabraji (1842-1904) and his partner Nazar were against Dadi Patel's similar intention to bring women on stage that forced Patel to leave the company in 1870-71 (Gupt 30).

Somnath Gupt considers Kabraji's contribution as important to the theatrical development of Gujarati stage and play writing (45). Kabraji managed the Natak Uttejak Mandali from 1868 to 1876-7 in Bombay (45). Kabraji kept in mind particularly the demand of new middle class Hindu public (45). He developed the mode of psychological realism (45). He included all types of characters like the sinner, the hypocrite and the truthsayer (50). He also depicted the conflict between king and pauper, hero and coward, sinner and ascetic, high and low, lover and beloved, such as "Sita in separation from Ram, Tara lamenting for her husband and son, Harishchandra ready to give up his life for truth" (50). Kabraji not only propagated Parsi history and culture, he encouraged reforms by bringing the Hindu epics such as Ranchhod Dave's *Harishchandra* (The Truth Sayer Harishchandra, 1875) and Narmad's *Sitaharan* (The Abduction of Sita), *Luv-Kush* (Luv and Kush) *Nal Damyanti* (Nal and Damyanti) (1893) and also the historical play, *Karan Ghelo* (The Whimsical Karan) to be staged (41). Vijaya Chavda notes in his book, *Modern Gujarat*, that *Karan Ghelo* was the first novel written in 1866 in Gujarati by Nandashankar T. Mehta (1835-1905) (19). The play, *Karan Ghelo* was performed by Kunvarji Nazar in Surat and Mumbai because it contained certain scenes and rituals that required the expertise of Hindus to advice Nazar for proper performance (49; Parekh 178). Nasharvanji D. Apakhtyar (1835-1878) produced a musical production of *Sohrab and Rustam*, which Gupt notes as "the first opera in Gujarati" (51).

Having been influenced by Apakhtyar, Kabraji began to include songs in his prose dramas and he "promoted music education by forming the Gyan Uttejak Company" (Gupt 51). The Gujarati playwrights such as Narmadashanker Lalshanker Dave (1833-1886) (Narmad), Dalpatram

Dahyabhai Travadi (1820-1898) and Ranchhod Dave himself assisted Edalji Khorji, who worked for Kabraji, in composing songs for his dramas (51; Chavda 18).

Translations of Shakespeare's plays in Gujarati showed the impact on the Gujarati stage. Kabraji was influenced by Dosabhai Randeria to produce Shakespearean drama (Mehta 42). Mehta considers Randeria and Dave as the important pioneers of the theatre movement in Bombay (42). He notes that Randeria translated Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* in 1858 which was staged that year and revived the play again in the 1876 (47). Nanabhai Rustamji Ranina translated two plays included in *Shakespeare Natak* in 1865 (Mehta 46). Mehta further notes in his article the impact of Parsi writers' use of Shakespeare in the act of translation of Shakespeare's plays in Gujarati and finds that Narbheram P. Dave translated Shakespeare's tragedy, *Othello* as *Venice no Habsi* in 1898 and *Merchant of Venice* as *Venice no Vepari* in 1911 (46). Mehta notes that Apabhai M. Patel translated *As You Like It* into *Kannan Kalol* (Merriment in a Forest) in Gujarati in 1948 which was "a good solid prose translation" (46). Mehta notes a different example of the translation of *Macbeth*, entitled *Malavketu* (The Effect of Illusion, 1900s) by Narayan VasANJI, who included number of songs in it so that it could be staged by a professional Gujarati Company (46).

The influence of Shakespeare was greatly evident till the end of nineteenth and early twentieth century when the Gujarati theatre began to develop a distinct style of its own. Dave, in his article, "Natakno Prarambh" (The Beginning of Drama) notes that the Gujarati Natak Mandali was transformed into Mumbai Gujarati Natak Mandali and led by Dayashankar, the famous actor and female impersonator of early Gujarati theatre in 1890 (64). Hasmukh Baradi, in his book, *The History of Gujarati Drama*, marks a significant change in the venue of stage platform in the theatrical activity from Mumbai to Gujarat- Saurashtra region (37). He notes that the Vankaner, the Subodh and many other professional Natak Mandalis were very active in the production of new plays from 1878 to 1898 (24). Dahyabhai Dholashaji Zaveri (1876-1902) expressed his vision of ideal Gujarati theatre in the Deshi Natak Samaj which he formed in 1890 whereas Vaghji Asharam Oza (1850-1896) started and managed the Morbi Natak Company and Shri Morbi Arya Subodh Natak Mandali in 1878 (Baradi 35-44; Mehta 43). Oza staged *Champraj Hando* (1889) based on *Cymbaline* in the year 1900 (Mehta 43). Oza wrote the plays only to stage them because he found the theatre groups staging a play in Gujarat-Saurashtra region "without

proper setting or costumes”, “religious sentiments or cultural sensitivity” but with “with vulgar allusions” (Baradi 35). These new Gujarati theatre groups produced hit plays like *Chandrhasa Charit* (Life Story of Chandrhasa, 1889) *Jagatsinh*, *Malavketu*, and even *Saubhagya Sundari* (Saubhagya and Blessed Wife Sundari) (1901), wherein, as Mehta notes, “the scenes were borrowed outright and the characters were translated by clever handling to prove the plays a hit on the stage (44). The play is based on the character of Saubhagya and his beloved Sundari. Thus the influence of Shakespeare is evident by 1900 and onwards at the centre of Gujarat as free adaptations of Shakespeare’s plays in Gujarati were produced by the founders of new Gujarati theatre companies such as Zaveri and Oza.

Influenced by Shakespeare and Sanskrit classic, Manilal Nabhubhai Dwivedi (1858-1898) wrote *Kanta* (Kanta, the beloved wife), a tragedy in 1884 and Ramanbhai Mahipatram Nilkanth (1868-1928) wrote *Rai no Parvat* (Rai in the form of King Parvat) in 1914 (Mehta 44; Chavda 22). Mehta mentions that two of their literary plays as “two classics” and written after Sanskrit patterns” and also observes the use of characters from Shakespeare “since Rai and Jalaka, the hero and the heroine of *Raino Parvat*, have their origin in Hamlet and in Lady Macbeth”, respectively (44). The use of characters of different plays allows us to see the complexities in the creation of the new genres in Gujarati theatre. Dukhdarshak natak needs to be understood in relation to this complex process.

The idea of writing dukhdarshak natak as equivalent of tragedy came out from the reformist agenda. The modern notion of ‘tragic’ was being exported and experimented in the early writings in Gujarati. Phiroze Vasunia notes in his article, “Aristophanes’ *Wealth* and Dalpatram’s *Lakshmi*” that Travadi wrote “Forbes Viraha”, the first “elegy” of the English type in Gujarati in 1864 to enact an appropriately modern gesture of recording lament by carrying out an English elegiac form after his association with Alexander Kinloch Forbes (1821-1865) was cut short by Forbes’s death (295). Parita Mukta observes the cultural negotiation between the colonizer and the Gujarati male reformers in her article, “‘The Civilizing Mission’: The Regulation and Control of Mourning in Colonial India”. Mukta notes that the local male reformers attempted mainly to create “a rupture with past practices and in their evolution of sensibilities and persona” (33). She finds that the women of the subordinated social classes are implicated within the specific class relationship in which she marks the Gujarati spokesmen’s patriarchal prejudices “in mapping out the self

image” of their emerging middle class (33). Thus English and Gujarati social reformers attempted to regulate the traditions of the ritual of lament, especially practiced by women.

Phiroze Vasunia discusses the translation of Aristophanes in the Indian context (295). He notes that Forbes himself compared the lament of Gujarati women to the lament of Greek tragedy in terms of theatrical setting to demarcate the display of grief “not only pre-modern but alien” in public domain (295). Here, it is important to note that women were at the centre of the discourse of reforms and equivalents of expression were being imported from the Western thought. Forbes imported the new expression of lament in the cultural domain of Gujarat and compared it to the lament of English woman. It is clear that there was an indigenous form of lament available in Gujarati culture.

In the context of Gujarati theatre, such observation is important because it can be seen that Dave used the *karun rasa* (sentiment of tragic) on the Gujarati stage as well as the element of *shakya* (chance) in Shakespearean tragedy as noted in the review, “*Natyaprakash*” (Light on Dramaturgy) (74). He, in his chapter, “*Rasaprakash*” (Light on the Sentiments), illustrates the episode of Rama’s farewell in Ramayana and Harishchandra’s suffering on account of his truthfulness which, according to him, provided a reasonable scope of tragic experience (15). Ramesh Shukla, in his book, *Navalram* argues that the note of deep pathos, anguish and uninterrupted tears can be observed even in the satirical jokes about the child husband in the mouth of a young wife employed by Navalram Pandya (1836-1888) to create humor as the central theme in his poems, *Bal-lagna Batrishi* (a collection of 32 poems on child marriage) (1876) and *Bal-Garbavali* (a collection of dance-lyric for girls) (1877) (24-25).

Thus, in regard to the negotiation of traditional and modern forms of tragedy, it is clear that tragedy comes as replacement to indigenous comedy. In this context, Dave’s critique of *Kajoda no Vesh* (The Impersonation of Incompatible Marriage), a Bhavai form of incompatible marriage is addressed in his article as another example which supports the point made here. Dave criticized the representation of older bride and a small bridegroom employed by the folk actors on the open stage in his village on the ground of *rasa* theory because it did not bring out the tears but laughter (*Natak* 48-50).

The tradition of *prahasan* (comic farce) was popular in the early plays in Gujarati because it reflected the indigenous comic performances of Bhavai. The modern dramatic forms and, the traditional forms and their elements were

simultaneously being appropriated as well as transformed. Achyut Yagnik in his book, *The Shaping of Modern Gujarat* notes the dramatic shift from 1850s to 1870s where he observes that Travadi drew heavily from Bhavai folk tradition but did not apply the indigenous way to construct the plot structure in *swang* (acts) in his second comedy, *Mithyabhiman Natak* (A Play on False Pride) in 1871, that he used in his first comedy, *Lakshmi Natak* (A Play on Goddess Lakshmi) in 1850 (84). Moreover, Jagdish Dave, in his book *Marathi and Gujarati Samajik Natak* [Marathi and Gujarati Social Plays] notes that Travadi was required to provide the subtitle, *Bhungalvinani Bhavai* (Bhavai without the Trumpet) to his comedy in order to convey the absence of unacceptable elements of Bhavai (38). However, Travadi brings Ranglo (jester) of Bhavai in *Mithyabhiman* to comment on the theme of kajoda (the incompatible marriage) (Jivram is 48 years old and his wife Jamna 16) (J. Dave 41). J. Dave considers the scene similar to “dukhdarshak samajik natak” (social plays revealing sorrow) in its thematic content because Travadi manifested the karunya (pathetic) effect underlying the laughter in the episodes of incompatible marriage and the bed stricken condition of main character of Jivraaj Bhatt, who confesses his vanity on the death bed. (41-42). J. Dave’s observation points to the impact of tragedy combined with the notion of rasa in the emerging Gujarati theatre.

Further, the Dramatic Performance Act was passed in 1876 which empowered the government to prohibit public dramatic performances which were scandalous, defamatory, seditious or obscene (Sarkar, *Rebels* 155). The influence of Bhavai in *Mithyabhiman Natak* was so strong that the play could not be performed until 1946 on the Gujarati stage in Ahmedabad because Bhavai was criticized for its vulgarity and obscenity by the playwrights like Travadi, who did not get English education (Baradi 34). It should be noted that even the writing of comedy in Gujarati added the element of tragic sentiment.

After *Lalita*, the tradition of writing tragedy for reforms started with *Sansar Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Household) (1869) by Bhaishankar Nahna (J. Dave 46). The other dukhdarshak plays such as *Vidhva Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Widowhood) (1871), *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage) by K.M. Parikh (1872), *Madyapan Dukhdarshak Chandramukh Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Drinking) (1874), *Balvidhva Rupvanti Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Girl Child) (1877), *Rajyaprapanch Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Conspiracies of State) (1878), *Durgagauri*

Dukhdarshak Natak (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Durgagauri) (1878), *Dushta Bharya Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of A Bad Wife) (1882) by L. K. Oza, *Kamla Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Kamla) (1883) by K.V. Joshi, *Mohan Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Mohan) (1884) by J. B. Das, *Rupsinh Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Gambling) (1884) by S. P. Thakkar and *Vishay Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Indulgence) (1884) by I.L. Majumdar appeared (J.Dave 31-84). These plays showed the idea of dukh in terms of nation-state, addiction and domestic failure of women, the plight of the Gujarati women who demanded education and attempted to reform the people in case of social evils such as gambling, drinking, addiction to “prostitutes”, immorality etc (J. Dave 51-81). Moreover, J. Dave notes the direct reference of *Lalita* and the reformist essays written by Travadi, Narmad and Joshi Sankleshwar in some plays in Gujarati. Bhaishankar Nahna shows the male character in *Sansar* who suggests to his wife to read essays on “Bhut and Dakyan” (Ghost and Witch) written by Travadi, “Vehem vishe” (About Superstition) by Narmad and “Kimiya Kapat” (Unworthy Business) by Joshi Sankleshwar (J. Dave 32). A young daughter-bride shares her views with her friend about *Lalita* in one play entitled, *Joravarvinod* (Mighty Play, 1881) by Anantprasad Trikamal (J. Dave 65). The young bride expresses her wish to endure her fate like Lalita even if she is married to an immoral husband like Nandan (66).

Thus looking at the emergence of tragedy in Gujarati and the production of other dukhdarshak play texts, it can be seen that the tradition of dukhdarshak natak used tragedy as a suitable form for advancing the thought of social reforms for women. However, in the larger context, the question of social reforms for women is a contested issue, and as many scholars point out, leads to the discourse of a ‘respectable’ nationalist discourse. The next section discusses some of these arguments for understanding the nuances of this critique.

“Women’s Question”¹: Representation of Hindu Woman and the Issues:

In his article, “The Nation and its Women”, Partha Chatterjee’s well-known analysis of the emergence of the discourse of nationalism in colonial India can be helpful to open up this debate. To explain “the politics of nationalism”, Chatterjee distinguishes between the period of social reforms and a period of nationalism (240-241). Chatterjee argues that the colonizers not only looked at and conveyed the Indian reformers the political disorder in their society but also used the “civilizing” discourse to term their traditional customs as “degenerate and barbaric” (242). He states that those colonizers who showed “sympathy for the oppressed” also brought along with it “the total rhetoric of moral condemnation” available through the language of enlightenment (243). Chatterjee cites Lata Mani to explain “the supposed tradition” and its relation with the suffering of “suttee” (a chaste and virtuous wife) (244). He notes that once tradition had to be thus tested, those women, who suffered by it, became its objects of analysis as “product of colonialist discourse” (244). However, all nationalists did not agree with this language of reform as well as the reformers themselves. To explain this, Chatterjee problematises the women’s question by stating that gender came to be defined by the two opposite domains between an “inner/outer” as (domestic/cultural) and (scientific/ political) domains (245). According to Chatterjee, the woman question lost its visibility (though it remained important) because the nationalist discourse was based on a “difference” (252).

The important point is that the gender identification was itself modernized with possibilities of authentic presence though it was conditioned that women would share space in the “inner” domain, “ghar” (home) while men would share space in the outer domain that is “bahir” (public) (245). Chatterjee states the significance of nationalism:

If we now find continuities in these social attitudes in the phase of social reform in the nineteenth century, we are tempted to label this, as indeed the liberal historiography of India has done, as “conservatism,” a mere defense of traditional norms. But this would be a mistake. The colonial situation and the

¹ I have borrowed this phrase from Partha Chatterjee, “The Nation and Its Women.” *Subaltern Studies Reader, 1986-1995*. Eds. David Arnold and David Hardiman. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. 240-261.

ideological response of nationalism to the critique of Indian tradition introduced an entirely new substance to these terms and effected their transformation (245).

The difference between Indian and Western ways of modern social life freed men and women to desire their reform by defining their social roles essential. However, Chatterjee also points out that the declaration of preservation of purity of spiritual domain was in fact a way of re-defining tradition as “an ideological principle of *selection*” (246). The nationalists applied certain codes of appearance to locate woman’s visibility in the public on the grounds of “feminine/masculine” values (252). This bifurcation achieved at one hand a supposed conservation of Indian culture and tradition and, at the same time, it also benefitted from the progressive aspects of “Western civilization” such as science, technology rational forms of economic organization (252). Thus distinction between the period of social reforms and a period of nationalism underscores the visibility of the women question in the social reforms era because the nationalist approach was “hegemonic”, “a new patriarchy” (256). It excluded the lower caste and class women on the ground of the cultural superiority which they embedded on the “*bhadramahila*” (elite woman), a new woman distinct in dressing and mannerism from Victorian woman and in social status and righteous conduct from “common” woman (253-256). Thus nationalism is “consistent with modernity” in the paradoxical sense that it is consistent with the system of binary oppositions which determine the women’s question as question of visibility in society (246-252). It is in changing and modernizing mode as it is strategic with the “classical tradition and “folk form” (252).

Taking this argument further, Dipesh Chakrabarty, in his article, “Limits of the Bourgeois Model?” highlights the “tension” which the nationalists experienced and notes their experience of alienation in day to day life as they found the modern progress important but silencing on the intimate aspects of life such as “customs and manners of thinking, domestic habits and ceremonies” (*Limits* 180-181). In this, he points out the domestic as “personal” (192). He focuses and analyses the lines of domesticity “within the public narratives of the nature of social life” (179). Chakrabarty thus problematises women’s question by focusing on the nationalist method which needed to understand the limits of emerging middle class domestic sphere. The nationalists experienced the limits when they came across reading of domestic

ideal and imagination of secular society still as, Chakrabarty notes, was “European category of thought” in many ways (180). Chakrabarty examines how the new domestic ideal is established.

Chakrabarty notes that the nationalists discovered an expression of sadness over the loss of domestic ideal, “*kamalahaya* describing Culcutta as the abode of goddess of wealth, Kamala (or Lakshmi)” because of worldly interests of the natives in colonial context (189). In this, Chakrabarty problematises the concept of “time” itself by questioning the “history/modernity” and argues that the nationalist failed to achieve oneness with it (193). He notes that the nationalists demarcated the life and action of men and women across the line of “religion”, “ancestry” and “mundane” and mixed the traditional, historical and day to day secular interests (190). This could happen because the nationalists defined the difference of familial kinship from Christianity (197). Chakrabarty locates the ‘narrative’ and the ‘secular’ aspects in the domestic sphere where reforms around women took place (192). The former is traced in the prescribed domain of religiosity and the latter is marked by the contradictory relation with western modernity (193).

Chakrabarty notes that the nationalists read new implications of purity of “self” as sacred while “public life” as polluting (191). This helped nationalists reconfigure and politicize the mythical figure of “Lakshmi” to suite the discourse of domesticity and its connection with the nation (192). The figure of “Lakshmi” was converted into “*grihlakshmi*” (ideal wife) so as to share selfhood not as motivated from European project (194). The figure of “Lakshmi” was converted into ideal wife rather to juxtapose European selfhood by the idea of “self sacrifice” and “spirit of living for others” and it could be possible through formal education (196). The nationalists theorized the term “freedom-in-obedience” to challenge the separation of “sacred” and “secular” time grounded by European history (Chakrabarty, *Postcoloniality* 280). In this, Chakrabarty reduces women’s question to the opposition between “Lakshmi” and “Alakshmi”, the former who is a middle class woman and the latter, a lower caste woman like “prostitute” and “washerwoman” (280-81).

Contrary to Chakrabarty, G.P. Deshpande, in his article, “Dialectics of Defeat: Some Reflections on Literature, Theatre and Music in Colonial India” notices the gaps in terms of the deep rooted traditional patriarchy in the acceptance of the “sanctity of religious scripture” and criticizes the new rational reformers who represented women in “a separate world of discourse” (2170).

For example, Deshpande notes that India had its own “secularism” and “literary tradition” after the “*bhakti* movement and resurgence of poetry by the end of 17th century” (2170). However, as he notes, the *bhakti* poetry was not read “even as the poetry of revolt against brahminism” by the end of 18th century which it actually contended (2170). Deshpande cites one of the Bhakti poets and also a critic, Madhusudan Saraswati and notes that Saraswati’s work on “the rasa theory” had declared the inclusion of bhakti (worship) in the rasas (sentiments) but it did not make any reference to bhakti poets in the colonial time (2170). Deshpande questions the historiography dominated by the elites and suggests Jyotirao Phule as important intellectual for his complete protest against Brahminical tradition and “an organic link with the social ethos represented by the low caste” Marathi *bhakti* poetry (2172). This strand of argument helps raise the question to the theory of rasa (sentiments) offered by reformist playwright.

Elaborating on the fusion of the private and “the more public and reified” domain, Tanika Sarkar, in her article, “Domesticity and Middle Class Nationalism in Nineteenth-century Bengal” focuses on the cultural process in which the reformists/nationalist politicized the intersection of public and private domain to represent women in public sphere in new ways “in terms of an articulated position, within the production process and the power structure” (160-165). She analyzes the discourse of nation with reference to the establishment of new as “real” middle class structure (158).

Here, Sarkar notes that the conjugal relationship had to be represented in new terms when “the nationalists needed to naturalize love as the basis for Hindu marriage” so as to excel the “western arrangements” (166). By the end of nineteenth century, the public domain was politicized with the increase of print and its consumption and it is seen that “the women became new patriotic subject” (168). The nationalists represent women as the beloved but skilled in executing the cultural value in new ways in the public sphere by carrying “the image of a class” (168). Sarkar does not find temporal division tenable anymore and the establishment of out/in theory watertight because Hindu home became, as she notes, the “substitute” for the outside world for “*karta*” (male) who aspired to be “a ruler, an administrator, a legislator, or a chief justice, a general marshalling his troops” (165).

Sarkar argues in her book, *Hindu Wife Hindu Nation Community Religion and Cultural Nationalism* that the middle class formation in colonial India

contained both the possibilities of social equality and authoritarian political positions (23-24). Sarkar's argument can be understood noting in her statement on the nature of colonial discourse:

A flat, uninflected, deductive, structural determinism then reads the consciousness of the colonized mechanically of these signs. Moreover, since these signs are vested with totalitarian powers, the consciousness of the colonized is divested of all claims to an autonomous life and made parasitic upon the master discourse of colonialism (24).

Sarkar notes her unease as she points out that the discourse of nation operates over the consciousness of nationalist. Her observation points to the hegemonic claims of the nationalist. In this, she points to the fact that woman thus was thus persuaded to exercise "extreme form of violence" upon her (*Hindu* 159).

Sarkar illustrates this point by giving the example of the opposition of the Hindu nationalists against the Age of Consent Bill as they found the sense of danger in not following the dogma of "*garbhadan* ("the obligatory ritual cohabitation as soon as the wife attains puberty"), contaminated the womb and the son lost the right to serve the ancestral offering (171). The injustice with Phulmani a girl of ten, who was raped to death by her twenty nine year old husband, Hari Maiti illustrates this point, but Hari Maiti could not be punished under the existing Penal Code provisions because of Phulmani's minimum age of ten (Sarkar 171-172). Malbari's allegations were justified and forced the hesitant government to give in to proposals for a higher age of consent (Sarkar 172). Sarkar's study of colonial themes helps us to understand the women's question in colonial context as she investigates the 'popular' response to the discourse of social reform and its relation to women's condition. This will be discussed in Chapter 2 to understand the emergence of dukhdarshak plays which incorporated similar themes.

If the Hindu nationalists were thus transforming the inner/domestic life of the nation, it should also be noted that the view of the English domestic life provided a kind of example, not only for rejection but also for appropriation. Antoinette Burton, in the introduction to her book, *At the Heart of the Empire*, argues that the English life was also "available for consumption, appropriation, and refiguration by its colonial subjects" such as Ramabai, Cornelia Sorabji and Malbari (8). In this, Burton points that "Indian" was imagined in different Victorian cultural terms (9). She notes that a critical challenge was introduced to "traditions of Western history writing" which depended on the civilizing

mission of “geographically determined” nations like India where the empire imagined the Hindu nationalists in stereotypical fashion (11). It should be noted that the “hybridized” identity of Ramabai, Cornelia Sorabji and Malbari helped resist the colonialist discourse of Hindu men and women (16). Burton argues, considering America as the land of colonizer too, that the question of reception is larger issue in colonial India which influenced the paradigm of culture (17). Thus, in the political context of cultural reception, Burton argues by quoting Aijaz Ahmad that culture is not “entrapment” but she terms it “givenness of circumstances” in which the nationalists made their choices, lives and histories (15).

Taking this argument further, Mrinalini Sinha argues about the masculine dimension in the emerging politics of colonialist and nationalist discourse in her book, *Colonial Masculinity: The Manly Englishman and Effeminate Bengali in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Sinha shows that the reforms of women consolidated “the dynamics between colonialism and nationalism” on the contradictory grounds of masculinity between Indian and the English men (1). This dynamics show how the women reforms were in fact also a creation of the developing discourse in the West about Indian social life and masculinity. Sinha argues that although the nationalist imagined the Indian woman in opposition to the Victorian model of women, “the Englishmen defended their late Victorian insecurities” by imposing on the Indian men disqualifying traits such as “inconsistency” and “shallowness” (183). Sinha notes that the competitive examination held by London selected the very few Indians in prejudicial manner and “offered much more pointed racial attack” giving them the stereotype of “the clever Bengali” (Sinha 104).

Sinha discusses four controversies to suggest the increasing nationalist tendency in the Indians in late nineteenth century. The debates around Ilbert Bill took place in 1883-1884. It demanded criminal jurisdiction over the European British subjects who lived in the Indian towns (Sinha 33). The Indians demanded “the creation of a separate native volunteer corps” all over India during the native volunteer movement in 1885-86(69). Sinha marks “competing masculinities” in the claims of Natives of India to higher and more extensive employment in the public service in 1886-7(100). She notes the sanction to Malbari’s protest to define sexual intercourse with married and unmarried Indian girls below the age of twelve as rape by the British administration was “a bastion to assert the stereotypical image of the Indian elites” (Sinha 138). Sinha

makes the fact clear that the Englishmen could secure their “tenuous British self” through frequent references to the effeminacy of Bengali men and justify the British presence in India to continue further (110). For example, Sinha, in her chapter, “Competing masculinities: the Public Service Commission 1886-87” notes that the colonial authorities’ decision to higher age limit was assumed to reduce the success of the “precocious Bengali”, as Sinha notes, not to include native public opinion but it “intended to make peace on the complaints about the quality of the British civil service recruit” (114).

Homi K. Bhabha, in his article, “Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817”, helps understand the productive difficulty in justifying woman’s question. The ambivalence, in the intellectual position of colonizer and colonized, functions in mutual way. Bhabha notes that both colonizer and colonized articulated their views through “a disclosure of its *rules of recognition*- those social texts of epistemic, ethnocentric, nationalist intelligibility” (152). On the other side, the hybridized notion of identity and articulation in the cultural domain is significant as it keeps the relation of colonizer and colonized in mutation and makes the voice of modernity compatible to the address of authority (152).

Against this background, it would be necessary to summarize some strands in the way the question of women reforms and nationalism was formed in the Gujarati public sphere.

The “Women’s Question” in the Reformist Context of Gujarat

The issues of everyday life were strong at the centre of reformist discourse in Gujarati literature. Sarkar notes “the first definitions of new middle class” published in the news paper *Bangdoot* in 1829 (*Domesticity* 161). Gauri Viswanathan’s point of “several large and overlapping social processes”, which established the cultural domination in Western India after British had experienced 1857 protest, also suggests the middle class society in colonial Gujarat in more developed form (Naregal 61).

Narmad is known as the first enlightened thinker who started a journal called *Dandio* or Night Watchman (1864) along with Nagindas Marfatia (Chavda 19). His *Narma Kavita* (The Poem of Narmad) (1866) covered the subjects regarding the condition of the Hindus with respect to learning, religion,

customs, superstition, and morals (19). He wrote the first essay of Gujarati literature called “Mandali Malvathi thata Labh” (the Benefit of Forming Association) in 1855-56, “stri kelvani” (women education) to educate women and “Punrvivah” widow (remarriage) in 1868-69 (19). Swati Joshi, in her article, “Dalpatram and the Nature of Literary Shifts in Nineteenth-century Ahmedabad” notes that Dalpatram Travadi was “moderate” in his reformist zeal unlike Narmad’s “patriotism” (348). Travadi dedicated his long poem *Ven Charit* (The Life Story of King Ven) in 1868 to discuss “the question of widow remarriage and the related issues of child marriage, bride price, female infanticide, oppressive wailing on death, remarriage for a childless woman, women’s education” (348). Travadi depicts the story of King Ven, who having been moved by the crisis of a widow, criticizes the Brahmins for their practice of selling brides and curses them “for replacing the *shashtras* with the rules of the caste which then pass on as religion and thus being very selfish, never thinking of the suffering of the other people” (348). Swati Joshi, however, marks the conservative outlook in *Ven Charit*. She states that Nanalal, Travadi’s poet-son and biographer, found Travadi accepting belief of “*vidhava brahmacharya*” (widow celibacy) in the end of poem (351). Travadi considers the woman who could control her desire superior to the one who desires to get re married (351).

Forbes established Gujarat Vernacular Society in 1848 and appointed Dalpatram Travadi as assistant secretary for the editor of *Buddhiprakash* (Light of Intelligence) (Joshi 332). This appointment helped in representing the social and intellectual life of Ahmedabad in all its productive details “to light the lamp of knowledge and intimate debates on reform” (Joshi 333). Swati Joshi, in her article, “Dalpatram and the Nature of Literary Shifts in Nineteenth-century Ahmedabad” notes that the prominent intellectuals like Bhogilal Harivallabhdas, Mahipatram Nilkanth, Bholanath Sarabhai, a judge and founder of Prarthna Sabha in Ahmedabad, Ranchhod Dave and others contributed to the editorship of *Buddhiprakash* (332). Dave published his first play *Jay Kumari Vijaya* in *Buddhiprakash* in 1861-2. R.L. Raval, in his book, *Mahipatram* notes that Nilkanth, who studied in the Elphinston College, was a guiding force to most of the reform associations of Ahmadabad including vernacular society, Vidhva Vivah Uttejak Mandali (Promotion Widow Remarriage Association); Bal Lagna Nishedhak Mandali (Abolition Child Marriage Association); Hindu Sansar Sudhara Samaj (Hindu Domestic Reform Society) (4).

Usha Thakkar, in her article, "Puppets on the Periphery: Women and Social Reform in 19th Century Gujarati Society" notes that Karsandas Mulji (1832-1871) a bold journalist and one of harbingers of social change was associated with the first Gujarati journal for women called *Stribodh* in India started in 1857 (47). He joined the Buddhivardhak Hindu Sabha after publishing his essay on *deshatan* (Travel to Foreign Country) or the needs for foreign travel (Chavda 77-78). He advocated the issue related to reforms of women including widow remarriage. However, Thakkar does not find Gujarati women "articulating their position" in public domain and explains how she, as an object of 'tradition', was remoulded in the reformist discourse on the ground of her "sexuality" (47). She points out "a common concern with the moral prescription of Hindu religious tradition for man-woman sexual relationship" (47). Thakkar, in her case study of controversial libel case in nineteenth century, finds Mulji's opposition against the inclusion of any writing by Gujarati women in *Stribodh*, first women magazine in Gujarati started in 1851 (50). She notes that a libel case was filed by a leader of the Vallabhacharya sect in 1861 against Mulji who alleged the leader for "the practice of immoral behaviour towards women of the sect" (47). Mulji intended to limit women's space in family and home so that the danger of her sexuality could be controlled outside, in the religious sect or marriage ceremony where she could sing *garbis* (songs of love) which Mulji criticized on the ground of "its amorous and licentious contents" (51). It should be noted that genres like *garbi* were part of the shared culture of Gujarati women. When we see, however, that Dave uses such songs in *Lalita* it raises the question whether theatre negotiated these issues differently and why. An attempt to suggest an answer to this issue is carried out fully in chapter one.

Joshi, in her article referred to above, further compares Travadi with the Western educated, Goverdhanram Tripathi who discussed the question of widow remarriage in his novel, *Sarasvatichandra* published between 1887 and 1901 (353). Joshi notes the difference between Tripathi and Travadi who used two different genres: the modern form of novel which came from the influence of West while 'aakhyan', which is an Indian form (354). However, Joshi marks the similarity between them as the writers arrive at the resolution regarding the question of widow remarriage "reinforcing the traditional patriarchy and redefining the middle class/upper class men's relation to women within that patriarchy" (354-355). Importantly, Joshi raises the question neither about

modernity nor about tradition here but focuses on the cultural negotiation which affected literary discourse.

Navalram Pandya began his career as a writer with his long poem on a subject of social reform-“the Maharaj Libel Case” (Shukla 38). Pandya was the secretary of Bal-lagna Nishedhak Mandali (An Association Refuting Child Marriage) but he did not support widow remarriage (39). Shukla notes that Pandya judged “social reforms and religious rethinking as two overlapping subjects” and implored the social leaders not to involve the government directly or indirectly in social affairs as it might have controlled people’s “freedom in exchange of social welfare” (39). He analyzed the progress of social reform in his incomplete essay “Sudharanun Itihasroop Vivechan” (Historical Criticism of Reform) and appreciated Narmad’s replacement of radical reform for revivalism to evaluate the forces for and against the reformist activity (39). Why did it become important not to support widow remarriage?

Dave, in his article, “Natakno Prarambh” (The Beginning of Drama), suggests the difficulty to support widow remarriage. He locates the binary opposition between widow’s *pashuvrutti* (lascivious tendency) and *satvikvutti* (calm and steady disposition) (Natak 49). Sonal Shukla, in her article, “Goverdhanram’s Women”, points out that Goverdhanram Tripathi, in his novel, portrays this binary when Kumud “tick(s) off an English woman for the very wrong custom of widows getting married all over again in England” and says that in India (Gujarat) child marriage was the wrong custom (69). This finally leads to a discussion of the question of colonial modernity of the Gujarati intellectuals and the issue related to the development of the public sphere.

Riho Isaka, in her article, “Language and dominance: The debates over the Gujarati language in the late nineteenth century” finds the argument of the Hindu intelligentsia based on “the use of Gujarati to develop their ‘intelligence’ and ‘morality’ and carry out the reform of society” in *Buddhiprakash*, the monthly of the GVS (5). Isaka notes in the same article that the Gujarat Vernacular Society was established by Forbes (5). Forbes established a similar association in Surat called the Surat Atthavisi Society (5). He also started the Gujarati Sabha in Bombay in 1864, which turned into the Forbes Gujarati Sabha when he died in 1865 (5). Even compared with other areas, the GVS was one of the earliest examples of a voluntary association focusing on the promotion of vernacular literature (Isaka 5). She notes the conflict between the Parsi educated elites and the Gujarati intellectuals at Elphinstone College on the ground of

standardization of Gujarati language which was “a further incentive for Hindu elites to dominate their leadership in Gujarati literary activities” (15). Lata Singh, in the introduction to *Theatre in Colonial India: Play-House of Power*, shows “acts of cultural resistance” against “the dominant cultural politics of the period which projected the Elizabethan writer as a monolithic cultural icon of universal and eternal value” (11). Poonam Trivedi, in the introduction to her book, *India’s Shakespeare*, marks the shifting impact of Shakespeare from “fashionable and cultural to the imperial and ideological axis” and notes the development of “two mutually exclusive streams-of an “academic” literary Shakespeare led by Anglicized Indian and a popular Shakespeare on stage, transformed and transmuted in translation” (15). Trivedi points out the writing of burlesque for its popularity and its rejection by Indian critics as “travesties” of Shakespeare (24). She finds *Saubhagya Sundari* (Saubhagya and Blessed Wife Sundari), “a loose amalgam of *Othello*, *Cymbaline*, *As You Like It*, and *Twelfth Night* and notes that it acquired such popularity in its main actor and female impersonator, Jayshankar”, who was later known by the name Sundari- the Desdemona of the play-as his stage name (*Impudent* 24-25). On the other side, the British educationists had problems with the Parsi theatre because “Shakespearean plays had small proportion in the diverse repertoires of the Parsi companies which had popularized, commercialized and insinuated Shakespeare into the psyche of the audience” without letting them know the presence of Shakespeare through the transformation on the stage (Trivedi, *Intro* 15-16).

Following the discussion above, the emergence of tragedy in Gujarati theatre with the writing of *Lalita* can be seen as marking ambivalence in Dave’s position. It is evident in his argument against the absence of tragedy in Indian literary context. But he defends the tragic genre in Indian epic. On the other hand, the impact of Shakespeare is also present in his use of five acts plot structure and use of soliloquies, climax in the middle of the play and melodrama. He also uses the intertexts from Bhavai and indigenous sources. The multi-featured aspect of genre makes it imperative to question: does Dave develop the tragedy to situate the new Gujarati heroine in the inner domain of home? Does Dave historicize the past through projecting the tests of Lalita’s sorrows to establish the new domestic sphere? What is the ideological function of Lalita’s sorrow in the public? Are there gaps in his tragic theory? Somnath Gupt notes the influence of Bhavai (folk play) on the Parsi playwrights in terms of the popularity the theme of kajoda (incompatible marriage) and the inclusion

of music on the contemporary Gujarati stage developed in Bombay. Apakhtyar's Parsi Stage Players performed "the most popular *Kajodano Sketch* (The Unfit Match)" in which a twelve year old girl is married to an old man (Gupt 51). These points become important in the context of the two Kajoda plays discussed in Chapter 2. Do these plays confirm the ideological nexus of high and low art in comparison to Dave's critique of the obscene language of Bhavai and his juxtaposition of good and bad woman? How do they modernize the Gujarati woman and her sorrow?

Methodology of Discussion:

The discussion of the plays in this dissertation is limited to 'textual' analysis. It does not include the analysis of performance and reception. The dissertation will carry out the discussion on the basis of two main grounds:

- a) Themes related to marriage, love and companionship and the formation of the idea of gender-relations, the institution of marriage and formation of the self in colonial Gujarat.
- b) The form of the play as the important constituent of the themes of the play. The form will be discussed mainly on the basis of the dramatic conventions used in the plays.

For the discussion, *Lalita* is taken as the base play, and is discussed in chapter 1. Chapter 2 consists of the discussion of the two other plays which differ from the model proposed by *Lalita*, and contribute to the development of tragedy as a new form, while addressing the themes mentioned above. The discussion below indicates some of the background for considering the above methodology.

The advent of colonial rule and the theme of modern love were the two important themes in early social plays in Gujarati. J. Dave notes that Nagindas Marfatiya (1840-1902), in his play *Gulab* (1862), presents the hero, Bhogilal who is strictly against corruption (16). He is a man of conviction and marries Gulab whom he loves (20). J. Dave notes in his book that Marfatiya does not show the use of the traditional characters such as Sutradhar, Nati and Vidushak in his play (19). However, the importance of these conventions was found still useful. For example, Dave's use of the characters of Sanskrit tradition appears in his first play, *Jay Kumari Vijaya* (The Victory of Jaya) (1864). Dave composed the

aesthetic of modern love and theme of protest against corruption (J.Dave 20). The heroine is against corruption and she opposes the postman who demands a bribe (20). She is educated by the hero. She performs her duty as a wife as well as a teacher (21). A sequel to this play, entitled *Uttar Jaykumari* (Jaya Afterwards) by Mansukhram Suryaram in 1866, depicts Pranolal and Jaykumari who are involved in the work for the progress of the nation but they are harassed by the jealous administrators. A British couple helps Jaya to get rid of the English men who kidnap her. The play ends with a lecture with a promise that the generous and social class of Britain will help the educated natives (J. Dave 30). Located in this contrasting situation, the dukhdarshak play shows a further negotiation between the available mode of comic plays and the formation of a new tragic play.

It can be observed that the idea of two literary forms of prahasan (comic farce) and dukhdarshak natak (tragedy) was brought in by the Gujarati playwrights. For example, as Jagdish Dave notes, Travadi (who did not take formal English education) included the farce of "Kutub-Vaghjee" (Kutub and Vaghjee) in the fifth scene of Act V in his comedy, *Mithyabhiman* (44). J.Dave, in the preface of *Tofagamat Apnar Gujarati Natak* (A Play with a Gift of Entertainment) (1872) by Bhavanishanakra Mehta and Ratanchand Oswal, notes that the play was written so that bhavaiyas (the local folk actors) could claim their acts distinct from the troupes of Parsis and the South Indians and perform for the Gujarati audience (45-46).

There were some noteworthy plays which showed the intention to make the readers laugh. In 1880, Manchharam Ghelabhai wrote *Sawaki Maytakee Chhokrao Upar Padta Dukho* (The Sorrows of the boys of a step mother) in which he incorporates Ramooji faras (comic farce) on the page number 109 (J.Dave 62). J.Dave notes that the tradition of dukhdarshak (showing of sorrow) was continued to entertain even with the inclusion of farce. For example, Keshawlal Thakar wrote "*Kajoda Dukhdarshak Faras*" (The Farce on Showing the Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage) in 1885 in ten scenes (J.Dave 88). Jagdish Dave finds that Girdhardas Parekh announced: jo vanchi has so nahi to vanchyu dhul (if you lived without laughing after reading, the reading is a waste) in the preface of his play, *Ek Ghanaj Ramooji Hiranekno Farce* (A Farce of Hira and Manek with much Fun) in 1889(107). These plays ended in tragic way showing the death of the men or women and with advice not to marry ansamju nano dhani (ignorant small bridegroom) (J.Dave 107).

The idea of comic play or prahasana and “tragedy” in the form of dukh darshak natak was thus emerging. For example, the subtitle of one of such texts makes clear the authorial intention: “*Kajoda Dukh darshak Natak Ramooji Rite Banavnar*”: (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage Creator in Comic Vein) the subtitle explains the intention to show the tragedy of unfit marriage to amuse the audience (Pandya 1). It was similar to the “anti-social-reform farces” which created the two opposite streams of “stark realism” and “didactic realism” (Jaaware and Bhirdikar 46). It was found that the Gujarati farces showed the illegitimate relation in an open manner with the use of abusive language. For example, Lalu Dholerawala, in his farce, *Chaar Bhaibandhu nu Ramuji Faras* (A Farce on the Four Friends) (1890) describes a woman to whom all men including her husband’s friend to the inspector, chief inspector and the king try to seduce in the absence of husband (J. Dave 110).

Another farce, *Soni ane Keshar Sonaran no ati Ramuji ane Hasykarak Faras* (A very Amusing and Ridiculous Farce of Mr. Soni and Mrs Soni) (1889), which was written by Venilal Sha and performed by ‘Nitidarshak Natak Mandali’, shows a wife punished by her husband because of her scandal with four men and her prayer in the temple to make her husband blind and deaf (J.Dave 111). The intelligentsia considered such plays harmful in their “realistic” portrayal of social ills (Jaaware and Bhirdikar 46). The playwrights started to imitate the “Realistic-didactic Trend” in the second half of the nineteenth century (Das, *History* 202). They developed the plot and consisted of “two characters of opposite nature” showing one stupid and the other intelligent (202). They focused to describe each characters getting punishment or reward according to her action (202).

Dave states in his article that he minutely observed the Parsi actors while rehearsing his plays and used to guide the actors of Natak Uttejak Mandali not to make the plays nindya shringar darshak (showing the unacceptable erotic) so that it does not create laughter for the Hindu audience (*Natak* 53). Dave explains the distracting side of shringar rasa in the mode of stagecraft in Parsi theatre companies in his article, “Gurjar Rangbhumini Vartman Paristhiti” (The Present Condition of Gujarati Stage):

Prekshak jano ne gamat ni sathe gyan male evi rupak na lakhaan ni rachna thavi joie. Sara lakhnara aa vaat poorepoori laksh ma rakhe chhe. Parantu ketlak natak mandalio na maliko ne e vaat posati nathi. Ajkaal prekshak jano nu valan sarva prakar no bhabhako jova bhani doray chhe (42) (The writing of such allegory should be composed that teaches the audience with

entertainment. Good playwrights keep this matter in aim completely. But some of the owners of theatre companies experience loss in that matter. These days the audience's inclination is led to watch the brightness of all kinds).

Though Dave criticized the use of shringar (erotic) in Parsi theatre, he did not exclude it in *Lalita* because it was written and performed in a moment of high competition and need of commercial success. He constituted a play to show the picture of society as a whole. Anuradha Kapur, in her article, "Impersonation, Narration, Desire and the Parsi Theatre", explains the consumption of "spectacular entertainment" in Parsi theatre (88). She notes "*identification-identifying with a character in performance*" as the frame of pleasure because it is one of the main codes of realism and the inevitable view to represent principally "a conscientious aspect" of life in writing the play which made the characters as important as plot "to fabricate forms to accommodate new ideas" (88). Kapur counts the effect of the "psychological" realism as one of the determining aspects of the Parsi theatre because the question of "theatrical modernity" had to reinforce the Gujarati playwrights associated with the Natak Uttejak Mandali in 1860s onwards (96). Kapur explains theatrical modernity in terms of the second phase of acting traditions to present "the one put in place by modern institutions and adopt "the traits of the actor/person to become the character, as strategy" (93). Kapur contradicts the experience of identification as "not identical to the experience of *universalisation*" with respect to performance (88). Both the experiences are incompatible because "universalisation draws the spectator away from her or his self towards another" whereas "identification pulls a staged character toward the spectator and expands her/his boundaries without making them permeable, without forfeiting particularity" (88).

According to Aniket Jaaware and Urmila Bhirdikar, the tragedy in Marathi suitably functioned to set not only an ideal example of hero proposed in a didactic realism that the audience can imitate, but also the literary scope wherein the playwright could envision the aspect of tragedy (to show death in the end) in order to gain access to "transcendental meaning beyond the lamenting figures" (8). It was, as noted by Tanika Sarkar, "an attempt to address an individuated self with interiority that became urgent with the failure of the sacred pattern and providential design" (*Saint* 178). Sanskrit plays showed the tragic aspect but it was not integral to character (Rajadhyaksha 85). The playwrights valorised tragedy and attached to the theory of rasa (sentiment), karun rasa (tragic sentiment) or dukh (sorrow).

Charu Gupta, in the chapter, "Redefining Obscenity and Aesthetics in Print" notes the assertion of a moral code in a canon of literature as a national virtue and "the heroine emerged as an allegorical motif" (41-42). Romila Thapar in her article, "Ideology and the Interpretation of Early Indian History" relates such assertion to the most influential theory of the Aryan race from Indological study in the nineteenth century (391). In Marathi theatre, Aniket Jaaware and Urmila Bhirdikar argue that the attraction of tragedy cannot be mapped onto the reception of Shakespeare's tragedies alone and they insist to investigate "how Shakespearean tragedy was received in the context of classical Greek theory of tragedy, combined with the theory of *rasa*" (44).

The showing of the suffering of women indirectly involved a social commentary; in this, the comic kajoda plays became the bad tradition and the tragic Kajoda plays became the demonstration of suffering; tragedy achieved its effect when the virtuous protagonist met an unjustified end; it awakened the discerning audience for wanting to eradicate the causes that make suffering. This model of tragedy seems neither fully Greek (for there is no fate nor hubris), not fully Shakespearean for it does not interweave the element of transgressive human qualities (ambition in *Macbeth*, doubt in *Othello*, pride in *Lear* etc) into the protagonists. The woman-reform tragedy somewhat simplifies the genre. Is it really tragic? Wasn't Ranchhod Dave right when he called it "karuna rasa"? Is it not just pathos? How did the tragic come to be associated with suffering of women in the throes of tradition and custom in Indian society? If reforms are to be for women, then marital harmony (choice, love, compatibility, companionship) etc became the agenda. The path of education was considered as one that enables women to understand their own plight. How did the social reformists and later nationalists negotiate these goals? What implications does it have on gender hierarchy? How are goodness and badness in women determined? These questions will be discussed in Chapter 1 following the understanding of *Lalita* as the formation of genre and its comparison with *Kajoda* and *Kanya* as tragedy in the process of acculturation in Chapter 2.

WORKS CITED

- Awasthi, Suresh. "Shakespeare in Hindi." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 63-72. JSTOR. Web. 25 Aug. 2013.
- Banerji, Rangana. "'Every college student knows by heart': The Uses of Shakespeare in Colonial Bengal." *The Shakespearean International Yearbook. No.12: Special Section, Shakespeare in India*. Ed. Sukanta Chaudhari. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012. 7-27. Print.
- Baradi, Hasmukh. *History of Gujarati Theatre*. Trans. Vinod Meghani. New Delhi: National Book Trust, 2001. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical Inquiry* 12.1 (1985): 144-165. JSTOR. Web. 1 Jan. 2013.
- Bhatia, Nandi. Introduction. *Modern Indian Theatre: A Reader*. Ed. Nandi Bhatia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. xi-xxxix. Print.
- Bose, Buddhadev. "Modern Bengali Literature: A Study in Indian-Western Relations." *Comparative Literary Studies* 1.1 (1964): 47-53. JSTOR. Web. 29 Aug 2013.
- Burton, Antoinette. *At the Heart of the Empire: Indians and Colonial Encounter in Late Victorian Britain*. Berkely: University of California Press, 1998. Print.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Limits of the Bourgeois Model?" *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010.178-201. Print.
- , "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts?" *Subaltern Studies Reader, 1986-1995*. Eds. David Arnold and David Hardiman. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. 263-288. Print.
- Chatterjee, Partha. "The Nation and Its Women." *Subaltern Studies Reader, 1986-1995*. Eds. David Arnold and David Hardiman. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. 240-261. Print.
- Chatterjee, Sudipto. *The Colonial Staged: Theatre in Colonial Calcutta*. London, New York, Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2007. Print.
- Chavda, Vijay S. *Modern Gujarat*. Ahmadabad: New Order Book, 1982. Print.
- Dalmia, Vasudha. *Poetics, Plays and Performance*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.

- Das, Gupta R.K. "Shakespeare in Bengali Literature." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964):16-26. JSTOR. Web. 25 Aug. 2013.
- Das, Sisir Kumar. "Shakespeare in Indian Languages." *India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation and Performance*. Eds. Poonam Trivedi and Dennis Bartholomeusz. Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2005. 42-65. Print.
- . *A History of Indian Literature: Western Impact: Indian Response, 1800-1910*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademy, 1991. Print.
- Datta, Amaresh. *Encyclopaedia of Indian Literature*. Vol. 2. Delhi: Sahitya Akademy Press, 1998. Web. 4 June 2013. <http://books.google.co.in/books?id=ObFCT5_taSgC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
- Dave, Jagdish. *Gujarati ane Marathi Samajik Natak, 1850-1900*. (Gujarati and Marathi Social Plays, 1850-1900) Ahmedabad: Vasant Prakashan, 2000. Print.
- Dave, Ranchhodbhai Udayram. "Gurjar Rangbhumini Vartman Paristhiti" [The Present Condition of Gujarati Stage in Colonial Period]." *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 42-45. Print.
- . *Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak* (The Play Revealing Lalita's Sorrow). Mumbai, n.p., 1866. Print.
- . "Natak no Prarambh" [The Beginning of Drama]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 46-64. Print.
- . "Rasaprakash-rasa [Light on the Sentiment]." *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1937. 12-19. Print.
- Deshpande, G.P. "Dialectics of Defeat: Some Reflections on Literature, Theatre and Music in Colonial India." *EPW* 22.51 (1987): 2170-2176. JSTOR. Web. 30 April 2012.
- Freitag, Sandria B., ed. *Culture and Power in Banaras: Community, Performance, and Environment, 1800-1980*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989. Web. 5 Sept.2013.<<http://ark.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft6p3007sk/http://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/view?docId=ft6p3007sk;brand=ucpress>>.

- Ghose, Ajit. "Modern Bengali Literature." *Modern Indian Literature: Plays and Prose*. Ed. K. M. George. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademy Press, 1994. 71-94. Web. 5 Aug. 2013. <<http://books.google.co.in/books?id>>.
- Gupt, Somnath. *The Parsi Theatre: Its Origin and Development*. Trans. and ed. Kathryn Hansen. Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2005. Print.
- Gupta, Charu. "Redefining Obscenity and Aesthetics in Print." *Sexuality, Obscenity, Community: Women, Muslims, and the Hindu Public in Colonial India*. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001. 30-66. Print.
- Hansen, Kathryn. "Language, Community, and the Theatrical Public." *India's Literary History*. Eds. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 60-86. Print.
- Harivithaldas, Keshavlal. *Kanya Vikray Khandan Natak* (The Play Denouncing the Practice of Accepting Bride Price). Mumbai, n.p., 1888. Print.
- Isaka, Riho. "Language and dominance: The debates over the Gujarati language in the late nineteenth century." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 25.1 (2002):1-19. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 11 January 2012.
- Jaaware, Aniket and Urmila Bhirdikar. "Shakespeare in Maharashtra, 1892-1927: A Note on Trend in Marathi Theatre and Theatre Criticism." *The Shakespearean International Yearbook. No.12: Special Section, Shakespeare in India*. Ed. Sukanta Chaudhuri. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012. 43-52. Print.
- Joshi, Swati. "Dalpatram and the Nature of Literary Shifts in Nineteenth-century Ahmedabad." *India's Literary History*. Eds. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 327-357. Print.
- Kapur, Anuradha. "Impersonation, Narration, Desire, and the Parsi Theatre." *India's Literary History*. Eds. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 87-118. Print.
- Lal, Anand. "A Historiography of Modern Indian Theatre." *Modern Indian Theatre: A Reader*. Ed. Nandi Bhatia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. 31-40. Print.
- Mehta, Chandravadan C. "Shakespeare and Gujarati Stage." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 41-50. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 Sept. 2013.
- Moorthy Rao, A. N. "Shakespeare in Kannada." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 63-72. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 October 2013.

- Mukta, Parita. "'The Civilizing Mission': The Regulation and Control of Mourning in Colonial India." *Feminist Review* 63 (1999): 25-47. JSTOR. Web 30 Oct 2013.
- Naregal, Veena. *Language Politics, Elites, and the Public Sphere*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001. Print.
- Pandya, Jagjivan Kashiram. *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* [The Revelation of Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage]. Ahmedabad, 1883. Print.
- Parekh, Madhusudan. *Gujarati Sahityano Aaswad* [A Review of Gujarati Literature]. Ahmedabad: Chandramauli Prakashan, 1981. Print.
- Parikh, Keshavlal Motilal. *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak: Ek Prasang* [The Revelation of Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage: One Incident]. Ahmedabad, 1872. Print.
- Rajadhyaksha, M.V. "Shakespeare in Marathi." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 83-94. JSTOR. Web. 1 Sept. 2013.
- Rajamannar, P.V. "Shakespeare in Telugu." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 127-131. JSTOR. Web. 1 Sept. 2013.
- Ranade, Ashok D. *Stage Music of Maharashtra*. New Delhi: Sangeet Natak Akademi, 1986. Print.
- Rao, A.N. Moorthy. "Shakespeare in Kannada." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 63-72. JSTOR. Web. 25 Aug. 2013.
- Raval, R. L. *Mahipatram*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 2002. Web. 24 Jan. 2013. <<http://books.google.co.in/books?id=EXgBme2yVVQC&pg=PP6&lpg=PP6&dq=Mahipatram+The+Makers+of+Indian+Literature.>>.
- Sarkar, Tanika. "Domesticity and Middle Class Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Bengal." *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010. 159-167. Print.
- . *Hindu Wife, Hindu Nation: Community, Religion and Cultural Nationalism*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001. Print.
- . "Performing Power and Troublesome Plays: The Early Public Theatre in Colonial Bengal." *Rebels, Wives, Saints: Designing Selves and Nations in Colonial Times*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2009. 53-191. Print.
- Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. "Natyaprakash" [A Light on Dramaturgy]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 74-75. Print.

- Shukla, Sonal. "Goverdhanram's Women." *EPW* 22.44 (1987): 63-69. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 July
- Singh, Jyotsna. "Different Shakespeares: The Bard in Colonial/Postcolonial India." *Modern Indian Theatre: A Reader*. Ed. Nandi Bhatia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. 77-96. Print.
- Singh, Lata. Introduction. *Theatre in Colonial India: Play-House of Power*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. 1-23. Print.
- Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: The 'manly Englishman' and 'effeminate Bengali' in the late nineteenth century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995. Print.
- Solomon, Rakesh H. "Towards a Genealogy of Indian Theatre Historiography." *Modern Indian Theatre: A Reader*. Ed. Nandi Bhatia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. 3-30. Print.
- Subramanyam, Ka. Naa. "Shakespeare in Tamil." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 120-126. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Aug. 2013.
- Sugimoto, Yoshio. "'Boys Be Ambitious': Popular Theatre, Popular Cinema and Tamil Nationalism." *Senri Ethnological Studies* 71 (2008): 229-240. Web. 5 Octo. 2014. <
http://ir.minpaku.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10502/1139/1/SES71_010.pdf>.
- Sukla, Ramesa Ma. *Navalram*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademy, 1998. Print.
- Thakar, Dhirubhai. *Abhigyan* [Recognition]. Ahmedabad: Bhagvati Mudranalaya, 1991. Print.
- Thakkar, Usha. "Women and Social Reform in 19th Century Gujarati Society." *EPW* 32.1/2 (1997): 46-52. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 May 2012.
- Thapar, Romila. "Ideology and the Interpretation of Early Indian History." *Review* 5.3 (1982): 389-411. *JSTOR*. Web. 02 Feb. 2013.
- Trivedi, Poonam. "Impudent Imperialists: Burlesque and the Bard in Nineteenth-Century India." *The Shakespearean International Yearbook, 12: Special Section, Shakespeare in India*. Ed. Sukanta Chaudhuri. Surrey and Burlington: Ashgate, 2012. 7-27. Print.
- , Introduction. *India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation and Performance*. Eds. Poonam Trivedi and Dennis Bartholomeusz. Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2005. 13-39. Print.
- Vasunia, Phiroze. "Aristophanes' *Wealth* and Dalpatram's *Lakshmi*." *The Classics and Colonial India*. UK: Oxford University Press, 2013. 279-297. Web. 5 July 2013.<

<http://books.google.co.in/books?id=GcWoqkmFJW4C&pg=PA279&lpg=PA279&dq=Vasunia,+Phiroze.+%E2%80%9CAristophanes%E2%80%99+Wealth+and+Dalpatram+Lakshmi>>.

Yagnik, Achyut and Suchitra Sheth. *The Shaping of Modern Gujarat Plurality, Hindutva and Beyond*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2005. Print.

CHAPTER I

***Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing Lalita's Sorrow): Formation of the Genre**

Lalita (1866) by Dave became a landmark in the Gujarati literary domain. Chandravadan Mehta, in his article, "Shakespeare and Gujarati Stage" calls *Lalita* a tragedy (43). Ramanbhai Mahipatram Nilkanth (1868-1928) in his article, "Ranchhodhbhai: Gujaratna Adhya Natyakar" (Ranchhodhbhai: The Pioneer Playwright of Gujarat) calls it a dukhmay parinamvalu karun rasa natak (a play with pathos that has a sorrowful effect) (82). Nilkanth evaluates *Lalita* as a tragedy and appreciates its literary significance in beejna udbhed ma, (in appearance of subject), kavyatva (poetic quality) and patrani kalpana (characterization) (83). *Lalita* is mainly based on the theme of kajoda (incompatible marriage). As Vijay Chavda defines in *Modern Gujarat*, it depicts some of the social evils like child marriage, the condemnation and persecution by mother-in-law, the miseries of long widowhood, and the rigours of caste (13). Hasit Mehta, in his article, "Gujarati na Pratham Karun ant Natak ni Takhta layaki" (The Stageability of the First Gujarati Play with a Tragic End), notes the making of *Lalita* with "nine hundred seven verses, two hundred ninety one stanzas, one hundred thirty four pages, forty scenes, thirty one characters, twenty two places and five acts" (160). Dave, in his article, "Natak no Prarambh" (The Beginning of Drama), notes that *Lalita* is karun rasa pradhanya (a play with pathos as the prominent sentiment) (56). He gives the account of his proof-reading of the tragic play: jyare jyare hu proof vanchto tyare tyare mari ankhmathi ansu vehta hata (when I read to proof the copy, tears flowed from my eyes) (56). Dave and his partner Narottam Mehta (one of the financiers and actors of Gujarati Natak Mandali) aimed that they would organize the first khel (performance) of *Lalita* to make the audience cry (Dave

56). Dave introduced *Lalita* to the members of his theatrical association as apno sansari rupak (our social allegory) (56).

The performance history of *Lalita* includes an account of rivalry and desire to assert cultural identity. Dave wrote during his association with Natak Uttejak Mandali (61). However, it seems that the drama company soon split (62). The following is an account based on Dave's essay "Natakno Prarambh" (The Beginning of Drama). Dave explains first, how the members of Gujarati Nagar community of Mumbai experienced a crisis when their dependence on Natak Uttejak Mandali resulted in a sudden controversy between Faramji Dalal (the leading Parsi actor) and the Hindu sponsors (62). One of the Parsi actors of Natak Uttejak Mandali, Faramjee Nazir denied to perform for the group of Gujarati merchants and demanded high payment (62). Dave reports that Faramjee Nazir insulted the Gujarati merchants and challenged them to take theatrical initiative on their own (62). Secondly, Dave explains the account of the training and rehearsal by the group of Gujarati actors under his own supervision (62). Dave and the group of merchants, Jayshankar Sarveshvar, Narottam Bhaishankar, and Shivshankar Karshanjee inaugurated the first non-Parsi Gujarati Natak Mandali and on 7th June in 1878 and financed it with the performance of *Lalita* for the first time (62). Thirdly, Dave gives the account of success of the performance of *Lalita* in Victoria Drama Company by the actors of Gujarati Natak Mandali (62). The hall of Victoria theatre was filled with twelve hundred spectators (63). He clearly states his rejection of the traditional performance of *Kajoda no Vesh* (Impersonation of an Incompatible Marriage) (48). Dave aimed to make theatre as a respectable pursuit of the educated elite, a goal which he considered essential to his campaign to establish a viable Gujarati stage (60). Dave and Gujarati members of the Nagar community sought to assert their cultural identity by establishing Gujarati Natak Mandali without their dependence on the Parsi Natak Uttejak Mandali.

The discussion in this chapter considers the question of the formation of the dukhdarshak natak by looking at the composition of *Lalita* in terms of its plot-design and the themes of suffering and incompatible marriage in Section I and II. Section III discusses the idea of respectability and the determination of good and bad woman. The final Section deals with the textual and theatrical conventions employed by the playwright to create the form of a tragedy. However it is necessary to summarize the plot of *Lalita*, first.

The Plot of *Lalita*

Lalita is divided in five acts. The protagonist, Lalita is a noble, cultured and educated young woman. She is the daughter of Jivraaj, an affluent man of Champanagari. Nandankumar (hereafter, Nandan) is the son of Dambhraj, a rich landlord of Snehpur. Nandan is portrayed as an idiot, uneducated and immoral. Priyamvada, the ganika (courtesan) and Chhaldas, the villain are portrayed as influencing and deceiving Nandan for the sake of his property. Nandan and Lalita have been married in childhood. But Lalita has not been called back to her husband's house once she had returned to her natal home to attend a traditional ritual in her childhood. After some years, Lalita becomes older and yearns for her husband. She awaits her husband's call and suffers in a state of separation. Panthiram is a loyal servant of Lalita. Lalita sends him with her letter to Nandan's house. Panthiram meets Nandan and finds him involved in an illegitimate relation with Priyamvada and in friendship with Chhaldas. Panthiram discloses this to Dambhraj. He visits Dambhraj as a seer in disguise and convinces Dambhraj to rectify his faults to save his property and respectability of home. He advises Dambhraj to call Lalita.

When Panthiram informs Lalita about her husband's bad character, she cries in sadness. Prabhavati is Lalita's friend. She is married and a happy wife. She has returned from her in laws' home to meet Lalita. Lalita becomes more disappointed when she compares her marriage with an uneducated and immoral husband to Prabhavati's happy martial state. Prabhavati listens to Lalita's sorrow and sympathizes with her. Lalita is given a farewell to return her husband's house as Dambhraj sends his messenger to take her. Panthiram accompanies Lalita on the way of Snehpur. He goes to look after Lalita at her parents-in-law's home.

Here, Dambhraj rebukes Nandan for keeping company with Chhaldas. He warns Chhaldas of taking him to darbar (court) if he is seen with Nandan again. Nandan is annoyed with Dambhraj and runs away from home. Dambhraj, with his friend Buddhisagar, a learned man, looks for his son. Lalita arrives with Panthiram at her marital home. She is tortured by her sister in law, Kajiyabai and mother-in-law, Karkshabai in the absence of Dambhraj. Nandan reaches Priyamvada's home. Priyamvada entertains Nandan. She criticises Lalita to make Nandan hate her. Having been informed by his agent, Kubhandi, Chhaldas reaches Priyamvada's house too. He persuades Nandan to go with

him to Dambhraj's house so that Chhaldas can pretend to be a helpful man. When Lalita meets Nandan, she expresses her dislike of his behaviour. But she accepts her marital duties. When she calls Nandan, he tortures her through his sexual advances and pains her in harsh manner. He steals Lalita's jewels and gives them to Priyamvada. Chhaldas is clever. He makes out that Nandan will meet Priyamvada again. He also reaches Priyamvada's house. He plots his plan with her and Nandan. He hires the jamadar (a head of small police unit) called Pooranmal to kidnap Lalita. He gets to consent Priyamvada and Nandan to meet together at a vaadi (an orchard).

Both Priyamvada and Chhaldas are shrewd and malicious to each other. Priyamvada decides to keep the golden jewels at her sister, Chandravali's house which is in Kankapuri. Chandravali is also a ganika. Priyamvada informs Chandravali in prior that she will reach Kankapuri. Chhaldas is cleverer. He sends the letter to Jivraj and Dambhraj informing them about Nandan and Lalita's death by snake bite. He has also planned to send Kubhandi to Kankapuri to deceive Chandravali. Chhaldas secretly plans to kill Priyamvada along with Lalita and Nandan with the help of Pooranmal. On the other side, Priyamvada plans to kill Chhaldas and others poisoning the sweets. But their wicked plot is turned down. Pooranmal turns vengeful due to the sense of betrayal by Chhaldas. He kills Chhaldas, Priyamvada and Nandan.

Having heard the news about Lalita's abduction, Panthiram looks for her. He comes around the place where Lalita is harassed by Pooranmal. Panthiram hears Lalita's shouts and finds her. He fights with Pooranmal to save Lalita but Pooranmal kills him. Pooranmal is also injured by the hunter who comes to the place in search of a prey. When Pooranmal threatens the hunter, the hunter becomes angry and kills him with his spear. The hunter introduces himself as the King of Parvatpuri and takes Lalita with him to keep her as his queen in spite of her reluctance. Lalita realizes the polygamous nature of the Kings of Hindustan. She escapes from King's harem at the cost of her life when she jumps into a river from the fort.

The fishermen find Lalita in the river and save her. They reach the banks of Kankapuri. At this juncture, Kubhandi reaches Chandravali's house. He pretends that he has been sent by Priyamvada. But Chandravali is doubtful about Kubhandi as he is Chhaldas's agent. She decides first to see whether Priyamvada has reached Kankapuri or not. As Priyamvada is no more, Chandravali does not find Priyamvada. But she coincidentally finds Lalita who

is saved by the fishermen at the river of Kankapuri. She finds Lalita's beauty a means to earn big profit in her business. She convinces the fishermen that Lalita is her daughter and offers them her golden earrings. Chandravali takes Lalita with their help to keep Lalita in her house. Kubhandi meets Chandravali and finds Lalita in an unconscious state. He decides to kill Lalita and leaves Chandravali's house because Lalita has seen him with Chhaldas earlier.

When Chandravali brings Lalita to consciousness, she introduces herself as Priyamvada's sister. Lalita fears for her own chastity. At night, Lalita runs away from Chandravali's court. Kubhandi pursues Lalita and attacks her. Lalita faints due to Kubhandi's attack. A tiger enters in pursuit of a deer on the stage. When Lalita awakes, she finds the tiger eating Kubhandi. Lalita catches the deer and sits on it to move ahead. Eventually, Lalita reaches Champanagari but she comes across harassment again unknowingly by her parents who believe her to be a ghost because they believe she has been killed by Chhaldas.

Exhausted and frustrated, Lalita calls all people at a townhall where she narrates her story of misery. She condemns the parents who marry their daughters on the ground of high caste status and do not consider virtue as the basis of selection. Lalita dies in despair at the end of the play. The play ends with the criticism of Hindu custom of child marriages from Lalita's friend, Prabhavati who appeals the other women gathered at the townhall to be aware. All cremate Lalita's body. The play ends with the note of instruction against the trend of incompatible marriage.

The Plot and its Theoretical Background

Lalita is divided in five acts. As for the plot design, Dave seems to have taken in account the technical aspects of plot construction as the major ingredient in sustaining interest throughout the play. *Lalita* is more or less Shakespearean in character, with five acts and clear climax in Act III.

Dave's use of Shakespearean conventions is clear. Harilal Bharucha, in his article, "Ranchhodbhai- Gujaratna Shakespeare" (Ranchhod-Gujarat's Shakespeare) called Dave Shakespeare (1564-1616) of Gujarat owing to his prolific contribution to the Gujarati theatre (213). The review, entitled "Natyaprakash" (Light on the Dramaturgy) on Dave's book, *Natyaprakash* (1890) (Light on the Dramaturgy), explains Dave's view on plot-design and its

connection with Shakespeare: “Yunitiz na bandhan thi natak lakhva ma ghanoj sankoch thai ave chhe, ane Sara lekhko Shakespeare paryant na pan, sarvada tene valgi rehta nathi” (a much hesitation is felt when the play is to be written with the constraint of Unities, and even the good writers up to Shakespeare do not always adhere to them). (74).

Instead, Dave took up the element of shakya (probability) by giving preference to the romantic novelist, playwright and poet, Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832) (74). Also, Dave gave priority to the ideas like deshkal (place and time) and vastuvinyas (arrangement of plot) and vishva-niyam (universal law) in the play as a whole (74). He also followed the standard of auchitya (propriety) (74). Why did Dave emphasize the idea of shakya and auchitya? Why did he consider the use of the concept of unities of old time inappropriate? The review shows that Dave advocated the application of probability and the aesthetics of decorum because he observes: “natako ne rangbhumi upar navin paddti thi bhajvi batavva ni kutrim yojna manthi e niyam udbhave chhe” (that rule stems from the artificial arrangement of performing the plays on the stage with new system) (74). Dave required rejecting the old rule of unities because he negotiates the principle of akutrim (natural) over kutrim (artificial) (74). Interestingly, Dave’s idea of the term kutrim signifies the proscenium stage while the term akutrim signifies the open ground of Bhavai where the play is performed without the changes of scene (74). Thus Dave, in his article, advocated the use of painted backdrops and stage props to represent the changing settings of acts and scenes (*Natak* 55). He is motivated by Scott’s idea of refusing old dramatic unities which looks approximate to the indigenous folk dramatic practice of establishing the place or time by verbal reference (*Natyaprakash* 74-75). Dave observes in his article the indigenous conventions of theatre such as the use of trumpet, earthen lamps, and open ground at the centre of village and single plot or impersonation (*Natak* 48). He imitates the proscenium design of the Parsi theatre and looks for a controlled, unambiguous, realistic, morally edifying model of theatre (48-52). This is Dave’s first contribution to the development of realism in theatre.

Dave’s support to Shakespearean tragedy is comprehensive in his aim to represent the tragedy in relation to the good character of Lalita and not in relation to her action (*Natyaprakash* 74-75). Aristotle’s idea of “probability” or “necessity” suggests the possibility owing to the serious nature of action which

links to the incidents as what may happen in the play (Butcher 14). Dave's idea of shakyata suggests possibility in terms of the good or bad nature of character. The contemporary Gujarati stage developed under the high influence of Shakespeare. Dave was associated with Natak Uttejak Mandali (*Natak* 54) and was familiar with many Parsi theatre companies in 1850 and 1860s such as Students Amateur Club, Shakespeare Theatrical Company and Gentlemen Amateur Club which performed adaptations and translations of dramas of Shakespeare at Grand Road Theatre in Gujarati (Gupt 42). Manchershah Navroji Maheta founded Shakespeare Theatrical Company in 1876 with an exclusive purpose of performing the plays of Shakespeare in Gujarati in the costumes of the Elizabethan era (143). Dave states that Nazir performed Shakespearean plays at the Victoria terminus in Mumbai (*Natak* 63). Dave did not want to discard bhavaiya (the actors of Bhavai) at all. He wanted: "sara kelyavela bhavaiya Mumbai sarkhi rangili nagari ma jaay to tem nu poshan thay ane natak ni navintaa grahan karva ma faavi jaay" (if the well trained actors of Bhavai go to the gay city like Mumbai, they can nurture themselves and succeed in capturing the newness of drama) (52). He also advocated writing moral plays in Gujarati on the theoretical grounds of Bharatmuni's *Natyashashtra* (Treatise on Dramaturgy) (200 BCE-200 CE) (50). He claims that Bharatmuni ordered him in his dream to propagate moralist texts and reform the folk tradition of performance (50-52). Dave takes an elitist position in his claim and proceeds to establish the legitimacy of Gujarati drama by linking it with the prestigious source of authority: the classical Sanskrit theorist, Bharatmuni, on one hand, and the European playwright, Shakespeare, on the other, in the preface to his treatise (*Natak* 50; *Natyaprakash*74).

Furthermore, Dave, in his chapter, "Rasaprakash", discusses his views on the rasa (sentiment) (12). The contradiction between Dave's view on the reform of folk actors and cultural leadership on the ground of his irrational view of Bharatmuni's order in his dream to reform Gujarati stage can be understood. With regard to the effect of dukh on the audience by highlighting unjust trend of incompatible marriage, Dave claims his privileged position:

Natak ma rasa nu anand may swarup batava ma avyu to karun, bhibhatsa ane bhayanak rasa ma dukh adi hovathi teni rasa ma ganna thai shakshe nahi em shanka karvi nahi, kem ke karun adi rasa ma pan je param sukh thai chhe tema anubhavnaar ni potani j shakshi pramanbhut chhe, topan atla thi kavya bhaavna ma jeni paripakva buddhi thai nathi teni khaatri thavi kathin chhe mate pakshantar suchav va ma ave chhe (14).

(If a joyful form of sentiment is shown in the play, one should not doubt that sentiments of pathos, disgust and terror will not be considered as sentiments because they contain sorrow, because the one who experiences them is authentic in the kind of ultimate pleasure felt in pathos and other sentiments, nevertheless it is difficult to ensure maturity of mind in poetic emotion that's why a different view is suggested).

Dave argues that the viewer reaches to the state of oneness with the sentimental heroine and experiences her sentiment which happens only to punyashali purush (a man of good deeds) (14). Dave, in his presidential lecture in the Fourth Gujarati Sahitya Parishad (1921) (The Fourth Annual Conference of Gujarati Literary Council) entitled as "Chothi Gujarati Sahitya Parishad na Pramukh na Bhashan manthi Avtarano" (Extracts from the Lecture of the President at the Fourth Council of Gujarati Literature), discusses the issue of previous council which was held in 1909 (4). He states:

maru manvu chhe ke, anek jaati na samajo upar sahitya ni prabal asar thay chhe, ane te sahitya ni unnati ane vistar saru tenu parishilan farjiyat thava ni agatyata chhe, karanke, ghani vaar jovama ave chhe ke a sansar ni anek upadhiyo, tatha manushya gat nanavidh dosho ne lidhe, amuk karyo game teva labhdayak ane sara hoi chhe, to pan te faraj-dharma na bandhan vina sari rite prapt kari shakata nathi (4).

(It is my belief that literature has an immense impact on the societies of many communities and for the development and expansion of that literature making its close study mandatory is useful, many times it is seen that because of many problems of the world and human faults of various sorts, some deeds how so - ever beneficial and good, cannot be attained without the bond of duty-religion).

Dave advocates: "deshi bhashae dwara uchch kelvani" (higher learning through provincial language) (4). He establishes the function of literature in terms of its relation with religion based on duty (4). He intends to control the activities of day to day life by the religious codes. It reflects his conservative method. He also warns against the attractions to the objects of life such as theatre but hopes to modify them on the religious ground (4). He expresses the elitist privilege of aesthetic experience and limits it to the particular class of viewer when he reveals his aim: "Bhavai jeva bhunda rupako bhajvi batavvano atkav thai eva hetu thi me pan natak no vishay haath ma lidho" (I too took the subject of play with the purpose of stopping the bad plays like Bhavai from being performed) (6).

Here, Dave uses the word, *bhunda* (bad) to convey the lower status of folk play (6). It reflects his castist outlook in viewing the act of local performers as it is explained in his article (*Natak* 48- 49). It alludes to a hereditary social class among Hindus; stratified according to ritual purity. It can be argued that Dave's views on theatrical and reformist discourse intersect caste and gender (49). M.S.S.Pandian, argues that caste cannot be limited to the understanding as "the form of division of labour and "creating boundaries between" high and low practices"; he notes that such understanding of caste by the elite reformers "was not simply contestation of colonial domination, but also a strategy to secure domination over the subaltern social groups" such as lower castes and women (Sanjay Joshi, *Intro* xi).

Like Dave, an anonymous writer, in his article, "Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak ane Teno Prayog" (*Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak and Its Performance*) evaluates *Lalita* as a tragedy but also seems to have excluded the lower class by calling it *agyani* (ignorant) and "*rasa shashtra no gandh pan lidho nathi*" (not even caught the scent of the treatise of sentiment) by using the binaries such as *bhutkal/ vartmankal* (present/past), *swadeshiya/pardeshiya* (native/foreign) and *svavarna/parvarna* (high/low) (64). The writer excludes this group because, as he views, it expects the use of Urdu language, and it is more entertained from enactments by *apakva shikshit abhineta* (less educated actors) on the stage which makes them inferior to the privileged experience of *rasa* (64). He denounces the inclusion of farce or laughter in the middle of a serious play: "*game evu shokatur man hoi pan natak ma avta hasya adi raso thi akarshatu te shok ne pan vishri jai chhe, ne sadhya parnivrutti ne pame chhe*" (how melancholic the mind is it that forgets even the sorrow as it is drawn towards comic and other sentiments, and attains the feasible happiness) (64).

Dave's theatrical agenda was: *anand sahit bodh* (pleasure with moral lesson) (*Lalita Prayog* 63). The Anonymous writer argues in his article against those who accept that pleasure is impossible in *shokant natak* (play with a melancholic end) (64). According to him, the function of social play is to showcase a moral principle: "*sansarik natako ekj jaati na lok samuday ne uddeshi temnej bodhdayak chhe em nathi*" (social plays do not aim and moralize to the group of people of one community only) because the mental senses are *sarvasadharan* (universal) (64).

As for the development of the serious or tragic sentiments, Dave alludes to texts such as *Ramayana*: in the episode of the hero, Rama's exile is

tragic; the people expressed their grief at the time of departure but the episode is narrated in poetic and dramatic mode (*Rasaprakash* 15). Dave illustrates the tragic character of Harishchandra that causes ashruvat (the flow of tears) from spectators because the mind is involved and experiences sadharanikaran (oneness) with the nayak, the protagonist (15). Dave defines the experience of oneness with the nayak (hero) or nayika (heroine)'s dukh (agony) as sukh, (ecstasy) or ananda (delight) (16).

Both Dave and the anonymous writer universalize the experience of dukh in theatre as sublime and present not only in karun (pathos) but bhittsa (disgust) and bhayanak (terror) rasas (sentiments) (14; 64). The reception of dukh in terms of Dave's view of sadharanikaran and anonymous writer's view of sarvasadharan suggests a complex relation of a Shakespearean tragedy with Aristotelian concepts of identification and catharsis (*Rasaprakash* 16; 66). This relationship can be ascribed to the way nineteenth century drama theory had developed

Dr. Jayshankar Acharya, in his article, "Gurjar Rangbhumi Prakhar Subhechhaknu Sansmaran" (The Remembrance of the Passionate Well Wisher of Gujarati Theatre), gives an account of his visit with Dave in 1915-16 (223). He notes that Dave was invited by the playwright and director of Morbi Subodh Natak Mandali, M. A. Ojha to watch the performance of play, *Bhaviprably* (The Power of Future) (224). Dave appreciated Ojha for the development of a moralist theme in the play but he criticized the inconsistency of *rasa* for the sake of entertainment of chotha vargna prekshakone khatar, the (pit khaas) [(for the audience in the fourth class, the audience in the pit)] (225). Acharya quotes Dave's criticism against the contemporary playwrights: "Rangbhumi na dhandhe thi petna bharay to anya dhandhe valgo, pan rangbhumi ne kalushit na karo" (if you cannot earn livelihood by business of theatre, adhere to other business, but do not contaminate theatre) (225).

Nilkanth, in his article, notes that Dave determined to give drama a respectful form and to reform the Gujarati theatre so that the 'adhamta' (lowliness) of 'prakrit varga' (the common people) could be corrected (82). It can be understood that Dave is in favour of newness of Gujarati drama with a moralist function on the contemporary stage. He considers Gujarati stage important as it can bridge connection between different communities of society. Therefore, it is imperative to note that Dave makes his selection of local, Sanskrit and Western theatrical conventions in the making of *Lalita* as a new

tragic genre in the reformist context. Dave, in his contemporary time and space, uses the mixture of theatrical modes and writes the plays to be performed for the common people.

In the introduction to the book, *Colonizing the Realm of Words*, Sascha Ebeling discusses Marry Louise Pratt's idea of "contact zone" to suggest further a critical inquiry (5). Viewing Gujarati drama as a "contact zone" provides the scope to analyse "how colonialism affected the practices centred around the production and consumption on both sides of the divide of colonized/colonizer" keeping in mind the fact that such divide was "historically shifting" in terms of literary form, content and aesthetics (Ebeling 5). The playwrights aimed to achieve newness for the contemporary stage in the cosmopolitan city of Bombay as "contact zone" (5). In this context, the following sections carry this discussion, first with reference to the integration of textual and theatrical elements and subsequently with reference to the subject matter of this tragedy, namely the sorrow of a woman caught up in an incompatible marriage.

The Textual and Theatrical Elements in *Lalita*

One can begin with the names of characters in *Lalita*. Dave uses characters' names in an allegorical fashion. Lalita stands for the 'fine' arts. Nandan, since this is the deity Krishna's name, is a man surrounded by women. Priyamvada, the courtesan, is a sweet talker. Chhaldas, her co-conspirator, is a wicked man who has the art of chhal (deceit). Karkasha bai, the mother in law is a shrewish woman while the name of her daughter, Kajiya bai means a quarrelsome woman. The father Dambhraj's name indicates that he is an arrogant man. Panthiram is a traveller. Buddhisagar suggests an intellectual mind and his wife, Gulab signifies a sweet rose. However, apart from the meaning of his name, Panthiram combines the role of a sutradhar, who announces the theme of the play, he is a messenger, a jester and a saviour, and as an outsider to the main theme of love, he is also a commentator.

In Act I, scene i, Panthiram enters the stage and introduces the theme of the play as he listens to the sound of drums used in temples, the noise of men talking, and the barking of a dog and looks at ek haveli akaashma dokiya kartee (a building peeping from the sky) from the outskirts of Snehpur, the home of

Nandan (Dave, *Lalita* 6). Panthiram, in his soliloquy, speaks of fatigue due to a long journey to Snehpur city. He rebukes himself for his refusal to take Lalita's advice to come by a horse. Though he is tired of walking, he encourages himself in his belief that there is no possibility of achievement in sitting only. He continues to walk (6).

In scene ii, he meets the gardener of Nandan's house. The gardener calls Panthiram mashkaro (jester) for his rustic and humorous speech (8). In scene iii, Nandan meets Panthiram as Lalita's messenger (10). When he receives Nandan's reply to inform Lalita, Panthiram jokes with a purpose. Panthiram knowingly asks Nandan whether he should give the letter to his mother in law (15).

Nandan repeats his command. He tells Panthiram that the letter should be given to 'her' (Lalita) (17). The playwright uses the pronoun 'ene' (her), indicating it is for his wife (17). Panthiram mocks at Nandan's childish hesitation to call Lalita by her name. In what follows he mocks Nandan when he says "gharvari" (woman of the house) and asks if he means Priyamvada, indicating he knows Nandan's alliance with her; finally, Nandan is forced to accept himself as the husband of Lalita and Panthiram leaves the place repeating the name of Lalita (16-18).

Initially, Panthiram appears humorous and cunning in his act. The character of Panthiram is a mixture of Ranglo of Bhavai, Fool of Shakespeare and Vidushak of Sanskrit tradition. As the play unfolds, Panthiram's role gains more dimensions.

Panthiram is cautious. He eavesdrops on Nandan's conversation with Priyamvada about the selling of the house for fifteen thousand rupees (14). He awaits opportunity and takes the costly jewels from Nandan by promising that he will not disclose his affair with Priyamvada (16). Panthiram detects the conspiracy of Priyamvada and Chhaldas in disguise in Priyamvada's bed chamber (23). In Act I, scene vii, Panthiram hides himself under the bed to listen to Chhaldas who has planned to seize Dambhraj's property and sell it off (23-24). Panthiram is humorous in his act; he shivers and speaks to himself in fear under the bed. Panthiram uses idioms. When Panthiram listens secretly that Chhaldas has also planned to kill him, he exclaims in fear: Bayadi ne chudo (25) (Put on the bangles of a woman). He is smart and so he does not want to be a hero but he chooses to run away like a coward.

In his actions on the stage, Panthiram resembles Ranglo of Bhavai: he plucks a flower and tickles the gardener's ear in a mischievous way; he sits near the well of the garden spreading his legs and takes out his pack of tambaku (tobacco) and enjoys it (7). In his use of idioms, proverbs and playful attitude with the language, Panthiram resembles the jester of Shakespeare and also the Ranglo. Panthiram creates hilarious performance and an active atmosphere to amuse the audience. Thus the characterization of Panthiram shows a mixture of conventions from the beginning of the play. It reflects the nostalgic effect because Dave recalls the tradition of past through Panthiram's appearance in the play.

In Act II, scene ii, Lalita doubts Panthiram for his comic attitude because he is mischievous (32). On this, Panthiram rebukes himself for his jesting and calls it blameworthy (32). Panthiram tells Lalita that he is equally sorrowful for the tension in her mind but she does not believe him, especially because she finds the Nandan's reply written after an illiterate style and thinks Panthiram is fooling her. Lalita is further shocked when she finds Nandan's jewels with Panthiram's (33). She assumes Panthiram to have killed Nandan (33). She threatens to call the guards (33). On this, Panthiram requests Lalita not to interrupt in his full account of his journey to Snehpur (36-37). He sings a song in raga Ramkali and convinces her about Nandan's friendship with the villain and indulgence with his mistress, extravagance behind her and his uneducated upbringing. He suggests to Lalita not to feel sorry (36-38).

This scene between Panthiram and Lalita is significant. It suggests the mixture of comic and tragic elements in the process of bringing out the main aspect of the play: Lalita's sorrow and its appeal to the implied audience who is well attracted by the jester of Bhavai.

Finally it is seen that in Act III, scene x, Panthiram fights with Pooranmal to save Lalita (78). But Pooranmal kills Panthiram with his knife (78). Lalita sings a song in the metre, Lalita metre:

Raday bhaar to apno kahi, karat khalee o! Naam to lahi;
 Kaik to mane, shaanti thaate re, dukhdu maahru ardh jaatre.
 Jau have hu kya, konne malu, nagar baapne shee rite valu? (80)
 (I could have made the burden of heart empty by taking your name;
 I would have met with some peace and half of the sorrow would have gone.
 Where should I go now, whom should I meet and how should I return to my
 father's town?)

The melodramatic aspect of this scene highlights Panthiram's martyrdom and Lalita's sorrow in more appealing manner. The lament over the loss of a loyal servant adds into Lalita's tragic visibility on the stage.

S.K. Das notes in his book that the Parsi theatres centralized the story around violent actions and developed the plays into melodramatic genre in which the music was loud and exaggerated (183). The popularity of romantic story was closely related to several "*haran* (abduction) plays" in many languages including Sanskrit (Das 283). Ganpatram Bhatt wrote *Pratap Natak* in 1866 in Gujarati in which the hero defends his honour against the onslaught of the Muslim King (283). Das notes that such representation caused a tension between the audiences divided by religion even if it did not aim to hurt Muslim sensibilities (283).

In his written account entitled, "*Mehlomani Prachin Natakshala*" (The Ancient School of Theatre in the Courts), Dave gives the account of rupak and its reception by the Hindu, Puritans, Buddhists and Muslims (67-73). Dave expresses the historical interpretation of the Muslim dynasty and the performance of rupak (70). He writes: "*jyarthi musalmano nu rajya thayu tyarthi to rupak no vishay jara pan uttejan pamyao hoi em jovama avtu nathi*" (little encouragement has been given to the subject of good play since the reign of Muslims) (70). Dave expresses in his article the social criticism of Muslim as *esharaami* (enjoying pleasure and comfort) audience in his article: the Muslim class of the audiences attended "*padosh ma vasti veshyao ne tyao*" (prostitute residing in neighbourhood) nearby the Grant road theatre in Bombay (*Natak* 63). So he chose to perform *Lalita* in Victoria Theatre Company (63).

The inclusion of songs in *Lalita* is another significant aspect. The songs used in the plays are based on a variety of tunes known to the audience. The songs express the bond of mother, father, close friend and the melancholic state of the interior self on the loss of aspiration of conjugal love and happiness. The songs express the symbolic form of the self and the place it lives in. In Act I, scene v, Panthiram enters the sheher (city) and sings a song in *rola chhand* (rola metre) (Dave, *Lalita* 19). He narrates the minute detail of the city: the defending and powerful killo (fort); the threatening and indomitable top (canon); the wide khadi (river) and the construction of three sides kangra (polygons) built in row upon the fort that can control the heavy flood of water; jabra dwar the (massive gates) and khilani haar (row of thorny nails of metal) which can obstruct even the elephants' attack; lakdu (the wooden arch) embedded with heavy lohodu

(iron) on both sides of the gate; patiya (the bridge) upon the river which can be pulled from the gate; and the huge darvajano bandh (the dam of the gate) that is a question for lashkar (the armed force) to break (19-21). Here, Panthiram's narration echoes a nostalgic effect since it reflects the image of princely state.

The description of the external scene is often a picture of the mind too. In Act IV, scene vii, Lalita appears on the stage which shows an open land from where she observes the landscape standing alone (91-93). Lalita sings a song to the tune to shankarnandna mahinano raag-desh (a song set to the tune of the genre of 'month songs' and composed in raga desh) (93-94). Lalita's song describes the row of mountains in zigzag shape and the serpent like rivers across the mountain (94).

She personifies the flowing of stream into a snake which comes to sting her (94). She looks at the cloud and personifies it in the image of a woman (94). She calls it vaadli (female cloud) (94). She speaks to the female cloud that she is tapeli taapthi (incensed with suffering) (94). Lalita urges her to be kind by showering on her and put out her inner fire.

In scene Act IV, scene vi, Lalita enters the stage. She passes through the forest to save herself from the entrapments of evil elements (89). She does not find any end to her sorrow. Lalita is attracted by the lightening in the sky (90). She sings a dohra (couplet) in which she compares the transitory sight of lightening with her marital state (90). She finds her marital life equally transitory which she entered in but failed to continue any more. The lightening is personified in her song as Lalita calls it her ben vijali (sister lightening) (90). Lalita suggests in her song that her failure is unnoticed. It shows that the victimized bride finds the meaning to her life futile. Here, the intersection of Lalita's soliloquy with her song can be noted.

Songs are the mainstay of Lalita's speeches and appear as the perfect medium to express various shades of her sorrow. (This point is discussed further in the next section). Apart from the expressive function, songs also appear in their traditional function as elements of luring and as the accomplishment of the courtesan. For example, Priyamvada sings a song in Act III, scene vi, to entice Nandan and to keep him attached to her (62). Priyamvada sings in a raga Kalingdo:

Avi chhe Lalita vahu tamtani re lala,
Tene nahi bhed kain apvo jee.
Jaapto pehle thi te par raakhvo re lala,
Tene jeev kain nahi sopvo jee.

Mane aap dasi jevi janjo re lala,
Chho Lalita rehti tam gher jee (62)
(Lalita has come to you dear,
Do not reveal any secret to her dear.
Keep a watch on her,
Do not give any love to her.
You believe me like your mistress dear,
Know me as your dasi No matter Lalita lives at your house).

Priyamvada is a traditional mistress of Nandan as a landlord. She persuades Nandan not to share his love with Lalita and talk about their secrets. She calls Nandan 'lala' to entice him.

In the larger context, songs and dances were also becoming the mainstay of theatres in western India. More importantly, the development of music in theatre points to changes in the appreciation and appropriation of new kinds of music too. In the preface to the sixth edition of *Lalita*, Dave, in the preface to *Lalita*, states that the members of Mumbai Gujarati Natak Mandali suggested him to add more gayano (songs) in 1895. The present edition shows the use of music and dance by the both male and female dancers. In Act III, scene ii, the garden is described where Lalita sings the song in the tune to angreji rah par (English style) (Dave, *Lalita* 46). She sings to pray nitivaan (moralist), the god to decrease the misery. Lalita prays the God to make her and all's life happy (46). The second song occurs at the occasion of Lalita's arrival at Nandan's home when the women in neighbourhood interfere in the quarrel (52). Act I, scene iii, Priyamvada orders the poriya (the boys) to read the letter written in verse and sing it in a song (10). The use of Marathi words, porio and poriya for the dancers suggests the influence of theatrical tradition of Marathi located in Bombay.

Dave also makes use of other dramatic devices. He adopts the traditional genre of conspiracy plot and experiments with it. The conspiracy plot is found in the local tales. It shows the method of scheming in a typical fashion. In Act III, scene ix, Chhaldas plots to settle his wicked intentions (72-76). He explains his yukti (plan) to Priyamvada and Nandan. Priyamvada stores bottles of poison in her house (75). She gives one bottle of poison to Chhaldas which can make Lalita unconscious before she is kidnapped. Chhaldas bribes jamadar (police head), Pooranmal to kidnap Lalita and kill others (75). Priyamvada shows a traditional image of a shrewd courtesan. She mixes

poison in the sweet to kill all. Chhaldas and Nandan eat meethai (sweets) and take kasumbo (a drink of opium diluted with water and having a saffron colour) but Pooranmal does not (77). However, the designed plan of conspiracy is turned down (77). Pooranmal expresses his anger for Chhaldas in his Hindustani speech:

Mara sala, mere haath se khun karake, o sab dagina usko le jane ka thaa; aur mujko kaha thaa, ke tum ko kuchh milega. Bot dafe mujko thag gaya thaa. Ab voi sab mera hi he to? Doka karne ka thaa, magar usme ek jyada hua so kya ho gaya? Chandal to ohi thaa. Chal ab sab dagina nikal rakh (77). (He died sala, by wanting me murder, he had to take away all of her jewels; and told me, that you would get some. He had deceived me many times. Now isn't that all mine only? Two were to be finished, but in that one more has been killed so what is the difference in it? Despicable he was only. Let's now all jewels take out)

Pooranmal appears murderous and vengeful towards Chhaldas and kills him for the cheating on previous occasions. He feels cheated as Chhaldas wants him kill all and take all money and jewels alone by giving him a small amount. Pooranmal kills Priyamvada and Nandan as it does not make any difference to him (77). The character of Chhaldas as villain resembles Iago of Shakespeare's *Othello* who lives in illusion that he would succeed in his wicked scheme but like Iago, Chhaldas too is killed too. Dave imitates Shakespeare here to characterize the villain, Chhaldas.

The playwright's treatment of the traditional genre of conspiracy plot is modern. He experiments with the traditional genre and creates the climax in the middle of the play. The well planned scheme of the evil characters is shifted to a different situation and surprises the audience. Moreover, the playwright moves beyond the traditional way to develop and deepen the pathos. Following the conspiracy plot, Panthiram's death is projected in the play. It is preceded by Pooranmal's confrontation with the hunter, who kills Pooranmal in his knightly manner. With the projection of such rapid changes, Lalita's sorrow is centralized with holding the interest consistently in the middle of play. The sight of murders reflects the influence of Shakespeare.

In Act III, scene xi, Priyamvada and Chhaldas converse about their wicked scheme in their minds. Both are malicious with each other (74). They plan to share the money of Nandan and jewels of Lalita with each other but both are greedy and malicious to each other (74). Chhaldas plots to kidnap Lalita with the help of Pooranmal and decides to kill also Priyamvada and

Nandan along with Lalita to own all the jewels and money. Priyamvada is aware of Chhaldas's treacherous mind. She manages to kill him during their meeting at the planned place. Priyamvada speaks in her mind when she agrees with Chhaldas: (Swagat) "ne rupiya malya, etle Chhaldas no ghaat karta kya apane avadto nathi? Mithai ma kai bhabhravyu etle patyu" (73-74) [(Aside), and as soon as I get money, where is it not possible to kill Chhaldas? It can be finished by mixing something in the sweet.

But Chhaldas speaks in his mind the real design of his wicked scheme: (Swagat) "tattu chalyu to chalyu na hiker thai padse" (74) [(Aside), if the trick worked against her, it is okay, otherwise it will occur any way].

The playwright has made the use of the technique of swagat (aside) to show the vice of greed in the villains. It shows the duality in Chhaldas and Priyamvada.

Throughout the play, the playwright uses the colloquial speech. For example, Act I, scene ii, the gardener speaks in his idiomatic language: sidhe sidhu ne vake vaaku (7) (by straight to straight and by curved to curve). In saying this gardener points out Panthiram's naughty behaviour and suggests that he will not give a straight response unless Panthiram behaves in a simple way. The gardener calls Nandan saap (serpent) when he is called by his master Nandan (14). The gardener misspells 'saheb' (master) as 'saap' (which stands for serpent in Gujarati). The gardener unknowingly uses the pun in his speech. On this, Nandan speaks in abusive language and calls the gardener aanya (abuse) (14) and slaps him. He is satirical in his tone when he uses the metaphor of pattharna bhamarda jevo (like a top of stone) for Nandan. Such comparison shows Nandan's gullible nature for he can be moved round like a top (9).

The gardener tells Nandan that Nandan will punish him if he came to know of his disloyalty. Here, 'naliyer' (coconut), a noun is used into a verb to mean punishment in local reception (8). The gardener is an ordinary servant. His language is distinctly local. Dave seems to have employed the Surati dialect in the gardener's speech i. e. the first letter of word beginning with 's' is misspelled with 'h'; the gardener speaks 'hahare' (bridegroom's in laws home) in place of 'sasare' (10). Such use of language allows the readers to identify the substantial humour of day to day life.

Priyamvada is knowledgeable and clever enough to apply her method. In Act I, scene iii, she uses the local proverbs: Morna inda chitrva nathi padata (12) (peacock's eggs do not require paint). Priyamvada suggests that a good face

needs no paints. She warns Nandan that Lalita may attract him with her beauty (13). She convinces Nandan to consider Lalita as inferior to him as she will not suit him. For this, she uses idioms and proverbs such as: Dungan door thaki raniyamna (the mountains from distance are beautiful) (12) or Andhali behenda fode (The blind woman breaks the pot) (13). She is sarcastic when she describes Nandan's dark face as kaledakaach na jevu tej (shines like a hemispherical earthen pan) (13). She compares his mind with mobhagra (the front side of beam that is rigid) (13).

Dave uses the indigenous sources and employs the proverbs spoken by the characters from the margins. The characters of courtesan, the gardener, the servant represent the margins in the play. The characters from margins mock at the landlord for its idiocy. Such treatment of characters and their language signifies *Lalita* as not yet completely severed from the local performance traditions.

On the other hand, Dave also uses several devices and elements from the tradition of Sanskrit plays. Three examples of the same are discussed below. The scene in which Lalita prepares to go from her father's home to her husband's home resembles Shakuntala's departure in Kalidas's *Abhijnanashakuntalam*. In Act II, scene iii, the messenger arrives at Lalita's home and gives her father in law, Dambhraj's letter in which it is informed that she is called back (41). Lalita gets prepared like Shakuntala to depart from her parents to meet her husband (42). Prabhavati sings a song set in the genre, 'Sitaji no mahina' (a song of month sung is based on the memory of Sita) and bids farewell like Shakuntala's friend Priyamvada (43). Here, the use of local song of mahina is related to the name of Sita, a heroine of *Ramayana*. It also used to highlight Lalita's image similar to Sita, the ideal wife of Ram. Jivraaj expresses his sorrow of separation like Shakuntala's father, Kanva. Lalita is embraced with affection by her friend, Prabhavati, her mother, Kamla and father, Jivraaj. She sits in the chariot decorated with flowers (45). She is bid adieu at the end of the scene. The allusion to the portrayal of virah (separation) in *Shakuntala* gradually escalates into dukh much the same as in Kalidasas's play, but departs from that tradition when it marks a tragic end, while the original Sanskrit play ends on a happy note.

Secondly, though the playwright criticizes the excessive use of shringar (erotic) on stage, he does not exclude the shringar rasa (sentiment of erotic) completely in *Lalita*. In Act III, scene x, the hunter observes Lalita when she is

unconscious (79). He describes her beauty with the use of the Sanskrit metre, mandakranta vrutt:

Bhogi bijo nahi muj samo kem aali bhame chhe,
Jaa tu, khoti leelee bhramari ni bhranti raakhee rame chhe (79)
(No other enjoyer is like me, bee why are you wondering,
Go you; you are playing in illusion considering her a female bee).

The hunter looks at the bee which moves around Lalita's body. He expresses his lust and wonders why the bee is moving around her. The hunter speaks to the male bee that he has guessed Lalita to be a female bee but in his illusion. So, the hunter asks the male bee to go away from Lalita's body. He compares Lalita's body to a garden.

The hunter calls Lalita a yellow coloured flower, her legs the banana tree and her face, a rose. He compares Lalita's breasts with oranges. He compares her nose with the saffron coloured flower. He compares her young body with the distracting art of madan (Cupid) (79). It should be noted that Dave uses footnotes to explain the Sanskritized similes (79). He employs a metaphorical language of Kalidas's romantic plays. The use of footnotes in the play suggests the playwright's intention to provide necessary instruction to the actors. Dave employs the use of Sanskritized metre to suit the position of King. Such linguistic placement in the speech of characters is noteworthy because it allows the iconic parallel of Kalidas and Shakespeare.

The use of nepathya (behind the curtain) is another Sanskritized technique which is used in *Lalita*. In Act II, scene ii, when Lalita and Prabhavati converse, Lalita is called from back of the curtain: "Lalita ne bolavo- Lalita ne bolavo" (call Lalita- call Lalita) (41). In scene x, Act III, Pooranmal tries to overpower Lalita (77). But Lalita resists and shouts (78). Here, Dave uses the technique again. The voice of Panthiram is heard from the nepathya (behind the curtain): "are abla par kon balatkar kare chhe?" (Hey, who is raping the powerless woman?) (78). Also, In Act III, scene v, Dave uses some couplets from *Hitopadesh* (a collection of Sanskrit fables) (61). He cites in a footnote the use of the couplets number eleven and twelve from the preface to *Hitopadesh* (61). The playwright contextualizes the discourse of moral and ethical lessons. He uses *Hitopadesh* (couplets based on the moral lessons) as a motif to correct dukh in domestic life.

Apart from these, Dave uses a few other theatrical devices, of which the idea of character in disguise is important. Dave develops it with reference to a

traditional form of disguise. In Act I, scene vi, Panthiram disguises himself into a seer and goes to Snehpur to meet Dambhraj (22). Panthiram enlightens Dambhraj with the fact that he pampered Nandan and brought up his son without moral lesson which dejects him (22). He informs Dambhraj that because he married Nandan with Lalita in their childhood but has not called the daughter-in-law back (22). Panthiram calculates the horoscopes of the moon signs, makar (Capricorn), kumbh (Aquarius), and mesh (Aries) and forecasts that Dambhraj's two bungalows and a barn are in danger (23). He warns Dambhraj to bring Lalita home otherwise he will not possess anything.

On the other hand, Panthiram is also a commentator on the aspects of modern life from a traditional point of view. He observes a statue of iron in human shape with an open mouth, a locked round belly and the forehead on which he finds the note in Devanagari scripts: patra paathav va kaje (to post the letter) (20). Here, Panthiram imagines the shape of the post box into a shivlinga (the idol of lord Shiva, the Hindu god) (20). He finds it modern because he himself comes to the city as a messenger from village.

Panthiram also appreciates the magnificent city: rasta vishal (the big roads) and the system of shadak (pavement), the raw of decorative fanas (lanterns) and the colourful lohstambh (pillars of iron) (19). He shows the colony in its modern arrangement by describing the rows of houses which are decorated, not high and low, and not curved but straight (20). He looks at the name plate and the number of Dambhraj's house in Devanagari script: "Dambhraj nu naam, ank navso pistalis" [Name of Dambhraj, number nine hundred forty five (21). He finds the statues of woman attached with taps in their hands to provide the outsiders water to drink (20). He finds fifteen rows of houses built in systematic way that equips the guests to know the name and number of houses so that they may not lose the way. Here, Panthiram finds the modern setting of the city (21). Thus the modern and princely setting seems to have infused in the narration of Panthiram in disguise.

Similarly, Dave uses the trope of the domestic quarrel, which was already popular in other literary genres. The first Gujarati social novel, *Sasu Vahuni Ladhai* (1866) (Conflict between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law) by Mahipatram Nilkanth can be taken as the example of this portrayal (Jani 113). The novelist depicts the story of a girl, Sundar who is married at seven and faces harassment from mother in law and sister in law in a Hindu family. He also included local songs in his novel (113). Dave incorporates this element and

attempts to create awareness about the evils which had crept into the familial relationship. His characterization of Panthiram is a way to suggest the need of moderation in language. In Act III, scene iii, Panthiram defends Lalita against the quarrelsome women (Dave, *Lalita* 53-54). He says "...Hu parke gher avu tatdi ne koi dahado bolu nahi" (54) (I do not speak any day this way in blunt manner at other's house).

Panthiram tells Gulab, who comes to control the quarrel, that he does not use extreme language in others' homes. Panthiram's confession about his language is a way to modernize the episode of domestic harassment as a trope.

Finally, Shakespearean influence can be marked in the structural design of *Lalita* but there are other aspects which inspire Dave to develop the genre. In Act IV, scene iv, Kubhandi generalizes on married women and speaks in his soliloquy: "Keva baira jagma thagaraa" (how deceitful the wives are in the world) which reminds us the famous Shakespearean quote from *Hamlet*: Frailty thy name is women (89). Chandravadan Mehta, in his article, "Shakespeare and Gujarati Stage" notes that the Gujarati playwrights found any number of the common sayings and as universal usage to provide a new form of expression, which Shakespeare wrote, apart from wholesale borrowing and adaptation of scenes and soliloquies from Shakespeare's plays (44-45). He notes that Shakespearean usages enjoy universality in nineteenth century Gujarati theatre.

Can the use of the colloquial and the Sanskrit techniques be considered as devices for popular appeal? And how can we think about Dave's appropriation of 'popular' help him modernize *Lalita*? Dhirubhai Thakkar, in his book, *Abhigyan*, notes that the contemporary audience were divided in two class of audience: shishta varga (the middle class which could read Sanskrit and Gujarati) and lok samuday (the common people) (24). The emergence of print played a crucial role in writing the scripts for the performance (24). Dave represents common people in terms of the daily lives they lived, the language or dialect they spoke. He keeps the oral traditions alive in the play but the idea of *prekshan* (spectacle) as Thakkar notes, was appropriated into the proscenium stage in Bombay (25). Dave welcomed novelty of the stage design of Mumbai's Gaity Theatre and insisted on bringing the local performers to Bombay where Gujarati theatre could be equipped with large curtains, ticketed show, lamps, scene-sceneries and the new props on proscenium stage (*Natak* 49-53). It is now important to see the development of Lalita's sorrow against the background of

the development of the new genre. The next section discusses this issue with reference to the idea of women and social reforms in Gujarat.

Lalita's Sorrow and its Larger Context

In *Lalita*, Dave develops the theme of suffering of Lalita due to the failure of her marriage at three levels. Lalita suffers on personal, domestic and public levels. He establishes the base of the rhetoric of pathos. The word, 'rhetoric' is used here to suggest the central idea of this chapter that Dave wrote *Lalita* to arouse pity towards the protagonist and to sustain his aim; he modified the indigenous mode of performance based on the social problem of kajoda (incompatible match) (*Natak* 55-56). Dave used a persuasive language of performance in new ways. In Act II, scene ii, the protagonist enters the stage for the first time (Dave, *Lalita* 29). Lalita's worry, grief, fear and curiosity reflect her tragic mood in the bedchamber. She is awakened by a nightmare about the loss of her husband (30). She tries to lessen her sorrow by sharing her gloom with Kamla (30). She sings a song set in raga Pilu and in Dhumaali rhythm. She sings that she suffers from the pain of pativirah (separation from husband) (29). Lalita considers swamiseva (service to husband) her religion and she becomes miserable as she cannot achieve it (29). Panthiram informs her about the bad character of Nandan. She becomes more sorrowful to know her husband's indulgence with the durguni (vicious) (36). She sings dohro (a couplet) in a soft voice:

Bani, bani nahi, nahi bane, khari ej chhe vaat;

Bijo kai upay nahi bolta sevu sarve jaat (36)

(Married, but has not suited, and will not suit, true that fact is;

There is no other way out except speaking to protect the self at all place).

Lalita finds her marriage with Nandan unsuitable because it will remain dissatisfactory. But she suggests that the traditional custom of marriage is inescapable. She is educated and virtuous. Her desire is to be married to an educated and virtuous man. She tells Panthiram that her marriage is a subject of compromise and she is forced to agree because of the reputation of her family. She sings a jilla (a light classical genre) set to raga Kafi when Prabhavati enters to meet her (37). Lalita compares her incompatible match with the happy marital life of Prabhavati (37). In her song she addresses Prabhavati:

Prabhavati! Piyu ne Mali, Poora kidha kod;
 Durbhagi hu ekli, vanthi mari jod.
 Hati aash muj ne ghani, pan thai have niraash
 Randapo piyu na chhata avi na malti rash (37).
 (Prabhavati! Having met the husband, you gratified the desire²;
 Unfortunate I am alone, my marriage is vitiated.
 Widowhood, however husband is alive, no compatibility is obtainable).

Lalita greets Prabhavati who has met the husband and got the love. She considers Prabhavati luckier. Lalita finds her misfortune because of the ruin of her hopes to get a happy marital life. She calls herself a widow even though her husband is alive. Lalita laments over her despair, misfortune and widowhood. She laments over her ironical situation. Prabhavati cannot bear her sorrow and stops Lalita. Prabhavati asks what makes her bavari (bewildered) (37). Lalita cries and sings a song to the tune of the song, 'odhvaji sandesho kehjo shyamne' to share the personal sorrow which she cannot share with others (37).

The contradiction between Prabhavati's happy marital status and Lalita's separation from her husband highlights the tragic image of Lalita. Lalita is older yet she is away from Nandan. Lalita remembers her child marriage with Nandan. Its memory provokes her anger. She remembers the procession moving towards her in law's home in which she was taken as a married child (38). Lalita resents her conjugal fate:

...Rath thaathdi no thayo hot jo thaath jo;
 Chundadi muj madda ne chomag vintva,
 Charee chitaa ma bhad bhad laagat kaath jo... (38).
 (If the bier of chariot would have been beautified;
 To cover my dead body with the bridal dress,
 I would have burned with fierce sound moving in the wooden pyre)

Lalita is disappointed. In the song, she sings at this point, she imagines the palanquin as a bier. She wishes that she would have been taken to the graveyard instead of her in-laws' house (38). However, it is not just despair that drives Lalita. She is also full of anger and ironical in her tone. She says to Prabhavati that her marriage is an unjust act because she was married in the childhood (38). She did not know the difference between good and bad in

² See the translation of the line available in *The Modern Gujarati-English Dictionary Volume I*. 2nd ed. Gandhinagar: n.p., 1925. 375. Print.

childhood. She was just happy to look at herself decorated in chundadi (traditional dress of bride) (30). The realization of the unjust custom increases the feeling of betrayal in Lalita's mind.

Lalita sings a song set to raga Belavar- lamenting her fate (39). She believes that her sinful acts of previous birth result in the present suffering. She sings the refrain in her song, 'sahiyar dukh su dakhvu' (friends, what sorrow should I show) (39). Lalita calls her parents poorva na veri (enemies of previous birth) and condemns them for her suffering (40). She is exhausted with despair and faints (40). However, she soon accepts the personal suffering and decides to endure it when Prabhavati becomes ready to convince Jivraaj against the unjust marriage (41). In Act II, scene iv, Lalita's sorrow can be noted in her farewell (43-44). Lalita sings a song to the tune 'sitajino mahino' expressing her sorrow of separation from home and friends (45).

At the second level, Dave represents Lalita's suffering in domestic sphere. In scene Act III, scene ii, Lalita replies to the gardener: "Hu dukh sahan karvane sruji chhu" (I have been created to bear sorrow) (48). The sister-in-law Kajiyabai tortures Lalita by claiming that Lalita's arrival at her in law's home is inauspicious because Nandan is missing (49). She taunts her even if Lalita behaves in a gentle way (49). The mother-in-law Karkasha also expresses her dislike of Lalita (49). Lalita's innocence reflects her suffering when she is tortured by the uneducated women of the neighbourhood who interrupt with comments on Lalita (52).

Dave characterizes Nandan as an oppressor and highlights the vulnerability of Lalita. In Act III, scene viii, Nandan and Lalita appear on the stage (69). When Lalita goes to sleep beside Nandan on the bed, Nandan abuses Lalita and becomes violent (69). He kicks her and beats her (70). It causes bleeding on Lalita's face. Lalita cries out of severe pain. She speaks begging kindness from Nandan:

Are pranpati! Mara kaap na badha moti ane aa lalam mara gaal ma peshi gaya. Are! Jara sachvi ne eke eke kahdo. Mare haathe nathi nikalata. Are! Hu bahu dukhi thau chhu. Peheda upar ni laate to mane puri kari hot. Are mane atishay kaltar thay chhe. Balta na bbbhuka uthe chhe. Tame vina apradhe mara upar atlo badho kop shu karva karo chho? Tame komal raday na ava ghatki kem thao chho (70) (Oh husband! My lobs studded with pearls are crushed my cheek. Oh! just take out one by one with care. I cannot take out with my hand. Oh! I feel more sorrow. Upon the bed the kick could have finished me. Oh! I feel

immense pain. The pain blows out of burn. Why do you oppress me so much without my guilt? Why does a soft hearted like you become so cruel?)

Lalita is traumatized by the cruel treatment from Nandan. She experiences domestic violence for the first time. She is terrified with the sight of blood on her hands and face. She looks in the mirror and speaks in her soliloquy: "Oh mara baap! Aa shu lohi...sansarna lokone ava dukh padta hase te me aje janyu. Aa to pehla divas nu mangalcharan. Aa dukh te hu kone kahu? Maro Panthiram pan aa velae nathi" (71) (Oh my father! This is what blood...people suffer from such sorrows I knew today. This is auspicious beginning of the first day. Whom should I tell this sorrow? My Panthiram is too not present at this time).

Here, Lalita's speech reaches the peak of her domestic suffering. The manifestation of blood on Lalita's face and hands through use of mirror on the stage creates the picture of victimization of Lalita. It deepens the effect of pity on the audience. Lalita speaks that the first day of her suffering in conjugal life is a mangalcharan (invocation of a divine being at the bringing of an auspicious work) (71). She speaks her experience of suffering in ironical tone because the very first day, which she expected to be auspicious, turns into a painful day. Lalita is threatened by Nandan not to complain to others of his violent act (71).

The sub plot of conspiracy of Chhaldas and Priyamvada can be considered as the extension of Lalita's suffering and as the bridge between her suffering in the domestic sphere and her final public suffering. In Act III, scene x, Pooranmal ties her hands and legs to keep her in a sack (76). When Lalita tries to run away, she falls off. She is terrified by the sight of Nandan, Priyamvada and Chhaldas murdered by Pooranmal (77). She is injured in her attempt to escape Pooranmal's hand (77). She becomes helpless and unable to find a way to escape (77). The conspiracy of Chhaldas fails but it creates a long path of suffering.

Lalita's suffering at the hands of Chandravali and Kubhandi is the final phase of her suffering due to domestic sphere, but extended outside. Act IV, scene ii is set in Kankapuri (82). In scene ii, Lalita is entrapped by Chandravali which tests her patience and courage to escape but with a deal of struggle (82). Lalita is attacked by Kubhandi (89-90). Here, Dave suggests a parallel that Priyamvada is no more but Chandravali appears as her equal to entrap Lalita

again. He suggests the second parallel that though Chhaldas has been killed, his man, Kubhandi tries to kill Lalita.

Lalita's final suffering is portrayed at the end of the play. Lalita sings a song to the tune 'sheth sagalasha sadhune seve' repeating the refrain: "are dukh shu kahu maru re, sunye dil dukhse tamaru re" (what sorrow of mine should i tell, after listening, it will pain your heart) (106). She uses the terms kaput (bad son), veshyama vanthel var (corrupt with prostitute), murkhnath (master of idiot) to criticize the bad character of Nandan who harassed her and became responsible for the tragedy of her marital life (106). Lalita shows the mark of Nandan's violence on her face (107). She explains Pooranmal's attempt of rape her, Panthiram's fight with Pooranmal and the great loss of a true servant, her imprisonment in the harem of the king of Parvatpuri and the escape at the risk of her life, Chandrvali's entrapment to involve her in kunda karma (illegitimate deed), her difficult escape, Kubhandi's attack and the tiger hunting Kubhandi in place of a deer (106-108). Thus Lalita sums up her suffering. She proclaims her message to the men of her society:

Sabla purush chhe ne abla ame to, lo to sambhal levay;
Vehti muko daya dur karine to, keva parinam thay.
Dukh bija ghana am ablane, bhai baapne na janay;
Chhana shekayye, dukhi bahu thaine, amthi upay sho thay (108).
(The men are powerful and we the women are powerless, if you try, take care;
If you abandon keeping away mercy, how result appear.
Sorrow many powerless have cannot be told to father or brother;
Suffer in silence; bear much sorrow, what way can we make out).

Here, the function of tragedy is directly operated through the rhetoric of showing sorrow. Lalita's account of suffering, at three levels, produces pathos in the context of reforms around woman's social life. Lalita is a daughter of a rich landlord. She is accompanied by her servant and dasi (maid servant). She is portrayed like a princess who faces troubles in the play. Dave deals with such treatment of characterization to win the sympathy of audience. He creates the sense of identification with the sorrow in the audience through the use of Lalita's soliloquies and creates the possibility to universalize the theme of suffering which is a result of incompatible marriage in its cultural context. Thus he appeals to the emotional response of the audience in his portrayal of Lalita's suffering on the stage. He portrays the tragic death of Lalita on the stage at the

town hall where the other women collect together to speak against the trend of marriage with incompatible husband (109).

However, one can ask, does Lalita's portrayal really allow it to be universalized? Does the pathos or the karuna rasa created in this play bear the marks of a common Indian woman? G.P. Deshpande, in his article, "Dialectics of Defeat: Some Reflections on Literature, Theatre and Music in Colonial India" argues that the early playwrights maintained a castist position. Deshpande notes that Madhusudan Saraswati's work on the rasa theory had declared the inclusion of Bhakti in the rasas but it did not make any reference to Bhakti poets (2170). It is clear from Dave's representation that he maintains an exclusivist position. It is also noted that Dave had expressed his agitation against Gandhi's support to the lower caste people in Mumbai during his visit in 1913 [*Prashstio* (Eulogies) 95-96].

On the other hand, Dave also seems to show exclusionist position in another context. The writer of the article, "Lalita Dukhdarshak natak ane teno prayogo (*Lalita* and its performance)' explains the kharu mool (true origin) of the emergence of tragedy in Gujarati theatre (65). Both the hero and the heroine die; the death of protagonist becomes inevitable because she continues to live "nana prakar na dukh bhogvi- tethi tan ane man ubhay na bhang thi" (by suffering from small kinds of sorrows-so by failure of both the mind and the body) (65). He expresses his view that high level of tolerance leads the sentiment of karun (pathos) to the zenith in the play (65). He argues that the "shokotkarsha- aa raday tatha netrano dravak darun ant" (this heightening of melancholy- this poignant end with melting of heart and eye) is distinct from Shakespearean tragedies because it does not show nishfal premnu paryavsan (the end of failed love), priya vishayak irshya (the jealousy towards beloved), vairpratikar na pryat na nu parinam (result of attempt of hostile revenge), lobh moh adi moolak kalah va yudh nu avsan" (greed, possessive love etc causing enmity or end of war) (65). Here, the writer suggests that the emergence of tragedy in Gujarati theatre is a distinct in its social function. He considers Dave's tragic genre distinct from *Romeo and Juliet* (1597), *Othello* (1603), *Hamlet* (1603) and *King Lear* (1608) because the tragic end of *Lalita* appeals the readers to be aware with the social reform of women. He specifies the distinct background behind the emergence of tragedy in Gujarati theatre: "grih ashram ma praveshak vivah ma asmantaa thi tatha nich sangati thi uttpann thai bhogvati kashta parampara na falrup chhe, ne teva dukhavah krutyo thi nivruvt

thava rup bodh na moolrup chhe” (it is prime form of moral, because of inequality of participation in the marriage at the stage of household duty and the result created by the legacy of trouble tolerated due to abject company, to emancipate from those paining acts) (65).

The above definition of *Lalita* as a tragedy in Gujarati theatre highlights the thematic aspect of suffering due to kajoda (incompatible marriage) and husband’s immoral character at the centre. The writer explains “vilakshan kavya kaushalya thi raso ni samta ne sankraman” (the distinguished poetic expertise in the integrity and mixture of sentiments) to produce *Lalita* as a new genre: it starts with the sentiments of laughter and beauty and evolves the tragic sentiment in mysterious way; it mediates with the sentiment of ‘raudra’ (anger) and ‘bhayanak’ (terror) keeping the middle less in tragic mode, developing the feeling of melancholy at the right places and the right times and not getting bound to the opposite sentiments; it ends with the protagonist’s account of sorrows and the condemnations to the forces responsible for it and being a moral for them, and in the end, showing the protagonist’s death, affects the minds of the audience with the sentiment of the tragic (65-66).

The discussion in the previous section has already considered the question of the mixture of genres in the making of tragedy in Gujarati theatre. However, the discussion can be taken further if the writer of the article on *Lalita* and its performance argues about the moral dimension of the tragedy in Gujarati that is contextualised in the larger issue of the social reformist view of martial sorrow. This discussion can take two directions: on the one hand, by locating Lalita’s sorrow in the larger context of women’s reforms, one can see the complexities in the notion of sorrow, and on the other hand, by looking at the appropriations of genres in the making of the tragedy, it is possible to make some conclusions about the genre itself.

First of all it needs to be noted how Lalita’s sorrow is contextualised within the binary of a good woman and a bad woman. Dave calls for didacticism and moral idealism in his play. For example, Dave develops the character of Lalita as the embodiment of beauty, education, humility, tolerance, self restraint and not transgressing the Hindu law and order. She remains loyal to her husband. On a new Gujarati stage, she does not belong to another throughout the play. In *Lalita*, the theme of moral law recurs consistently. Dave creates the discourse of reforms around women but the function of reformist discourse operates in the didactic realm. Dave aimed to valorise the virtue of

Lalita as a chaste Hindu high caste woman and made her one of the exemplary heroines in Gujarati literature.

In Act II, scene ii, Jivraaj tells Kamla to convince Lalita not to be aakali (bewildered) out of feeling of separation from husband (27-29). Jivraaj tells Kamla to advise Lalita the importance of self restraint. Kamla is persuaded to adopt the norms from Jivraaj's position (29). She assures him that she will teach Lalita ristyaag (renunciation of passion) (29). When Lalita expresses her anxiety about the failure of conjugality, Kamla ensures her about pehedina punya (the good deeds of previous birth) (30).

Dave constructs the image of Lalita to show that she does not transgress the Hindu law of marriage with incompatible husband. In Act II, scene iii, Prabhavati decides to meet Lalita's parents and persuade them to nullify the unjust marriage. But Lalita informs her about Jivraaj's tharaav (contract) with Dambhraj (41). So she does not want to go against her parents (41). She wants to face the conditions at her father-in-law's house (41). Lalita as a good woman surpasses Prabhavati who is also educated but cannot accept the reality of an unjust relation for the sake of respectability of home. Lalita accepts to bear the sorrow of unexpected match with Nandan. Prabhavati tells Lalita to keep in mind the principle that expectation does not always come true. Therefore, she advises Lalita to keep faith in god and leave her sorrow (38). Though Lalita expresses her sorrow for the bad character of Nandan, she measures her tragic situation on the ground of her belief in the deeds of last birth (39).

Prabhavati is convinced of the intensity of Lalita's sorrow. She compares Lalita's mild nature to a cow (40). Prabhavati also loses her courage when Lalita condemns her parents in anger. But Prabhavati sympathizes and provides her encouragement. But she does not find any solution to help Lalita to bring her out of sorrowful state. Like Lalita, she also becomes helpless. She advises Lalita to be sincere and endure the fate of incompatible marriage. Prabhavati advises Lalita to condemn her parents for the feeling of unjust in her mind but not in public. Lalita expresses her sorrow and prepares herself to face the reality of the marital custom (38-41)

Dave represents the virtue of good woman in her companionship with the husband. He constructs the image of Lalita who is respectful to her husband and considers him above her. In Act II, scene ii, Lalita sings a song in her bedroom alone (29). She defines the good woman: "Je naari saari sadguni te, shobhe saasavase re" (that woman who is virtuous, gets dignity at in-law's

home) (29). Lalita believes that she should accompany her husband and live at the home of her father-in-law because good woman takes birth at her parents' home but she lives with her piyu (husband) (29). Lalita explains that she feels the domestic life sunu sunu (lonely) and suffers from the feeling of separation from her husband (29). Lalita sighs because she has not got the chance of svamiseva (to serve her husband) even in the dream (29).

Dave represents Lalita as a true chaste woman. In Act III, scene x, Lalita becomes a widow (77). Pooranmal offers Lalita a chance of living a happy life by becoming his mistress (77-78). Pooranmal is bribed by Chhaldas and Priyamvada to kidnap Lalita and kill her but he wants to make the agreement with Lalita. He tells her to become his mistress and live happily as her husband is dead. He expresses his desire to love her and reluctance to hurt her. On this, Lalita is provoked and expresses her resistance by telling him that she can kill him with a knife if she keeps it (78). She resists him and does not care for her life. She hits him in the chest with her head and falls down (78).

In Act IV, scene v, Lalita prays to God to grant her courage to protect her chastity (88). Lalita sings a dohra (couplet) when she comes to know that Chandravali wants to convert her into a courtesan (88). Lalita observes the insects that climb and descend with saliva rapidly in Chandravali's house (88). Lalita prays to God to give her strength in her helpless situation. Lalita becomes an ideal wife in her escape because she takes inspiration in the name of God. Also, in Act IV, scene iii, Lalita attempts to escape the harem of the fort of Parvatpuri Kingdom (81-82). Lalita sings the prayer in raga Anand Bhairavi when she finds no way to escape (82). She decides to jump into the river at the cost of her life. Before Lalita takes the risk, she sings calling God to save her. She expresses herself as a miserable woman and seeking the divine shelter. She expresses her doubt of imprisonment and feels the increase of sorrow. She prays God to set her free from her sorrows and jumps into the river (82). Here, Lalita's courage suggests the safeguard to the respectability of her cultural code. The incident of Lalita's entrapments and her escapes is preceded with the coincidental and divine helps in the play. Lalita's troublesome situation is repeatedly located in the religious domain.

The idea of cultural threat regarding the repressed sexuality of Lalita can be noted in the play. In Act II, scene ii, Kamla reports to Jivraaj that Lalita takes offence without any serious fault of others (27). The maid servant conjectures that it is so because Lalita has grown up and she is not in her right

place (28). Her comment reflects the sense of danger in losing one's chastity (28). Kamla is warned by her maid servant to send Lalita to her in-laws. She tells Kamla that a married woman is like a horse which should be controlled to protect the respectability of home (28). A good woman is 'chaste' and 'pure'. It suggests the fear of guilt in the mind of Kamla about her daughter's impatience. Lalita is compared with the horse of stable (28). Lalita's parents worry because they find the characteristics of losing one's chastity in her attitude.

In Act III, scene viii, when Lalita meets Nandan, she does not like his looks and express her disgust at his dull attitude (69). But Lalita accepts Nandan because she cannot bear the physical desire, which she expresses in her soliloquy with the use of shikharinee vrutt:

Nathi rasto bijo, pati par abhavo kyam karu,
 Bhale rudo bhundo priya pati ganine man tharu; (69)
 (There is no other way out, how to express aversion on husband,
 Let him be either good or bad, pacify mind considering dear husband ;)

Lalita express the incompatible outlook of Nandan. She finds the external features *kalo* (black) *rabha* (stupid person) *bhaybhit thayelo baldiyo* (Frightened ox) (68). However, Lalita does not find defects in Nandan and accepts to love him (69). She represents an ideal woman who accepts the conjugal relation irrespective of any resistance once it is formed.

Dave interprets the reformism in terms of education for women. But he considers education for women to be of secondary importance to the relationship to the husband. He constructs the image of educated woman in the discourse of home. A good woman represents home and assist husband on the way of reformism. In Act III, scene iii, when Lalita is harassed by Karksha and Kajiyabai, Gulab interferes and advises Karkasha to be calm and control the quarrelsome nature of Kajiyabai (53-57). Gulab emphasizes on education for women to assist the husband. Gulab explains that she was backward five years before but as her husband hired a teacher to educate her, they can live happily (57).

In the Act III, scene vii, Dambhraj appears and criticizes the quarrelsome women for torturing a good wife like Lalita (65). Dambhraj gets angry with his daughter and wife for their harassment of Lalita (65-66). He sympathizes with Lalita for her unfortunate condition. He appreciates her tolerance and patience of her behaviour as the sign of "kulinpanu" (the standard of high caste respectability) (66). He requests Lalita to take care of his

unreformed home through her understanding. Lalita assures Dambhraj of her loyalty to her in law's home and advises him to believe in God (66-67).

Against the background of respectability of home, which is represented by the model of Lalita, Prabhavati, Kamla and Gulab, Dave sets the badness in the characters of Priyamvada, Chandravali, Karkasha and Kajiyabai. The characters of Priyamvada and Chandravali are constructed in stereotypical manner. They are highlighted as bad women on account of their profession as ganika (courtesan). Dave uses the diminishing term veshyaa (prostitute) in the play (107). He represents the image of bad woman in their attitude of pretence, greed and immorality. They are not portrayed in the domestic sphere.

However, Dave constructs the image of bad woman inside the domain of the home too. The nuances of this characterization can be understood with reference to the figures of "Lakshmi" and "Alakshmi" as explained by Chakrabarty and discussed in the Introduction (see the section on Women's Question).

Judith Walsh, in her book, *Domesticity in Colonial India*, investigates the politics of men when they advised their women in colonial India. Walsh uses the phrase "global domesticity" in perspectives of domestic literatures from England and America as well as in India (11). She argues that the development of Gujarati, Bengali and Hindi and other languages and domestic literature in the advent of print charged the process of "naturalization", "politicization and "contextualization" of woman's space (2). The writing of manuals- "advice literatures" in Indian languages sexualized all nouns and did not have sexless gender to make colonized people think of their daily chores and conduct (2). Walsh's study makes the fact clear that the Indian debates about how to become 'modern' went far beyond the introduction of English (the latest enlightenment ideologies) (2). Walsh notes that the process of "Naturalization" of woman's space:

"civilized way to behave/live-needed in each small matters to move practices associated with home and family life out of the unconscious depths of collective social identity and up into conscious consideration" (2).

Tanika Sarkar, in her article, "Domesticity and Middle Class Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Bengal", notes that the relation between the critique of 'modern' mores in the form of play-scripts in Bengali and the representation of Hindu home as the site of conservation of domestic values such as love, purity and chastity assumed the all possible functions of patriarchy to represent the

Hindu woman both in inside and outside the home (159-167). Dipesh Chakrabarty, in his article, "Limits of Bourgeoisie Model?" explains the fear of looking "unoriginal" in the reformist writers (178). He makes the difference of human realm clear in "*Mangal kavya* (Auspicious poems)", where it is never separated from "the realms of gods and spirits", to the Christian text where "the distinction between the divine and the human do not apply" in the narrative aspect (197). It can be understood that both the Hindu and Christian texts combine divine and human but they are different in terms of the experience of temporal reality. For the reformers, the imagination of past was at work with "the European imagination of progress" in incompatible way (180). The connection of two realms human and divine worked as an alternative to the social life as "the dark age or kaliyug" in present (192). On the contrary, the reformers did not find the practices of kinship and family in narrative of Christian text intact from historical point of view (196-197). This allowed the reformers, as Chakrabarty notes, to use the image of "Alakshmi" "interchangeably" to defend against the model of Victorian memsahib and traditional model of past in terms of jealousy, ignorance and quarrelsome nature of uneducated woman (197).

In this context, Walsh insists on undertaking the study of manuals with the perspective of "hybridity" as derivative not only in Indian terms but English and American because it offers new ideas both in local and foreign context (25). It should be noted that the historical function of imagination in reformist aesthetics marks the domestic manuals centring the new model of housewife which signified "a nationalist sublime" (197). It could show the social life comparable to "heaven" (197). It could not be assimilable to the Eurocentric vision of reforms of woman in domestic sphere of Indian society.

Following Dipesh Chakrabarty and Tanika Sarkar's comments, it can be argued, first, that Dave's didactic approach, in terms of his use of manuals and the binary of good and bad woman under the cultural threat of repressed sexuality, reflects the conditions and structures in the private sphere that could compensate the reformers for their loss of power and position in public life. Secondly, the introduction of English through Shakespeare in Gujarati forced Dave to gloss over both the sites of rupture and continuity of past traditions in its guidance by and in opposition to the colonial presence. The same infusion of reformist sentiments accompanied the development of other literary genres. The emergence of tragedy cannot be seen just as a radical break with the literary

mode and in social and cultural sensibilities existing before. Dave is more centrally involved in creating a rupture with past practices and in the evolution of new sensibilities and persona. The horizon of Dave's imagination of progress was involved with the sense of struggle for social reform in the contemporary public sphere. So, in the making of a new genre, Dave's selective and strategic appropriation can be understood. In this context, the final Section analyses the theatrical traditions which Dave incorporated in the formation of a new genre. It aims to unravel the formation of a "hybrid" genre in its cultural context. It attempts to understand the "hybridity" developed by Dave in his composition of *Lalita* in 1866 during his association with Parsi enterprise and its performance in 1878 after his disassociation with the Parsi theatre company.

***Lalita* and the Making of the Genre of Tragedy**

In addition to the points made in the earlier discussion of the mixture of theatrical and textual traditions in the making of *Lalita*, it is important to note significant genres explored in it. Women's lament is one such genre that finds a major presence in *Lalita*.

Parita Mukta, in her article, "The Civilizing Mission: The Regulation and Control of Mourning in Colonial India" argues that the male reformers constructed "the domestic ideology" in specific way through "privatization and interiorization of women's grief" so that women could maintain the code of honour and honesty in their righteousness (25). Mukta argues that the discourse "naturalized the laments in a very specific space" and made them "resonant and identifiable with a melancholic and romantically inscribed landscape" (34). In the case of emergence of tragedy in Gujarati as a genre, Mukta's analysis of discourse of lament can be further understood with the help of Alexander Forbes' comments in his *Ras Mala; or Hindoo Annals of the Province of Goozerat in Western India* (1978):

"His description of lamenting women (below) does three things: first it situates the lament within the domain of a dramatically public display of a loss of a social relationship. Second, and *incontrovertibly*, the description of this display of grief (in a significant public space, open to the eyes of the colonial viewer) places the laments in a theatrical setting akin to a Greek tragedy. This description was then bounded by a tacit acknowledgement between the colonial writer and his readers that

what they were viewing was not only pre-modern, but alien (for this was no classical drama was performed in a theatre)" (emphasis added 34).

The sense of "recognition"³ in the colonized allows him to recognize the space between desire and its fulfilment to attain visibility in cultural domain (Bhabha 150). It could not be possible for Dave to respond the existing power structure without the representation of Lalita's sorrow as it was prescribed in *Rasmala* by Forbes. In this context, it should also be noted that Dave translated *Rasmala* into Gujarati in 1869 (Chavda 35). It is clear that the import of tragedy could be assimilated with the indigenous form on the base of mutual negotiation between colonizer and the colonized. In this process, as Isaka points out in her article, "Gujarati Intellectuals and History Writing in the Colonial Period", that Dave as one of the Gujarati intellectuals appropriated and modified certain "ideas and idioms introduced under British rule and others existing in the local society" and began to reformulate caste and religious identities and articulate regional identity and Indian nationalism (4867). Dave was obliged to define *Lalita* a 'modern' play by supposing an analogy between Greek tragedy and local sensibilities as pre-modern or alien. It is important to note that Dave's use of Shakespeare from technical point of view is not less significant but it underscores wider implications in the emergence of tragedy in the cultural context of Gujarat. So, the plot design of *Lalita* and resonance of Shakespeare cannot be seen in isolation on the superficial ground of structure but it imbricates with several discourses in the process of consolidating colonial power. It allows to question: why did the appropriation of lament become essential for the reformist playwrights to interact with colonizer and participate in the colonial discourse of civilizing mission?

Mukta notes that the relationship between the death and mourning was changed in the "quietist (devotional) form" from the "transgressive form of mourning whereby women exhibited spectacular form through lament" (25). It again points to the cultural threat in the public with the presence of sorrowful woman in pre-modern form.

In *Lalita*, the relationship between suffering and the high caste women's lament is located in the domain of righteousness. It can be noted that though

³ I have borrowed this term from Homi K. Bhabha, "Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis* 28 (1984): 125-133. JSTOR. Web. 12 Jan. 2013.

women participate in the public sphere at the end of the play, the public sphere is created on the stage in relation to the domain of mourning. It shows the absence of women in public gatherings in ironical sense despite the entry of Brahmin women into the educational institutes. Mukta notes: "Women were not allowed to participate in the proceedings of Gujarat Vernacular Society even till the first decade of the twentieth century" (33).

It signifies emotional solidarity but does not show fully the political solidarity (though a threat as significant point) in real sense. Mukta points the implication of suffering in the loss of cultural pattern of behaviour:

"The naturalizing of lament obliterated the structured and highly social nature of lament, which provided a forum both for the woman lamenters to cry out against her socially designated status and, for the airing of social grievances" (Mukta 34).

Dave naturalizes the discourses of lament in very specific space making them recognizable in a melancholic space. However, at the end of the play, the lament provides Lalita, Prabhavati and other women, who are assembled at the town hall, the space for voicing the truth of incompatible marriage which can cause tragedy in woman's life (106-111). Lalita hurls accusations against Nandan, her mother-in-law and sister-in-law; she is provided a space to criticize the parents who look for high caste status only (106). She also criticizes the courtesans, the villain, the polygamous king, and the killer agents while her lament uses the space to appreciate the loyalty of a servant (106-107). Prabhavati and other women criticize the position of Hindu men for their ignorance of Indian culture and suggest them to stop the ill marriages (109-111). Mukta argues that such collective accusation could even "threaten the men of emerging Gujarati middle class" in the late nineteenth century (34).

Lata Mani, in "Multiple Mediations: Feminist Scholarship in the Age of Multinational Reception" argues that the female body is a "zone" (24). She questions the "positionality" and "location" in the context of reception of colonial knowledge (25). She notes that the abolition of sati in 1829 showed the concern for women secondary to 'tradition' (35). Dave's mode of showing Lalita's sorrow is significant but his interpretation of *dukh* is positivist because he emphasizes the observable facts and excludes theoretical speculation about ultimate causes. Though Lalita and the women assemble and speak in public sphere, they function in the "inner" domain of home (Chatterjee 244). Mani calls such representation of woman related to "civilizing impulses of colonialism and

modernizing desires of proto-nationalism" (36). Mani's analysis points out that the problematic discourse of sati was not a human subject invested with notions of personal dignity and subjectivity (37). She rejects the suffering of Hindu woman as a realistic suffering body in the colonial context (37). It can be argued that Dave represents Lalita's suffering in terms of a concept of *dukh* which stands as a hallmark of tradition. The safeguard of tradition becomes the condition to emancipate Lalita even by showing Lalita's death at the end of the play.

Swati Joshi, in her article, "Dalpatram and the Nature of Literary Shifts in Nineteenth-century Ahmedabad" notes the two major issues of debate among the Gujarati reformers: "the crossing of the sea and widow remarriage" (347). She argues that these two "taboos ensured for themselves larger reception and therefore possibilities of larger consensus" when they are caste into the fictional space of Gujarat's literary history (347). The reformist intellectuals believed that the notion of chastity could impose women to accept the ideal of social reform and stop them misleading on the path of prostitution or remarriage (348). The cultural threat of losing women's chastity is one of the dangers in the ambivalent position of the early Gujarati playwrights.

Dave valorises Lalita's purity and chastity. Dave does not seem to have supported widow remarriage. He shows Lalita's resistance against Pooranmal, her escapes from the harem of the king of Parvatpuri and Chandravali's attempt to convert her into a courtesan. Dave employs the repetition of escapes and the sorrow tolerated in overcoming the escapes establishes its relation with the notion of Lalita's suffering.

Though the pathos dominates in the play, the essential basis of *dukhdarshak natak* is not the emotions related to the suffering of Lalita and the act of lament in the theatrical language mediated through the use of soliloquies and songs. The discourse of *dukh* primarily unfolds or creates an opening where the playwright is himself left behind valorising the concept of *dukh* related to woman's question. It is not Dave who constitutes the theme of suffering in virtual sense but the context of reforms around Gujarati women in which the text is situated in colonial period.

Tzvetan Todorov, in his essay, "The Origin of Genre", uses term, "*discursive property*", to explain the emergence of genre (162). He uses the term in "inclusive sense" because the properties such as comedy, tragedy, sonnet, songs, autobiography, epic and novel arise from "the pragmatic aspect" "(the

relation between the users)" of texts (163). He argues that genres exist as an institution and function as "horizons of expectations" for readers and "models of writing" for authors (163). Todorov observes the origin of genre on account of relation between the author and the reader. Todorov uses the term "generic system" which encompasses both the author and reader as a mutual function and establishes their relationship through "institutionalization" in the society (163). Todorov points to the ideological framework in which the relation between the genre and society operates in distinct way.

In the context of Gujarat, the ideological framework can be illustrated through the citation of Gujarati journals, the girls' schools and training institutes. Mahalakshmi Female Training College in Ahmedabad was established in 1874 and the Barton Female Training College of Rajkot was established in 1885 (Mukta 32). Shirin Mehta, in her article, "Women Journalism in Gujarati: A Study in Gender Perception (1850-1920)" investigates women's consciousness through popular writings, literature and journalism of the period 1850-1920 in Gujarat. She questions the "difference in women's perception of contemporary issues from those of men sensing the tone of ideology" they focussed upon (90). *Stri-Bodh* (1857) was the first woman's journal in Gujarati (S. Mehta 90). Kabraji started it and later the Parsi women edited the articles and proved that they could assimilate the culture of occupying power (S. Mehta 90). *Stri-Mitra* (1867) was introduced by Parsi social reformers Rustamji Ranina but it was closed down in 1907 (S. Mehta 91). Unlike theses magazines published from Bombay, *Gujarati Shala Patra* (1861) was the first non-Parsi magazine (S. Mehta 91). It was edited by Mahipatram Rupram (S. Mehta 91). The Parsi promoters incorporated non-Parsi men such as Karsandas Mulji, Mangaldas Nathabhai, and Nanabhai Haridas in the Board of Editors in 1868 to make the magazine commercially viable but the articles continued to keep "a moderate liberal stance and did not join the debate on contentious issues" (S. Mehta 90).

Shirin Mehta notes the tradition of reform through garba song titled, "Strione Shikhamanona Garba" (a garba song to advice girls) which was accepted by the government girls' schools to be sung in the prayers before the daily classes (91). Mehtaji Vrajbhukhan Dalpatram of a Government School, Godhavi in Saurashtra wrote the garba song (S Mehta 91). Mehta notes that the garba song so widely circulated that its price was reduced to one anna from four annas and the girls were advised to be polite, womanly and enduring (91). *The Times of India* dated 5th October notes the historical background of the garba

songs. Parth Shashtri reported that “Many were in form of Satire and *Kajoda no Garbo* (Song on Incompatible Marriage) that narrates social evils” by citing the sociologist, Gaurang Jani who had spoken about the trend to record the important happenings in his book, *Ognismi Sadi nu Gujarat Granthma* (The Nineteenth Century Gujarat in the Book).

Thus the institutionalization included learning of new ways to articulate and affirm the emotional bonds within the Gujarati high caste society. The theme of suffering is mobilized through the use of popular genre of garba songs among the Gujarati women audience in specific manner. So, it is both the rupture and the use of pre modern tradition to appropriate the notion of suffering. Dave does not solely use of Sanskritized metres but employs local songs based on the popular tunes and sub tunes integral to the shared culture of Gujarati women, as discussed earlier. In *Lalita*, the representation of Lalita appears to be the redefinition of the images like Sati, Sita and Savitri. The representation of Lalita echoes in the rendering of traditional narrative based on, for instance, Savitri who overcomes the obstacles to save her husband back from the god of death. Such narrative resonance is consolidated more and more and slips into contradictory fact that it brings change in the very discourse of reforms around women. It creates the productive difficulty in justifying the voice of women. One side, Dave constitutes Lalita’s subjective formation of suffering in a variety of ways.

However, the selective appropriation of local forms is filtered through an equally selective adoption of the new western discourses. Dave is selective in adopting liberalism, enlightenment and scientific approach. This adoption shapes Dave’s critique of some of the local forms of theatre which he considered inappropriate to the idea of his theatre.

Dave developed the theme of incompatible marriage from his critique of Bhavai (*Natak* 48). This popular genre became a site where Dave was enforced to create the language of high and low literature and its interplay with the construction of bad woman and good woman. The next paragraph explains Dave’s appropriation of Bhavai and the mode of representation of the theme of kajoda in new way.

In Act II, scene ii, Panthiram sings a song to define Nandan’s discrepancy for his idiocy and immorality (Dave, *Lalita* 34-36). In Act III, scene viii, Lalita, in her soliloquy, sings in shikharinee metre in her mind and uses animal imagery when she confirms incompatible features of her husband (68-

69). She salutes Nandan in traditional manner but he does not understand her greeting and stands like bhaybhit thayelo baldiyo (frightened ox) (68). Thus Dave modernizes the folk theme of kajoda. He raises the question of character as he develops it in philosophical language too. In Act III, scene v, Buddhisagar sings dohra to explain Dambhraj the nature of his son:

Ajaat Mrut, ne murakh ma, var be adi, na chhe;
Ek vaar dukh adi de, pade pade de chheh (61)
(In unborn, dead and idiot, two men are not the first;
the first cause sorrow for once, the second cause sorrow at each step)

Buddhisagar explain Dambhraj that the company of an idiot brings sorrow at each step and considers the dead body better than the company of an idiot man (61). It should be noted that although Dave accumulates Lalita's account of sorrows through popular form of songs, he excludes its use in Lalita's account of kajoda in her soliloquy; Dave includes the use of Sanskritized metre; for instance, "shikharinee" to portray Nandan as incompatible (68).

Further, Lalita observes Nandan when he is asleep. In Act III, scene viii, Lalita chooses to sleep away on a couch because she is warned by Nandan (71). Lalita cannot sleep because Nandan ghure chhe (snores) and balle chhe (babbles) in his sleep (71). She looks khasna folla (scars of itch) on his hands in plenty (71). She feels disgusted when she finds the scars on his whole body. She looks the dadar (ringworm) on his waist (71).

Dave's selection of the actors and the training he gave them further emphasizes his choices. For Nandan's role he chose a short man named Maneklal Mehta because his physical features were suitable to the image: levai gayela bandha no, ankhe kano (of emaciated body, one eyed) (*Natak* 58). Dave explains that he could train Maneklal Mehta because he was dhyadamro (having the appearance of wisdom but inwardly cunning) and a vaniyo (of bania caste, merchant) of Surat (58). This also helped him to maintain Surati gat (the speech pattern located in Surat) well (58). Dave writes:

Tene kagal lakhva besadyo, lakhta lkhta ketlik jeebh kahaadi tenu chalan valan kare chhe, tem karvani bataavani kari. Kagal lakhta "chachchajeeni ni chopdi" adi kathan ni kuthli kem karvi, kagal upar sahi no tapko te kem chhaati javo ityadi na chala batavya (I made him enact sitting and writing a letter; displayed how to put a bit of tongue out while writing and imitating this style. I showed him how to behave in a childlike manner and recite "chachchajeeni ni chopdi" and lick the ink on the page) (58).

Such nature of his selection of actor highlights the theme of kajoda. Dave uses the instruction of action of the actor in the bracket. It develops the theatrical realism. In Act III, scene viii, when Nandan appears on the stage, he smokes and hurls his bidi (cigarette) in anger (Dave, *Lalita* 69).

On the other hand, it is important to see his selection of the (male) actor for the role of Lalita. Dave explains that he selected a boy who was goro (fair) rupalo (beautiful) and had a chamak (spark) like a star in his eyes (*Natak* 57). He could recite well but Dave trained him to enact well the traditional forms of ashchraya (surprise) dhikkar (condemnation) and pranamni ada (the style of greeting) (57).

Kathryn Hansen, in her essay, "Making Women Visible: Gender and Race Cross- Dressing in the Parsi Theatre" notes that the respectable image of Gujarati woman was attached to the material male body so that it could be useful for both men and women in the public and help them assert their colonial modernity in representation (140). The visibility of Hindu women appeared paradoxical because "the external markers of femininity- the armour of correct sari, hairdo, and jewellery, together with appropriate gestures" made it easier for women to begin to move in public (Hansen 140). Anuradha Kapur, in her article, "Impersonation, Narration, Desire, and the Parsi Theatre", uses the term "theatrical modernity" which the female impersonators were taught to display in their presence on the stage (93). Kapur suggests a quest of the playwright, who trained the characters in strategic way, to achieve the sense of visibility in society. Kapur defines theatrical modernity in "the second phase of acting tradition" which presents the self in the institutionalize domain and adopts "the traits of the actor/person to become the character, as strategy" (93).

In this way, Lalita's good behaviour is highlighted to develop the kajoda theme on the stage. Dave, in his article, argues against the indigenous performance of bhavaiyas: the folk actors showed the young bride punished by the small child (her husband) in hilarious way (*Natak* 48). He advocates that the issue of incompatible marriage was a subject of sorrow and sympathy towards the brides and not laughter (48-49). His appropriation is based on the question of *effect* on the audience after the performance (Emphasize mine, 49). In this context, the writer's description of *Lalita* as tragedy in the referred article on *Lalita* and its Performance from Gujarati archive is significant. The writer locates *Lalita* in the class of shokavasanik rupak (an allegory of melancholic death) (65).

He points out two aspects which define it as a tragedy in cultural context of Gujarati theatre:

First,

jyare ne tyare te te karunamay dekhav drashti agal pure chhe, ne teve, teve prasange manovrutti na pravah ne viprit marge chadhi jato atkave chhe, jem anubhuta shiksha nu smaran aparaadhi ni punh pravrutti ne nivare chhe (whenever the pathetic scenes are displayed in front of the sight, it stops the stream of tendency in mind from leading to the opposite path, like the remembrance of punishment once experienced, cures the guilty from repetition of the activity) (65).

Second,

Samanyatah bahulokpriya hasya ne shringar raso to karuna virodhi hovathi teonu darshan ghanij kushalta tatha yukti thi karavu pade chhe (In general, more popular sentiments of laughter and erotic are opposite to tragic, to display their spectacle requires immense expertise and trick) (65).

In his analysis of *Lalita*, the anonymous writer points out the prominence of pathos and the seriousness of craft in his perception as the sentiments of laughter and tragic are in opposition to each other. He notes Dave's aim to teach morality and represent a new image of Gujarati woman to achieve cultural respectability. It denotes the politics of 'pathos' and appropriation of 'popular' aspects of theatre.

Dave appropriated *Kajoda no Vesh* and included the episode of domestic harassment in new fashion. Dave explains further in his essay that he aimed to produce karun rasa which he did not see in the popular treatment of kajoda theme (*Natak* 56). Dave denounced the representation of vhaali vahu (dear bride) and her "aturta bhareli adhirai ane ulat bhareli karnina lajamna havbhav" (impatience full of curiosity and shameful expression opposite to moral acts) in *Kajoda no Vesh* produced the feeling of laaj (shame) out of crude laughter (48-49). He did not show a quarrelsome wife but a gentle wife who is not blunt but tolerant with the in-laws' bitter words. He took care to maintain the traditional image of Lalita in her behaviour and speech. Lalita does not complain about the incompatible husband to the in-laws.

Dave raised the question of respectability in Bhavai and its theatrical representation of social problems. He develops the enactment of incompatibility between Lalita and Nandan in the tragic mode. He claimed theatrical modernity of Gujarati stage in his appropriation of kajoda at one hand and in his view on the experience of pathos in theatre on the other.

Dave, in his article, gives the account of his attempts to reform the local performance of bhavaiyas (the folk actors of Bhavai) went hand in hand to the British education inspectors and the native intelligentsia: he visited Ahmadabad and worked with Rao Saheb Mahipatram Rupram Nilkanth, a guiding force to most of the reform associations of Ahmedabad including Vernacular Society such as Vidhva Vivah Uttejak Mandali (Widow Remarriage association); Bal Lagna Nishedhak Mandali (Anti Child Marriage association), Hindu Sansar Sudhara Samaj, Anjuman-e-Islam, Ahmadabad Municipality and such other public institutions and associations and also the secretary of the Buddhivardhak Sabha, established in 1852 by Narmad with Parsi students at the Elphinstone college (52;Raval 4). Dave worked with M.R. Nilkanth to teach the folk actors not to display vulgar and sexual implications and to maintain pronunciation of the words in moral way (*Natak* 52). Dave and Nilkanth both assisted to the Education Inspector, John Russell (1792-1878), a British administrator in Gujarat, who watched Bhavai and provided suggestions on its reformation (51-52).

The anonymous writer admires Dave for his making of *Lalita* as a new genre and its performance on the stage because it established “saraday-gamya anek guno ane rasabharta thi” (qualities appealing to the heart with full of sentiment) (65). S.K. Das in his book quotes Shiv Kumar Joshi’s observation with reference to the nineteenth century Gujarati drama (278). Joshi argues that although Ranchhod Dave and Dahyabhai Dholshaji Zaveri were associated with the popular theatre, they themselves were “regulated by it instead of regulating the popular taste” because the aim of entertainment was the main motive (Das 278). Das notes that the “Indian theatre and dramatic literature had to reckon with the demands of the general audience and compromise with popular taste” in 1870s (184).

It can be argued that Dave failed at some places to be consistent in his rhetoric of dukhdarshak natak. For example, it is comic to find Lalita when she identifies herself as ardhangna (the part of the body) of Nandan (Dave, *Lalita* 69). In Act III, Scene viii, she addresses him with salutations such as priyapati, prannath or pranpati (69). Lalita sings to convince Nandan her love for him in tune to raga Mahaad (69-70). On this, Nandan uses the abusing words such as gadhedi, raand and chhakti and keeps on kicking her (70). Dave tries to expose the disgusting characteristics of Nandan by showing him balle chhe (snoring and murmuring in sleep) (71). Also, the episode of domestic harassment

involves unnecessary inclusion of taunting songs which the women of neighbourhood sing and create a fiasco (52-53). Such theatrical exaggeration loses the effect of tragic in creating the feeling of pity.

Sandria Freitag, in her book, *Culture and Power in Banaras: Community, Performance and Environment, 1800-1980* explores the site of performance and its relation with the power on the stage in the cultural milieu of Banaras. Freitag notes that the Parsi actors “could turn the prevailing social codes upside down and provoke” the social reality by way of reaction although temporarily (77). The Parsi theatre was more apt to hold the crowd in “the public display of eroticism, in the extremes of pathos and melodrama, in the latest gimmicks and spectacles” (Freitag 77).

Vasudha Dalmia, in the chapter, “The National Drama of the Hindus” notes Bharatendu Harishchandra’s problem with the visiting commercial Parsi theatres and its actors who enacted the role of noble hero Dushyanta dancing “salaciously with his hands on his waist like a dancing girl” (40). Dalmia points out the misguided state of British government by such “coarse representation of Hindu drama” from the Hindu reformist point of view (40). She notes that it was Harishchandra who judiciously modified Sanskrit traditions and conventions to achieve the needs of the times and its goals (41). His modified conventions were “distinctly re-oriented towards the socially corrective and politically progressive” (41).

In Gujarat, the Bhavai, *Kajodano Vesh* provided the stimulus to the reversal of social rule on a simple stage. Kathryn Hansen notes that this folk play was displaced to the cosmopolitan centre of Bombay (Gupt 51). Apakhtyar’s Parsi Stage Players produced *Kajora no Skech* (The Plot of Unfit Match) with the inclusion of music and songs, in which a twelve year old girl is married to an old man (Gupt 51). In his article, Dave states that he laughed at Kabraji while guiding him to perform the play, *Nal-Damyanti* (Nal and Damyanti) (1877): when Dave suggested Kabraji to enact het uparathi batlave (showing affection in superficial way), Kabraji directed his finger to the sky in inappropriate manner and misinterpreted Dave’s use of word uparathi (superficial) (*Natak* 53). However, it should be noted that although Dave dissociated from the Parsi theatre and established Gujarati Natak Mandal, his early association helped him write and perform *Lalita* in the modern tradition invented by the Parsi playwright to keep its closeness to middle-class popular taste.

Dave imagined the middle class culture with the notion of purity of language and integrity of moral. His problem was with the question of behaviour or attitude. A biographical article, published in *Samalochak* in July-September, 1905, "Vidhyaman Gurjar Granthkaro" (The Existing Gujarati Writers), explains Dave's contribution to the Gujarati drama and his loyal contact with and support from the British officers and the Gujarati intelligentsia: Dave supported the thoughts of ancient religion in his social plays *Jay Kumari Vijaya* (Jay Kumari's Victory) (1864) and *Lalita* by taking the side of true and good reform; his other plays such as *Madalasa* (1878), *Banasur mad-mardan* (Taming of Banasur's Arrogance) (1878) and *Nal-Damyanti* (1893) were performed (the first two were performed by Mumbai Natak Mandali in 1890s) and engrossed the audience and impressed them with the tone of righteousness till the end of the show; the songs of the plays became so popular that women could sing them with ease (173). Dave established a new aestheticism on the Gujarati stage to standardize the dramas low in taste and by that means refined successfully the interest, tendency, mentality and conduct of the people (*Vidhyaman* 169-174).

Similar to Bharatendu's theatrical mode of representation that predicated the social reality "on the values of control, order and refinement", Dave became the chief exponent of such elite theatre with the establishment of Gujarati Natak Mandali in 1878(Freidman 77). According to Acharya, Dave aimed to bring "Peace, order and good government" (225). In Dave's framework of aesthetics of Gujarati stage and standardization of Gujarati language, he developed the "didactic realism" (as Aniket Jaaware and Urmila Bhirdikar views in the popularity of tragedy in Marathi) (46) and "mimetic" realism (which was achieved as noted by Anuradha Kapur, following the tradition of the Parsi theatre by printed curtains and impersonation of male actors) (98) in *Lalita* and on the Gujarati stage. It also conjoined the juxtaposition of good woman and bad woman in the nexus of 'high' and 'low' art. The dissertation proceeds with Chapter 2 to explain how the nexus of 'high' and 'low' is reflected by discussing the two Kajoda plays in comparison to *Lalita*.

WORKS CITED

- Acharya, Dr. Jayshankar. "Gurjar Rangbhumina Prakhar Subhechhaknu Sansmaran" [Remembrance of the Passionate Well-Wisher of Gujarati Stage]. *Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 223- 225. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis* 28 (1984): 125-133. JSTOR. Web. 12 Jan. 2013.
- ."Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical Inquiry* 12.1 (1985): 144-165. JSTOR. Web. 1 Jan. 2013.
- Bharucha, Hiralal. "Ranchhodhbhai-Gujaratna Shakespear" [Ranchhodhbhai- The Shakespeare of Gujarat]. *Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1937. 213-215. Print.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Limits of the Bourgeois Model?" *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010.178-201. Print.
- Dave, Jagdish. *Gujarati ane Marathi Samajik Natak, 1850-1900*. (Gujarati and Marathi Social Plays, 1850-1900) Ahmedabad: Vasant Prakashan, 2000. Print.
- Dave, Ranchhod Udayram. *Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak* [A Play Revealing Lalita's Sorrow]. 6th ed. Mumbai, 1866. Print.
- ."Mehlomani Prachin Natakshala [The Ancient Theatre of Palaces]." *Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1937. 67-73. Print.
- ."Natakno Prarambh" [The Beginning of Drama]. *Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 46-64. Print.
- ."Rasaprakash-rasa [Treatise on the Sentiment]." *Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodhbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1937. 12-19. Print.
- Das, Sisir Kumar. *A History of Indian Literature: Western Impact: Indian Response, 1800-1910*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademy, 1991. Print.

- Deshpande, G.P. "Dialectics of Defeat: Some Reflections on Literature, Theatre and Music in Colonial India." *EPW* 22.51 (1987): 2170-2176. *JSTOR*. Web. 30 April 2012.
- Ebeling, Sascha. Introduction. *Colonizing Realm of Words: The Transformation of Nineteenth Century Tamil Literature in South India*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2010. 1-20. Print.
- Freitag, Sandria, B., ed. *Culture and Power in Banaras: Community, Performance and Environment 1800-1980*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989. Web. 4 June 2013. <<http://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/view?docId=ft6p3007sk;brand=ucpress>>.
- Gupt, Somnath. *The Parsi Theatre: Its Origin and Development*. Trans. and ed. Kathryn Hansen. Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2005. Print.
- Hansen, Kathryn. "Making Women Visible: Gender and Race Cross-Dressing in the Parsi Theatre." *Theatre Journal* 51.2 (1999):127-147. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 May. 2013.
- Isaka, Riho. "Gujarati Intellectuals and History Writing in the Colonial Period." *EPW* 37.48 (2002): 4867-4872. *JSTOR*. Web. 8 Sept. 2012.
- Jani, Balwant. *Lokgurjari* [Folk Literature of Gujarat]. vol. 23. Ed. Balwant Jani. Gandhinagar: Gujarat Sahitya Academy, 2011. 113. Print.
- Joshi, Sanjay. Introduction. *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010. xv-lvi. Print.
- Joshi, Swati. "Dalpatram and the Nature of Literary Shifts in Nineteenth-century Ahmedabad." *India's Literary History*. Eds. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 327-357. Print.
- Kapur, Anuradha. "Impersonation, Narration, Desire, and the Parsi Theatre." *India's Literary History*. Eds. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 87-118. Print.
- "*Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak ane Teno Prayog* The Tragedy of Lalita-Dukh-Darshak" [Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak and Its Performance]. *Samalochak* 1.3 (1896): 63-68, 94-99. Print.
- Mani, Lata. "Multiple Mediations: Feminist Scholarship in the Age of Multinational Reception." *Feminist Review* 35 (1999): 24-41. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 Aug. 2012.

- Mehta, Bhanusukhram and Bharatram Mehta. *The Modern Gujarati English Dictionary Vol I and II*. Gandhinagar: Director of Languages, Gujarat State, 1926. Print.
- Mehta, Chandravadan C. "Shakespeare and Gujarati Stage." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 41-50. JSTOR. Web. 1 Sept. 2013.
- Mehta, Shirin. "Women Journalism in Gujarati: A Study in Expression of Gender Perception (1850-1920)." *Visibilising Women: Facets of History through a Gender Lens*. Eds. Kirit Shah and Radhika Sheshan. Delhi: Kalpaz Publication, 2005. 85-102. Web. 5 Oct. 2013. <<http://books.google.co.in/books?id=o4LEcHOV85UC&pg=PA16&lpg=PA16&dq=Mehta,+Shirin.+Visibilising+Women+Facets+of+History+through+Gender+Lens>>.
- Mukta, Parita. "'The Civilizing Mission': The Regulation and Control of Mourning in Colonial India." *Feminist Review* 63 (1999): 25-47. JSTOR. Web. 30 Oct 2013.
- Nilkanth, Ramanbhai. "Ranchhodbhai: Gujaratna Adhya Natyakar" [Ranchhodbhai: The Pioneer Playwright of Gujarat]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 81-83. Print.
- Raval, R. L. *Mahipatram*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 2002. Web. 24 Jan. 2013. <<http://books.google.co.in/books?id=EXgBme2yVVQC&pg=PP6&lpg=PP6&dq=Mahipatram+The+Makers+of+Indian+Literature>>.
- Sarkar, Tanika. "Domesticity and Middle Class Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Bengal." *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010. 159-167. Print.
- Shashtri, Parth, "Garba was in tune with Times!" *The Times of India*. 5 Oct. 2013: n.p., Web. <articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2013-10-05/ahmedabad/42744337_1_garbo-garba-raas>.
- Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. "Chothi Gujarati Sahitya Parishadna Pramukhna Bhashanmanthi Avtarano [Extracts from the Presidential Lecture of the Fourth Gujarati Sahitya Conference]." *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 3-10. Print.
- ."Natyaprakash" [A Treatise on Dramaturgy]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 74-75. Print.

- ."Prashstio" [Eulogies]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 95-96. Print.
- Thakar, Dhirubhai. *Abhigyan* [Recognition]. Ahmedabad: Bhagvati Mudranalaya, 1991. Print.
- Todorov, Tzvetan and Richard M. Berrong. "The Origin of Genres." *New Literary History* 8.1 (1976): 159-170. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Sept. 2012.
- "Vidhyaman Gurjar Granthkaro" [The Existing Gujarati Writers]. *Samalochak* 10.3 (1905): 169-174. Print.
- Walsh, Judith E. *Domesticity in Colonial India: What Women Learned When Men Gave Them Advice?* U.S.A.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2004. Web. 15 Aug. 2013. <
<http://books.google.co.in/books?id=u3PndxX904gC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>>.

CHAPTER TWO

***Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage) and *Kanyavikray Khandan Natak* (A Play Denouncing the Practice of Accepting Bride Price): Reconfiguration of the Genre**

This chapter is a comparative study in terms of similarities and differences between *Lalita* and the two other plays, *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak: Ek Prasang* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage: One Incident, 1872) by Keshavlal Motilal Parikh and *Kanya Vikray Khandan Natak* (A Play Denouncing the Practice of Selling of a Girl Child, 1888) by Keshavlal Harivithaldas. 'Kajoda' or incompatibility of marriage is the underlying theme of both these plays; hence, they will be called together Kajoda plays in this chapter. *Kajoda* is based on one single incident of 'kajoda', the child marriage where a young boy of fifteen years is married to a woman who is twenty years old. The play shows the tragedy of Chanchal. *Kanya* is specifically based on the social problem of 'kanyavikraya' (the practice of selling a girl child) which usually resulted in marrying off very young women/girls to men much older than them, sometimes even to men of advanced age. *Kanya* aims to denounce this unjust custom. It shows the tragedy of Chandagauri. Together all the three plays contribute to the genre dukhdarshak natak or plays revealing sorrow of women.

The chapter observes that while many dukhdarshak plays aimed at portraying the tragic end of the protagonist, they emerged as comic in the treatment of language and characterization. Based on this observation, the chapter asks: Is this feature can be taken as the development of the genre tragedy? It seeks the answer in the context of the development of Gujarati theatre in colonial India. On the one hand, as discussed in chapter one, incompatible marriage was a traditional topic of comic or satirical plays. It acquired a tragic sense under the influence of the social reforms for women. The

genre dukhdarshak natak shows a mixture of both these elements in showing the tragic aspects of such a custom where the satirical treatment of a bride and her sorrow is fused with the didactic aims. Thus, the Kajoda plays aimed to amuse the readers by specifying the reason of bride's sorrow and incompatibility of marriage in a different way. In this context, the role of the jester appears significant under the influence of Bhavai, Sanskrit and English theatres. In the case of *Kajoda*, it can be argued that it is highly exaggerated, extravagant and improbable in comparison to *Lalita*. In his book, *Gujarati ane Marathi Samajik Natako* (Gujarati and Marathi Social Plays), Jagdish Dave looks at the constant presence of the jester with his comments but concludes it as "apvaaryama etlu baad karta anya kashu nondhpaatra nathi" (except its omission of comic element there is nothing noteworthy) (45). He reduces the importance of the play in pointing only the presence of jester's alone. In this light, the chapter argues that the playwrights do not treat Kajoda plays in a standardised tragic form and therefore they have an important role in creating the problematic of mixture of genres, on the one hand and the specific character of theatrical realism on the other.

There are four sections in this chapter. Section I offers the plot synopsis of *Kajoda* and *Kanya*. Section II discusses how the two Kajoda plays differ from *Lalita* in their use of the dramatic conventions such as the use of traditional characters like jester, the songs and music as characters express, the number of characters, sub-theme or sub-plot, act-divisions, scene divisions and other incidental events. Thus, Section II discusses the question whether the Kajoda plays follow a more realistic plot. In this, the writing of Kajoda plays suggests that social condition, heredity, and environment had inescapable force in representing Gujarati women and so oppose the reception of tragedy of Gujarati women in symbolic and idealistic treatment. *Kajoda* shows frankness about sexuality along with pervasive pessimism; it also enlightens readers with dark harshness of life including the theme of corruption. Section III deals with the thematic aspect of the two Kajoda plays. It discusses the question: how is the theme of social reform about women, reasons of incompatibility, the nature of women's education, expectations of a happy marriage, women's social role and the overall treatment of women by the society in the plays differ or agree with *Lalita*? Section IV makes a comparative study between two Kajoda plays in terms of any other element not considered earlier and a brief note on how the theme of incompatible marriage was furthered in the later post-Kajoda plays.

Section V looks at the notion of hybridity in the two Kajoda plays in comparison to *Lalita*. It aims to note the implications of modernity.

The Plot Summary of *Kajoda* and *Kanya*

Kajoda is divided in three acts. The protagonist, Chanchal is a twenty year old educated woman. She is the daughter of Ghelabhai (hereafter, Ghela) who is a wealthy and high caste man of Nadiad. Manibhai (hereafter, Mani) is the son of Dahyabhai (hereafter, Dahya), a high-caste man of Ahmedabad. Mani is portrayed as a fifteen year old boy who is uneducated, childish and timid. Chanchal is married to Mani on the grounds of his high-caste status. Chanchal is sorrowful because she calls and requests Mani to speak with her but he is shy and ignores her in his childish fear. Chanchal is older than Mani. She wants a loving husband. She laments in sadness because she fails to convey her feelings to Mani. She experiences neglect and loneliness after marriage as Mani is unable to understand the meaning of consummation of marriage. Chanchal laments because of the suppression of her sexual desire.

Chanchal is also tortured by her mother-in-law, Navi who complains to Dahya about Chanchal's upbringing. Navi taunts and quarrels with Chanchal for her upbringing. Chanchal's sister-in-law, Nani is also bitter in her speech with Chanchal. She argues and quarrels with Chanchal on the grounds of bearing much sorrow of incompatible marriage because her husband is an old and not a child like Mani. Gammatdas is a jester who remains present and comments in between but he is not responded to by Chanchal and others.

Mahakunvar is Chanchal's friend. Chanchal sends a letter to Mahakunvar and calls her. Mahakunvar is surprised when she finds Mani's timid and childish behaviour. Mahakunvar sympathizes with Chanchal and advises her to be patient and promises her that she will organize a public hearing of Chanchal's sorrow. Chanchal does not agree with this idea and tells Mahakunvar that her suffering is too much to bear. After Mahakunvar leaves, Chanchal decides to commit suicide in spite of Mahakunvar's consolation and assurance. Chanchal kills herself with a knife in the middle of the play. Mahakunvar is informed about Chanchal's death and she realises that it must be a suicide. Here, Chanchal's father-in-law Dahya tries to conceal the dead body. But the rumour has spread and a police inquiry follows. The father-in-law

and his relatives and friends then bribe the police officer and try to hush up the case.

Meanwhile, Dahya remarries Mani off to the daughter of Shivilal, a wealthy man, to avail the price of dowry. Vigyandas is Mahakunwar's husband. He is educated and rational. Mahakunwar, Vigyandas and Chanchal's parents reach Ahmedabad to meet Dahya. But they first stay at Raja Mehta's house. Mahakunwar is asked by Chanchal's mother, Surajbai about Chanchal's death. Mahakunwar explains Chanchal's sorrow of incompatible marriage. Vigyandas inquires about the government's role in the unnatural death. He is informed that the head of police is corrupt. He decides to bring punishment on the head of police.

Vigyandas takes the head of police and Dahya to the court. The Judge inquires and finds that Mahakunwar and other's witness accounts true. The chief of police and Dahya are imprisoned and fined. Mahakunwar takes permission from the Judge to give a speech on the equality of justice for both the poor and the rich. She appreciates the reformers of Nadiad and proclaims her anger for the orthodox merchants of Ahmedabad. The Judge agrees with Mahakunwar's speech. He advises the natives to be aware and make the nation progressive and stop the trend of child marriage. The play ends with a couplet which prays the god to stop oppression of women.

The plot of *Kanya* is also divided in three acts. Chandagauri is a young girl of sixteen years. She is educated. Her father, Jugaldas is a merchant of Kankapuri. Amrutlal is a seventy year old man. He is a rich landlord of Champanagari. He has already married five times. His fifth wife has died. He wants to marry a young wife but cannot find the bride. Lalbhat is a cunning and quarrelsome Brahmin. He is the agent who is paid by Amrutlal to travel in Kankapuri and finds out a wife for him. Vidushak appears and explains the incompatible features of Amrutlal and comments on the greed of Lalbhat. He pities a girl who will marry Amrutlal.

Lalbhat passes through a dense forest at evening. He finds a hunter. The hunter warns him stop in nearby village. Lalbhat rejects his suggestion but he begs the hunter's help as soon as he finds a tiger. The hunter allows Lalbhat to pass night in his hut. On the way to Kankapuri, Lalbhat meets a thief named Thag bhai who is a robber. Lalbhat is clever. So he smartly runs away and reaches Kankapuri. He stays at the lodge of Chhabildas where Raambhat welcomes Lalbhat. Vidushak appears and comments that two "bhat" will

quarrel and make fun. Lalbhat is given food but he complains that the taste is bad. Raambhat takes Lalbhat in charge and scolds him for his cunningness. Lalbhat is forced to leave the lodge.

Lalbhat meets Santokram in the market of Kankapuri. He offers Santokram two fifty rupees to find a young woman the next day. Vidushak appears and criticizes the Brahmins for the selling of bride which will victimize Chandagauri. Santokram meets Jugaldas and fixes the marriage of Amrutlal with Chandagauri for a price of twenty thousand rupees. On his return to Champanagari, Lalbhat meets a driver who is provoked by Lalbhat's proud words. The driver threatens Lalbhat because he is abused by Lalbhat. A gentle man, Nagindas, tries to stop them. But Lalbhat also abuses him. The driver attacks Lalbhat as he annoys the driver. Nagindas requests the driver to forgive Lalbhat. Lalbhat meets Amrutlal and promises to go with him and arrange his marriage with Chandagauri.

Next day, Santokram comes and informs Jugaldas that Amrutlal has come with his procession. Chandagauri resists her parents and Santokram. She calls Santokram an evil man, and calls her parents her enemies and rebukes them for their greed. Women in the neighbourhood are shocked when they see old Amrutlal. They pity Chandagauri's fate and criticize the greedy parents. Vidushak interferes and comments on the fate of Chandagauri. Chandagauri's friends, Hiralakshmi and Vidyalakshmi, sympathize and encourage her to take care of herself in the sorrowful condition. Sadgunbhai (hereafter, Sadgun) is Hiralakshmi's husband. Sadgun tries to dissuade Jugaldas to stop the bad trend but he is insulted. Chandagauri is forced to compromise her desires on the grounds of respectability of home.

After marriage, old Amrutlal feels panic as he suffers from rheumatism. Amrutlal asks Chandagauri to call others as he feels desperate. All family members assemble and look at Amrutlal who dies due to rheumatism. Jugaldas gets the letter and comes to know that Amrutlal is no more. Savitagauri and Jugaldas lament Amrutlal's death. Jugaldas tries to hide his knowledge about Amrutlal's death to avoid criticism from others for selling the daughter.

In Champanagari, Chandagauri laments over her state of widowhood. She regrets the fact that her head has been tonsured; her hands have been empty of the beautiful bangles; the auspicious mark on the forehead seems her enemy; god is cruel who has not left a chance to live with the auspicious marks

of a married woman. She questions the god why she was given education, happiness, and expresses her expectation to be married with a learned husband. Chandagauri, in disappointment, embraces her friend, Vidyalakshmi. She expresses her last wish to give public admonition in the open ground of Amrutlal's house. Chandagauri explains her sorrowful tale and curses the father who is the real sinner, evil and unholy. She prays to god and asks him to take her in his shelter. Suddenly, she feels giddy and falls down. Vidyalakshmi declares that Chandagauri is dead. She cries and stands aside. Sadgun, drawing the people's attention to *Hemadri* and *Manusmruti*, advises them that dowry is evil and a crime. He also advises the shudras that selling bride is forbidden. He criticizes the practice of dowry as well. All sing together to reform women's condition to decrease sorrow in their life and learn a lesson from Chandagauri's example. The play ends with couplets against the trend of selling brides and expects the blessing of god. Both the plays, *Kanya* and *Kajoda* seem to have similarities and differences. The next Section discusses both the *Kajoda* plays in comparison to *Lalita* from structural and thematic point of view.

Lalita, Kajoda and Kanya: A Comparative Discussion

This section includes a discussion of the plot design and the dramatic conventions of the two *Kajoda* plays with reference to the discussion of these issues in *Lalita*. The aim of this discussion is to understand the development of the theme of incompatible marriage as the cause of the death of the female protagonists, and the consolidation of the genre *dukhdarshak natak*.

Both *Kajoda* and *Kanya* are divided in three acts as against *Lalita* which is composed in five acts. This marks the two *Kajoda* plays for following a different plot design than the Shakespearean design in the making of *Lalita* as discussed in the previous chapter. It seems that Parikh and Harivithaldas do not aim to follow the Shakespearean design. Further, Parikh represents the death of the protagonist in the middle of the play. Harivithaldas portrays the death of the protagonist at the end, but divides acts unevenly (Act I shows fourteen scenes where as Act II is divided in three scenes, and Act III, in four scenes). It should be noted that Chandagauri is introduced in Act II scene ii, while the entire Act I is devoted to the comic pranks of other characters. It

seems that Harivithaldas aims to amuse mainly and keep the tragic aspect at the subordinate level. *Kajoda* too is farcical in character.

The playwrights show the laments of protagonists for the incompatible marriage and their tragic death at the end of the play but it is clear that they make use of the comic genres. There are other examples available too. Shivalal Keshavlal Thakkar's *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Faras* (A Farce on the Revelation of Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage, 1886) with the same name of the protagonist, Chanchal and the tragic end approves the above argument (J. Dave 88). Another writer named Jagjivan Kashiram Pandya not only entitles his play as *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play on the Revelation of Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage) but also provides the authorial intention to the play that reads *Ramooji Rite Banavnar* (created in a comic manner) (J. Dave 79). The play also ends as a tragedy (79). *Kamla Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Kamla, 1883) by Keshavram Vishvanath Joshi is also a three acts play which shows characters from the Sanskrit theatre such as Sutradhar and Nati, and Vidushak that constantly remains on the stage and also comments (J. Dave 76). The play, as J. Dave notes, is full of *asambhavit ghatnao* (improbable incidents), and is not proper in its *samvadkala* (art of dialogue) and *vastusankalana* (plot-construction) (77). He criticizes the play calling it *saamanya kotinu* (of low level) (77). J. Dave notes another three-act play, *Kankavati Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing Sorrow of Kankavati, 1887) by Narbheram Mayashankar Mehta, in which the protagonist, Kankavati, commits suicide by drinking a glass of poison (100). The play is improbable because it is Sutradhar who returns at the end of the play to explain the moral of the play (J. Dave 100).

It should be noted that the mixture of modern and traditional elements are present in the *Kajoda* plays. The role of the playwrights of Parsi theatre is important as they wrote in Gujarati in the earliest phase of theatre and developed such farces (Gupt 41-42). Edalji Khorji (1847-1917) wrote the three act drama *Khudabaksh* in 1871 for the Zoroastrian Theatrical Company (43). Hansen notes that the Gujarati version was very popular (43). Anand Patil, in his book, *Western Influence on Marathi Drama* observes that in the nineteenth century Marathi theatre, the *aakhyan* (Puranic episodes written in verse) plot was added with "short skits, sketches, interludes, which came to be described under the umbrella term: farce" (118). He also notes that Bhavé's *Dhongi Mahantachi Nakkal* (a Farce of the Hypocritical Ascetic) was "a direct or indirect borrowing from the British amateur theatre in Bombay" (118-119).

This lack of a systematic identification of genre creates an opportunity to study the nuances of the emergence of dramatic genres in colonial India. Jagdish Dave notes the influence of Western theatrical modes along with Marathi, Parsi, Hindustani and English speaking characters in the dukhdarshak plays. He notes that Sundarji Punjabhai Thakkar's five-act drama entitled as *Vyabhichar Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Adultery) uses the technique of 'antarnatak' (a play within the play) (95). J. Dave observes that Jamnadas Bhagvandas' *Mohan Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing Sorrow of Mohan), which is divided in two acts, shows characters speaking in Marathi, 'Parsheeshai boli' (Parsi Gujarati) and English (80). It should be noted that the protagonist is a male who commits suicide being frustrated with a bad company (79-80). J. Dave also notes the use of 'katha-kathan shaily' (story-telling mode) in a play *Kaamsen ane Rasika* (Kaamsen and Rasika) by Damodar Somani (71). The emergence of several Kajoda plays in Gujarati in this phase points to the modernization and institutionalization of drama in the process of acculturation. The phase can be studied with reference to theories of acculturation. The chapter takes up this question in the last section.

The first point of difference between *Lalita* and the two Kajoda plays is that these two plays are divided in three acts unlike five-act division in *Lalita*. In the preface to *Kajoda*, Parikh claims his desire to enlarge the play (5). He blames his busy schedule and the friends who wasted his time and expresses his failure of desire to enlarge the play (5-6). In such a type of confession, Parikh expresses his apology but he is argumentative in the preface too. He argues that nobody is learned by the very birth (6). He also states it that he does not know verse (6). Harivithaldas in the preface to *Kanya* also makes it clear that he has no knowledge of verse to develop his play (1). He does not show even a single concern to write the play in act division. Thus, the Shakespearean idea of plot structure is minimized in Kajoda plays. Parikh and Harivithaldas both appropriate the idea of dukhdarshak genre because they express their inability to compos it in five acts plot structure, using melodrama, songs, metres and colloquial speech patterns. In her article "Languages on Stage: Linguistic Pluralism and Community Formation in the Nineteenth Century Parsi Theatre", Kathryn Hansen notes such appropriation due to "the instability of 'standard' or accepted forms of literary language" and "the divergence between prose and poetry" (384). Hansen argues that "popular culture also cannot be separated from the development of print culture" in nineteenth century Bombay (384).

The level of typification of characters is achieved in *Lalia* though the use of symbolic names is minimized in *Kajoda* and *Kanya*. Apart from the names of female protagonists in both the Kajoda plays (Chanchal means one that has a tendency towards dynamic or slightly impatient disposition and Chandagauri indicating a sense of beauty and innocence), Gammatdas (meaning literally a servant of fun) is the only type-cast character. Other names in both plays are without any specificity of character type, apart from their caste and class markers. Thus it is possible to suggest that the two Kajoda plays move towards a different kind of individuation of characters than the character types suggested in *Lalita*.

A further point of departure may be observed in the use of comic devices in a dukhdarshak natak. At the outset, it may be said that the Kajoda plays use the comic devices at different levels in comparison to *Lalita*, and, in that sense, depart further from the law of unity of action already denied in *Lalita*. The use of comic devices in both the Kajoda plays appears at the level of the treatment of the character of jester, and secondly, at the level of dialogues and speeches of characters in different measures.

One can begin this discussion with reference to the character of the jester in the two Kajoda plays. In both plays, the jester (Gammatdas in *Kajoda* and Vidushak in *Kanya*) appear on the stage right in the first scene as Panthiram does in *Lalita*. However, while Panthiram in *Lalita* also performs the role of a messenger and a narrator, the jester in the two Kajoda plays seems to have been limited to the production of sarcastic commentary to the ongoing play. The following is a discussion of the further nuances and specificities in the portrayal of the sarcastic jester in the two Kajoda plays.

In *Kajoda*, the plot is a mixture of dialogues and humorous asides. The instruction does not refer to the name or presence of Gammatdas in the play. In Act I, scene i, when Chanchal tries to wake her young husband Mani addressing him in the traditional respectful epithets like swaminath (master husband) and prannath (master of my life), Gammatdas suddenly comments on Chanchal's traditional way of calling Mani swaminath because the boy-husband is ignorant of such mannerism (Parikh 11-12). Gammatdas sings a couplet:

Swami shabda samje nahi, evu chhe e ratna
 Mate pitya kahi pukar to, bar ave tuj yatna (12)
 (Doesn't understand a word swami, such jewel he is,
 Hence, you address him as pitya, so that your efforts are fulfilled).

Gammatdas here suggests Chanchal to wake her 'ratna' (gem like) husband calling him 'pitya' (means 'dead') as he will not understand the word 'swami', and says that then only her effort will succeed. When Chanchal tries to wake Mani, he is shy. He blabbers like a child and moves away her hand from him (12). Gammatdas mocks at the ignorance of this boy-husband and calls him a 'ratna' (a gem) sarcastically (12). Chanchal implores Mani to speak to her and not to feel shy (12). On this, Gammatdas tells Chanchal: "Tame janta nathi ke! Sharmay chhe kya! E to swamiji e tamari laaj kahadi chhe" (12) (Don't you know? He is not feeling shy! The husband himself has covered his face).

In Act I, scene i, Chanchal's response, in the form of soliloquy, suggests that she will not succeed in satisfying her sexual impulses (13). She speaks to herself that there is no possibility of shukravar (to get success) in her effort to convince her child bridegroom (13). Gammatdas ridicules Chanchal's laments (12). It should be noted that Chanchal does not pay any attention to Gammatdas's comments or suggestions as if he is not there. This feature continues in all instances where Gammatdas is present. He remains outside the action and comments on and interferes in it from a different plane, criticising or scolding her for her desire for this boy.

Gammatdas also appears when Chanchal is harassed by her mother-in-law, Navi and sister-in-law, Nani. In Act I, scene i, Nani complains that Chanchal speaks rudely in the presence of her father-in-law (24). On this, Gammatdas asks Nani to kill her father and surpass Chanchal who does not care the father-in-law's presence (12). When Nani accuses Chanchal that Chanchal will sell her brother in the market and will buy sweets with the proceeds, Gammatdas questions Nani whether Chanchal has sold Mani in the market indeed (25).

When Navi tells her husband that Chanchal complains about her sorrow, Gammatdas intervenes: "Aa em kem bole chhe! Peli sukh kahe chhe ne aa dukh dukh bakya kare chhe. Jaani joine dukh j devu chhe ke shu?" (22) (Why does she speak like this? The mother-in-law speaks of happiness and the daughter-in-law continuously speaks of sorrow. Does she deliberately want to give pain to her?)

Gammatdas trivializes the sorrow through his sarcasm and irony. When Navi torments Chanchal by calling her "chhati par ubhi rakhi chhe" (made her stand on their chest), Gammatdas picks up the literal meaning, and points out Chanchal who is standing on the stairs and not on a chhati (chest) (22). In Act I, scene ii, Navi argues that the boy-husband will grow older

tomorrow (23). Gammatdas intervenes again and shows surprise regarding such a rapid growth. He concedes that may be the boy can grow taller if they feed him healthy food like milk (23).

The theme of incompatibility caused by the boy-husband's lack of manliness and the ensuing disappointment for Chanchal is continuously elucidated by Gammatdas. He keeps scolding Chanchal and makes her aware of the reality of her marriage. He suggests her to call Mani shwannath (the dog-husband) instead of swaminath (master-husband) (17). He also subjects her to humiliation by telling her to perform sexually explicit gestures and even to disrobe (18). Gammatdas' language borders on the explicit and risks being termed "obscene". In Act I, scene i, Gammatdas puts a stick in front of her (15). His act suggests the audience that Chanchal should not plead for her desire but use the stick to convince Mani who, being a child, might be convinced in fear of punishment.

Like Panthiram in *Lalita*, Gammatdas too resembles the figure of Ranglo of Bhavai but while Panthiram is heroic and chivalrous in character, Gammatdas remains closer to the traditional Ranglo and retains the satirical tone. The continued presence of both 'traditional' and 'western' can be seen throughout the colonial theatre. Rather, the proscenium stage can suggest and provide an important space for the character of jester in Kajoda plays. Ashok Ranade, in his book, *Stage Music of Maharashtra* notes that the farce continued till 1880s after the bookish plays were started to be written in prose by 1860s (22-23).

Gammatdas is not sympathetic to the bride's laments; rather, he continuously trivialises or laughs away at her lament. He is open and explicit in his speech. He creates crude laughter. He is not even responded to by other characters in the play.

In *Kanya*, the figure of the jester appears as a Vidushak. Vidushak appears along with the Sutradhar (narrator or stage manager) and Nati (actress) in the manner of the Sanskrit theatre. The play begins with a humorous discussion between Vidushak and Sutradhar (Harivithaldas 3-4). Sutradhar asks Vidushak not to become the brother of marcha (chilli) but of baraf (ice) (3). Sutradhar asks Vidushak to participate in the discussion on the topic of incompatible marriage (3). Vidushak listens to Nati's song and views the stage (4). He speaks: "Juni ankhe nava tamasha joine pani na matla jevo thai gayo

chhu” (4) (I have become like an earthen pot of water having watched new Tamasha with old eyes).

His comment already introduces the play in a subtle manner: the play will give a new treatment to an old theme, and the audience who is used to the old treatment will get to watch a new theme. But it is still a tamasha as the format is that of an old style Tamasha on one hand and it also means a fiasco on the other, clearly that of a marriage. The Sutradhar requests Nati to appear with all her beauty and sing a song to entertain the audience before the play begins (3). Nati introduces the *khel* (play) on the incompatible marriage between Chandagauri, a sixteen year old young woman with a seventy year old man (4).

In Act I, scene ii, the play begins with Lalbhat’s entry that interrupts amid the few men arguing on the social issues (6). Lalbhat informs that there have been cases of selling of brides (6). He gives the example of Amrutlal who has ordered him to find a young woman for him (6). Ratilal comes to know that Amrutlal was married five times but all his wives died without any child. He questions Amrutlal’s loss of productivity and declares his anger at selling of daughters (6). Vidushak comments on Amrutlal’s health: “Pelo becharo vaniyo to vaa khay chhe” (that poor Baniya suffers from rheumatism) (7). Ratilal is frightened by the appearance of Vidushak on the stage. He questions others and calls him kaal no bhai (brother of the god of death) (7). He shivers with fear because of the horrifying face of Vidushak (8). He requests Vidushak not to speak in between (7). So, Vidushak leaves the stage (7).

In Act I, scene iii, Vidushak is present on the stage again (8). Amrutlal awaits Lalbhat to know whether he has found the woman or not (8). On Amrutlal’s eagerly waiting, Vidushak criticizes the old man for his intention to marry for the sixth time and destroy the life of a young woman (8-10). He also criticizes the Brahmin Lalbhat for boasting of loyalty (9). He congratulates him for becoming a servant for the sake of money and thus enhances the glory of his caste-duty (9).

Once begun in this ironical tone, Vidushak calls Amrutlal vrudh kaka (an old uncle) to point out the incompatibility of his intended marriage (9). He suggests that he should take rest in bed and chant the name of god (9). He interrupts the dialogue between Lalbhat and Amrutlal. When Amrutlal questions the auspicious time of marriage, Vidushak speaks up: Holi ne dahade (10) (On the day of Holi). Here, Vidushak’s comment clearly indicates that the

time of the festival of subversion is the most suitable for such a marriage. He indirectly points to the burning of a new bride's life in the fire lit in this festival. The play shows the Vidushak's capacity to satirize in comic way. In Act I, scene vii, Lalbhat comes to stay at the lodge (16). Lalbhat meets the owner, Rambhat who is also a Brahmin. When both the Brahmins meet together, Vidushak comments on the impending tussle between the two Brahmins (16).

Surely, a tussle follows. Rambhat offers good hospitality to Lalbhat. Lalbhat enjoys it. When Lalbhat eats food, he keeps on eating in plenty, but he complains and accuses Rambhat (17). On this, Rambhat calls Lalbhat a cunning and shameless person (17). He catches Lalbhat and throws him out of the lodge (18). The scene becomes comic for the clownish side of Lalbhat who provokes the others by his cunning nature.

But there is another side to the Vidushak. In Act I, scene xi, he instructs Jugaldas not to sell his daughter for the sake of money. He instructs him that he will repent because of his greed. He sarcastically requests Santokram to organise his marriage too (25).

In Act II, scene i, Vidushak listens to the women from neighbourhood of Jugaldas (34). He listens to them commenting on the health of Amrutlal, who is called a *chamarvade shukvela khokha* (a skeleton dried by skin) (34). When they questions about the place where Amrutlal go after the marriage in his old age, Vidushak speaks: *Masaan kanthe* (34) (to the cemetery).

He expresses his sympathy for Chandagauri, the victim of unjust marriage (34). He questions the kindness in Jugaldas. In scene iv, Vidushak warns Jugaldas indirectly when Jugaldas emotionally blackmails Chandagauri, but he also predicts that Jugaldas would repent (45). When, Jugaldas thinks of committing suicide, however, Vidushak sarcastically reminds him that he would be getting the promised money, after all (46).

In Act III, scene i, Vidushak appears when Amrutlal calls the doctor to treat him for his rheumatism (48). Vidushak points out that Amrutlal's young wife has to face a harsh widowhood now as Amrutlal is a Brahmin. In scene iii, Vidushak appears again at the end of the play. He comments on the harm caused to Chandagauri (58).

Looking at the differences in the role played by the jester in *Kajoda* and *Kanya* in comparison to *Lalita*, it is imperative to question: what does the apparent reversal in the *Kajoda* plays suggest when a traditional character type appears in a modern form? Homi Bhabha, in his article, "Of Mimicry and Man:

The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse”, quotes Jacques Lacan which helps define the jester “the technique of camouflage practiced in human warfare” (125). The traditional type of jester in *Kanya* and *Kajoda* reverses the ‘supposed modern change’ against Dave’s characterization of Panthiram, which is strategically prepared on the ground of aesthetics of drama, in *Lalita*. In turn to such ‘supposed modern change’ in the characterization of Panthiram, which indicates the sign of simplicity of humor, chivalry, heroic and sympathy, the traditional type of jester attains the space in the (modern form) where it “mimics” the ‘supposed modern change’ and parodies Panthiram with an ‘extra’ reformist stance (‘extra’ as it is sarcastic and accessible to all groups of reader) (*Of Mimicry* 125). Bhabha’s consideration of “mimicry” is significant in the reformist context of dukhdarshak natak because it both resists and confirms to existing colonial discourse. Bhabha states:

“...that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an *ambivalence*; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference.” (127)

The writing of *Kajoda* plays in the second half of nineteenth century is important because, taking in account the traditional role of jester, the double stand of social reform of women is suggested. In *Kajoda*, the jester mocks at the repression of sexuality; whereas, the jester in *Kanya*, mocks at the old man for his vulnerability. Both specify the reason of incompatibility. In this sense, *Kajoda* and *Kanya* adopt more naturalist way to deal with the women’s question. It suggests the transition phase of social and theatrical reform in Gujarati culture.

Dave wrote *Lalita* to mediate the implied public and he adopts the theatrical conceptions of the commercial Parsi theatre to assert the Gujarati ethos and culture (*Natak* 46-47). Parikh and Harivithaldas get the space to assert back the Gujarati ethos and culture. However, Parikh and Harivithaldas, in their apology expressed in the preface, presuppose the presence of colonial power which seeks to operate over the indigenous culture and modify it.

It should be noted that the presence of colonial power itself is modified from “behind” in the sense that it is laughed at, mimicked or parodied “through the figures of farce” (Bhabha, *Of Mimicry* 125-126). It suggests the double meaning “forked” vision of social reform which produces “a partial vision of colonizer’s presence” in colonial context (125). A “desire” for the reform of “self”, “the disturbance of cultural, racial and historical difference” signified the narcissistic demand of colonial authority (Bhabha, *Of Mimicry* 129). In this

context, it is seen in Dave's article, "Natakno Prarambh" (The Beginning of Drama) discussed in Chapter 1, that the instance of appraisal on the folk actors through Dave, Education Officer, Russell and Mahipatram was required to reform their social behaviour on the Gujarati stage. Here, the traditional jester, Ranglo in form of Gammatdas and Vidushak in *Kajoda* and *Kanya*, exercise colonial authority and power which is signified as the colonial knowledge imbued with Hinduist scriptures.

Moving on to the other theatrical devices such as dialogues, soliloquies and songs, an overall point of difference between *Lalita* and the two *Kajoda* and *Kanya* is that the latter seem to reverse the aim of refinement pursued in *Lalita* by employing more colloquial, at times explicit language and appropriate a more varied repertoire of local and popular kind of song types.

The first example can be taken from *Kajoda* and Chanchal's speech. As Chanchal decides to complain to the family about her problem with her husband, she says:

Are Ish! Kai najar pahonchti nathi. Shu karu? Re! Mare mathe te a ratna kyathi bhangyu? Mare ne e pitya ne kiya bhav nu ver hase, te pityo atyre vaali le chhe! Pitya ne atlu atlu kahu chhu tem tem royo vadhare undhu ghale chhe, tyare mare te shu karvu have! (Parikh13) (Oh God! My vision reaches nowhere, what should I do now? Oh! From where has such a gem fallen upon my head? Of which birth do I and that *pitya* have an enmity that he takes revenge now? The more I tell him, the more the wretched feels ashamed, so what I should do now?)

Chanchal's speech clearly recovers some aspects of Bhavai. She imitates the sarcastic tone of Gammatdas who is a Ranglo of Bhavai. Chanchal does not use the traditional form of address for the husband in her speech; she calls Mani pitya (abusing term); she uses the sarcastic word, ratna (gem), enemy of the previous birth and finally she calls him roya (wretched) because the more she urges him, the more he undhu ghale chhe (is ashamed of her) (13; Mehta and Mehta 198).

She repeats her song several times. In Act I, scene i, she says that she is singing the same couplets for the fourth time (Parikh 19). Chanchal, in her soliloquy, sings the couplet but she stops herself from singing because she remembers only a little and she does not want others to hear her sing and get disturbed in the night (19). She decides to sleep without lamenting any more.

Thus *Kajoda* represents a more self-reflexive heroine than in *Lalita*. She confesses that she suffers because she is forced to repress her sexuality.

In comparison to *Lalita*, the protagonist of *Kajoda* uses more local proverbs and songs. Many of her songs describe her state of desire. Act I, scene iii is set in a bed chamber again (30). Chanchal enters the stage. She laments her sorrow. She recalls her friend. She speaks a proverb: *sukhe soni ne dukhe ram sambhre* (In prosperity gold, in adversity God) (31; Mehta and Mehta 1526). She mocks at the experience of brides who are tempted to take the name of god when married, rather than think about the pleasures of marriage (Parikh 31). In this context, she sings a song called *sakhio* (31). *Sakhi* is a song sung by woman while standing at rest in a circle, the other part being sung while walking (Mehta and Mehta 1500). Chanchal repeats the refrain: “*Maru joban bharpur jaay, prabhu kem pramada pide chhe*” (Parikh 31). Chanchal questions the god why he torments young woman like her because her youth is being wasted because of her marriage with a *bal-kumar* (a child) (31).

The idea of writing in *dukhdarshak* mode is dismantled by Parikh and Harivithaldas. The use of preface becomes a way to take the stand ‘outside’ the act of writing *Kajoda* plays. (Here, ‘outside’ suggests Parikh and Harivithaldas’s sense of mistake harder to accept than dishonour of society). In the preface to a play with the same title, *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* (A Play Revealing the Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage) by Jagjivan Pandya, it is seen that the writer clearly expresses his apology for the risk of *bhibhatsa shabda* (obscene words) aspects in writing (7). In a way, their apology expressed in the preface suggests the doubt of being criticized in terms of *Bhavai*/popular representation of incompatible marriage. It suggests their escape from being blameworthy for ‘obscene’ notes in the plays.

In this context, the chapter argues that *Kajoda* and *Kanya*, in such canonical imitation of *Lalita*, mock at but also confirm the cultural threat in the respectability of Hindu domesticity and in that show gaps in the standardization of Gujarati language and stage in the transition period of the nineteenth century. Besides the apparent reversal in the appearance of jester, it is also evident in the portrayal of ‘extra’ individuated self of Chanchal in *Kanya* (as she does not care the presence of in laws and speaks in bold and explicit manner) and Chandagauri (as she resists against the agent, Santokram and the greedy parents who emotionally black mails her). The importance of *Kajoda* plays cannot be reduced for the minimization of plot structure and farcical

elements. In the Kajoda plays, it is clear that the social convention of 'respectable' bride is played away; the daughter-in-law's relation with mother-in-law and sister-in-law is inverted and also omitted; in *Kanya*, it is not even added.

In comparison to Dave, Parikh's treatment of soliloquies and songs is different in *Kajoda*. It should be noted that Chanchal, not only shifts from speech to song but also that she shifts from one song to another such as saki, lavani to garbi songs (Parikh 31-38). The metaphors of dukh used in the songs characterise a different form of dukh darshak natak. For example, she sings *lavani* in which she compares the bloom of youth to rose buds (33). She expresses her desire for her husband. She looks for a husband like a manly gardener who is supposed to water the rose buds and nurture them (33). Chanchal expresses her impulses as her name suggests the inconstancy/dynamism in her behaviour. The more she laments the more she becomes self reflexive. She becomes more and more an individuated self. She condemns the parents to follow the orthodox custom of marriage (34). She openly expresses her sorrow:

Palang upar kadi nahi podhi kai din smere swami sange;
Vali raatri swami sange rami nahi range; (34)
(I never slept upon the bed with my husband a single day;
Moreover, I have not enjoyed the pleasure with husband at night)

She faints because of her sorrow (35). She gets conscious again and sleeps alone. The act of fainting is similar to *Lalita*.

In Act II, scene iv, Mahakunvar is informed by her driver about Chanchal's death (57-58). She is shocked when he informs her of Chanchal's suicide. She sings a song in lalit metre (59). She regrets the suicide of Chanchal and sheds tears. Mahakunvar expresses her melancholy on the loss of a close friend. She also faints lamenting (59).

In Act III, scene iii, Mahakunvar sings a couplet set to raga Paraj and summarizes the tragedy of her friend (84). She critiques the Hindus for their backward state:

Aryo eva andhla thaine, kare ati anarth;
Gun ke avgun kashu nav sujhe, hoe jo kul samarth (85)
(Arya Men being so blind, do immense injustice,
Virtue or vice nothing is considered, if the caste is superior).

Mahakunvar calls the modern Hindus blind for creating disorder. She criticizes those who do not make distinction between virtues and vice if the family is of superior caste. She rebukes the Hindu males for the unawareness of the social reform of women. She appeals for the compassion toward the young women so that they do not fall prey to custom of incompatible marriage (85). Mahakunvar repeats the second couplet to express her exhaustion (87). On this, the Judge stands up. He sings couplets too.

Keval Kathor thai, shabda dharo nahi kaan;
Vadu punya ema vase, bhai bhulya chho bhaan (88).
(Don't just lend ears by being cruel but pay attention to the words;
More rewards dwell in it, brothers you have lost sensibility).

The Judge advises the present members to understand the importance of morality. He advises to be sensible for the social reforms of women.

Kanya follows a similar use of songs as in *Kajoda*. But also like *Lalita*, *Kanya* includes a song based on an English tune but unlike in *Lalita*; in *Kanya*, it is not the heroine who does but it is the Vidushak who sings it in Act I, scene x, and it is based on the tune sung as kam lend lord fil thi (come Lord feel the):

...kanya ummarma athtani, varnito tethi baargani,
Topan nav mudh kare vichar, putrina dukhno niradhar,
Deshe shrap kari te pokar, e burathi nunya shu (Harivithaldas 23)
(The daughter is eight times younger in age, while the husband's is twelve times older,
However, the fool does not think, is unsupporting to the daughter's sorrow,
She will curse by shouting, what is lower than that shout).

In this song, Vidushak rebukes Lalbhat who does not consider the difference between Chandagauri and Amrutlal's age. He highlights Amrutlal's incompatibility by noting that his age is twelve times more than the bride's age. He calls Lalbhat a fool who does not understand the sorrow of Chandagauri. He warns him that she will curse him.

In Act II, scene ii, Chandagauri expresses her sorrow (35). She remembers god at the time of her forced marriage (35). She speaks about the cruelty of her parents who force her to marry an old man (36). The protagonist sings a gazal in raga Zinzoti (36). When Chandagauri meets her friend, she informs her that her parents have become her enemies (36). She predicts suffering of her marriage in the second gazal:

...bhavroop sagar aakro, va tofani yovanno kharo,
Vishayi sukhani a chitthi, kem deh suddh rakhi saku;...(39)
(...worldly sea is difficult, the storm of youth is true,
This mind concerned with worldly pleasure, how can I keep the body pure?...)

Her friend, Vidyalakshmi sings a song set to raga Ramakri (40). Vidyalakshmi advises her friend to be patient. She calls her parents irreligious because they do not think good of the women and possess greed. She commits her fate in the hands of God.

In *Kanya*, the second soliloquy is noted in Act III, scene iv (58). It shows Chandagauri sitting in despair. Chandagauri embraces her friend when she comes to meet her. She expresses her last wish to give public admonition (59). Chandagauri uses a proverb to explain her sorrowful tale. She says: "Dikri ne gaay jya dore tya jaay" (59) (Daughter and cow move as they are directed). The weak woman will always have someone to tyrannize over her. She speaks of herself as similar to a cow which has been misused by the master (the parents). The discussion will now move to some important aspects of the plot that register continuation or departure from the design of *Lalita* in terms of the idea of realism in dukhdarshak natak.

In *Kanya*, the element of co-incidence and improbable actions can be observed as similar to *Lalita*, but *Kajoda* does not show co incidence and improbable actions. In *Kanya*, the presence of the hunter, the pursuit of the robber and Lalbhat's escape, the arrival of a tiger, Lalbhat's comic behaviour similar to Panthiram in *Lalita* are more or less similar. In Act I, scene iv, Lalbhat's journey through a horrific jungle is a reminder of the Lalita's journey through the forest but, in *Kanya*, Lalbhat creates a comic scene unlike *Lalita* which has more tragic appeal in Lalita's struggle (10). Lalbhat meets a hunter in the jungle. Lalbhat also finds the tiger. But he is saved by the hunter. The role of the hunter becomes stereotypical with his hard nature. The hunter warns Lalbhat never to travel through a jungle. He hunts the tiger and sends Lalbhat into a hut to pass the night in the jungle. Lalbhat is similar to Panthiram in slapping himself when he is warned by the hunter (10-12).

In Act I, scene v, Lalbhat also meets a robber similar to Chhaldas who sends his agent to catch Panthiram on the way, in *Lalita* (12). But Lalbhat is different from Panthiram in this scene. He meets Thagbhai who is a deceiver but Lalbhat deceives Thagbhai by sending them in *vaav* (a well) and runs away (13-14). In Act I, scene xii, Lalbhat meets a driver and wants to ride with him to

Champanagari but he denies giving money introducing himself as a Brahmin (27-28). When the driver denies, Lalbhat speaks rudely (27). Lalbhat calls him *bhilda* (an insulting way of taking his community name) and his father, a donkey (28). He also calls the driver cunning (28). The character of Brahmin is portrayed in more comic manner.

The Idea of Sorrow in the Kajoda Plays

This section discusses the theme of sorrow developed in the two kajoda plays. The theme of sorrow is largely dependent on the theme of incompatible marriage. Like *Lalita*, both the Kajoda plays also develop the theme of the woman's desire and the frustration arising out of its non fulfilment, but as the discussion will show, there is much dissimilarity among the three plays especially with reference to the theme of domesticity and its relation to the idea of respectability. Finally, like *Lalita*, the tragic end of the female protagonist moves out of the domestic sphere into the public sphere underscoring the didactic aims of the plays.

In *Kanya*, the theme of incompatible marriage between a sixteen years old Chandagauri and seventy years old Amrutlal is highlighted in Act II, scene i (33-35). The women in neighbourhood cannot accept this marriage (34). The women see Amrutlal for the first time on the occasion of marriage. They express their frustration and dislike for Chandagauri's parents. They blame Jugaldas for fixing this match. They juxtapose the divine image of Chandagauri with Amrutlal calling him a dried box (34). The women point out the fragility of old Amrutlal's health and the young beauty of Chandagauri. One woman expresses her pity for Chandagauri: "Bichari gaay jevi Chandagauri ne nasibe ava Yampuri na barna sudhi pohunchela mud daal pati sathe panu padva no prasang kyathi avi lagyo hase? Radya mabaap nu shu bhalu thase. Avi kumali balki ni antardi baali ne te kya sukhe reheshe" (34) (From where has the incident of making a pair of poor cow like Chandagauri with such a dead husband, who has reached the door of god of death, come from? What good will the rude parents achieve? Where will they live happily burning the mind of such delicate daughter?)

The image of the helpless cow forced by others into an intolerable position is similar to image of *Lalita*, however, unlike *Lalita*, Chandagauri is

more innocent and therefore more helpless. This helplessness can be understood further with the help of the development of the same imagery elsewhere in the play. At times, she represents an individuated self of woman who is aware of the injustice and protests against it. Chandagauri is against this marriage; she protests on the very day of her marriage with Amrutlal. The parents attempt to convince her but she questions: "Mane baleline balvane agnima ghee homsho tethi Ishwar tamaru shu bhalu karshe varu?" (44) (Pour the oil in the fire to burn me who is burned already, so what good will the god do you anyway?)

The writer represents the protagonist as the woman of modern education. Chandagauri is resisting in her tone. The priest attempts to persuade Chandagauri on the ground of the respectability of home and character of good woman (45). The heroine is active in her speech. She rebukes the priest for his greed and interference (45). She also opposes her father and mother for their enmity and cruelty (46). Her mother requests her to save the reputation of family (45). Her father blackmails her by threatening her that he will harm himself in public by cutting his own tongue (45). On this, Chandagauri replies: "Jyare tame mane dukh devanej ubha thaya chho tyare atyare maari nakho, pan mane ribi ribine marva mate tamara haththi kasaivade jabar jastithi na hadselo" (46) (when you have stood to cause sorrow on me, then kill now, but do not push me with force by your hands to die in pain at the butcher's place).

Thus, she can realize the life time suffering after her marriage with the old man in her young age. She can understand the feeling of mental death. The priest informs the others and threatens her that she will cause public humiliation to her family. Chandagauri is blackmailed and she is forced to give up her individual will.

She succumbs in the name of god as she finds herself a poor daughter who has not been helped in adversity. The writer presents the reluctant woman against the unjust marriage. However, he shows the reality of social forces on a daughter who is blackmailed by the family members. The voice of the victimized daughter suppressed with the authority of God becomes the ground of the tragic fate of Gujarati woman.

In this marriage there is no scope for domestic harassment. On the contrary, the peculiar situation of the protagonist leads her on the path of widowhood very soon. The writer suggests the cultural boundaries for the Gujarati woman in her widowhood. Chandagauri's speech in her widowhood is

significant in this respect. She laments the death of her husband and for the wastage of her youth. Chandagauri finds that the husband may be virtuous, bad, young or old but it is essential that he is alive. She finds the husband an ornament of womanhood and his presence allows woman to be visible and happy in life (52-53). After the death of husband the ornaments are removed too. The ornaments on the body of woman become the sign of her status as the wife which give her visibility in public and confirm the happiness.

On the contrary, Act II, scene ii, Chandagauri struggles with the dilemma to transcend the cultural boundaries. As she contemplates the life of frustration ahead, she says:

...Nitibhang!! Na, na, kadapi karva ni nathi. Are! Prtyaksha agni ma bali maru topan shu? Kamagni mane tethi vadhare shu kari shaknar chhe. Punarlagna! Na te pan nahi..Are! Haji bija dukho hoi to te pan sahan karva teyar chhu. Man, Chanchal man shant tha. Have te sarva shaktiman prabhu tarafa j taru valan raakh ke te tane aa dukhi sansar manthi mukta kari potana charno ma raakhe (54-55) (Breeching morality! No, no, I will never do. Oh! Even if I die by burning in the fire itself, what is the matter? What more the fire of lust can do? Widow remarriage! No not even that... Oh! If there are other sorrows, I am ready to tolerate them too now. Mind, calm down unstable mind. Now keep your tendency toward that omnipotent god only so that he keeps you at his own feet making free from this sorrowful world.)

The tragic image of Chandagauri is highlighted as submitting to the omnipotent God for her emancipation from her sorrow of widowhood. The playwright teaches the Gujarati women to think of their cultural life only worth living if they behave like Chandagauri who does not give up her widowhood even though she is disturbed by the sexual instincts and contemplates to transgress the ethical code and religion. The Hindu wife is forced to accept even a mismatch because the loss of the husband becomes the loss of the very foundation on which the making of Hindu woman takes place. Her social position and status is determined by the presence of husband even if her sexual life is frustrated.

In this way, *Kanya* locates the tragic aspect of women's social life by showing the dilemma of woman's sexuality and her respectable position in society. Chandagauri laments for her unresolved fate by equating her misery to a sea which has spread in all the directions. She expresses her helpless condition in widowhood.

In a sharp contrast, *Kajoda* highlights Chanchal's bold sexuality as discussed in the earlier section. The author creates a sense of realism in the play. The child bridegroom does not speak throughout the play because he is a child. As in *Kanya*, in *Kajoda* too, the playwright employs the device of animal imagery to highlight the theme of incompatibility:

Shabda shunine shwanna, jem nashe manjar;
tyam nase dekhi mane, maro pran pyaro bharta (Parikh 32)
(Listening to the word of dog, the way male cat runs away;
In that way, my life-loving husband runs away watching me)

The contrast is striking in comparison to *Kanya* and *Lalita* where the female protagonist is submissive or docile and can be forced like a cow. Chanchal, on the other hand, compares her image like a dog which can frighten a cat.

Chanchal's bold speech is highlighted in the scenes of her domestic harassment. Unlike Lalita, Chanchal does not bear the taunts of the women in her married family but gives counter response to her mother-in-law, Navi. She retorts Navi on fond upbringing: "Laadvijay chhe to, te lavaya vina ma baape atla badha sukhma nakhya hase" (22) (So what if I am pampered, have the parents put in so much happiness without pampering?) She directly complains that she is not happy with Mani because he is not an adult man (23). She warns her mother-in-law to stay within her limits and not speak because the sorrow of incompatibility with child husband is larger than anything else (24). Nani enters and expresses her bitterness for the bold tone in Chanchal's speech (23). Nani tells that Chanchal is not even afraid of her father in law's presence and she will also offend him (24). Chanchal makes both her mother-in-law and sister-in-law clear that she is no more interested fighting with them (25-26).

In Act I, scene ii, the domestic quarrel takes place between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law (20). Navi criticizes Chanchal because she does not respect her son, Mani. She blames Chanchal for her "Gai gai ne muva ne varnu naam to dhool" (singing again and again diminishes the name of son and husband) (23). She also suggests that Chanchal can speak badly in her ironical language: "a maay saaru karta to natharu kahe chhe j" (she speaks more bad than good) (23). Navi complains that Chanchal laments because she is educated and she can further speak in blunt manner (23). Navi abuses Chanchal. She reveals that she will not care even if Chanchal "Chhone bhasti" (start to bark) (23).

In Act I, scene iii, a quarrel takes place again between Chanchal as bhabhi (sister-in-law) and Nani as nanand (sister-in-law). Nani also introduces herself as a victim of kajoda. Nani fights by claiming that her sorrow is greater than Chanchal's sorrow (35-36). She tries to argue and lament on the ground of her sorrow of kajoda. She argues that her husband is an old aged man (35). She tries to compete with Chanchal's sorrow because she is married to a husband who is not a child bridegroom but an aged man of sixty years old (35). But Chanchal dominates in her argument. Nani speaks out of jealousy: "Ha...ha... nano to saro...saro" (36) (yes...yes...the small bridegroom is good only...good).

The episode of domestic harassment outwardly creates laughter because of the wit in colloquial Gujarati. However, the theme of kajoda is that is mocked here. Both the victims of kajoda do not sympathize but argue with each other on the claim of being more sorrowful in the play. *Kajoda* dismantles Dave's representation of incompatible marriage between Lalita and Nandan. The episode of domestic harassment is one such site where the lament of bride is mocked.

However, despite this feature, *Kajoda* too does not fail to highlight the sorrow of the protagonist. It is possible to say that the expression of sorrow first comes in the form of the advice to Chanchal about the necessity of being a chaste and loyal wife. In Act I, scene iii, Chanchal reads the letter in the form of a song written by Mahakunwar (37). She is advised in the letter not to cross the rules of domestic life (37). She is advised to be a good wife by maintaining the discipline of home (37). Chanchal writes in reply and gives her letter to Kashad (39). The writing of letter is rendering of the scene in *Lalita* where Kamla teaches her the codes of good conduct to protect the respectability of home. Chanchal reads the list of advices not to bring disgrace to her home.

Secondly, at the outset it appears that unlike Lalita and Chandagauri who submit to the will of god, in Act I, scene i, Chanchal sings a couplet questioning the divine authority:

Nahi buddhi jari ehma, kehta laaj pamay;
Te dekhi tujne daya, shathi ram na thai (15)
(I am ashamed to tell that he has no or little intellect in him;
Oh God, why do not you be kind watching it?)

But Chanchal resembles Lalita when she urges god and thinks of the sins she might have committed in the last birth (33-34). She cries and asks in her

soliloquy to god why she has to tolerate so much pain (34). She sings a couplet for the second time:

Kahe Dayalu tujne, sau sushtina lok;
Ne julam kem jamaviyo, abla upar fok (13)
(All people in the world call you kind;
Why have you established meaningless oppression on powerless woman?)

Here, the contradiction between the protagonist of *Kajoda* and *Lalita* should be noted. Though Lalita suffers the multiple sorrows, she submits her physical desire to the name of god and does not reflect in her soliloquy irony to the divine authority. In case of Chanchal, the image of an individuated self is more visible. Chanchal does not submit to her sexual desire to the name of god but she questions and speaks in ironical manner. But finally, she too avoids blaming others and submits her experience of sexuality to the divine authority. She repeats the name of god and sigh: “Ram! Ram! Ram! (em undo nishvas nakhine) hashe, ishwarno gamyu te kharu” (14-15) [Oh God! Oh God! Oh God! (Thus sighing deeply) anyway let it be, what god has like is true].

The playwright does not show it as a cause of sorrow; rather, the problem of loss of husband’s manliness and wife’s chastity is highlighted a possible context in which the sites of sorrow are also mocked. In such context, the playwrights represent the laments of protagonist owing to the repression of sexuality.

Thus both the female protagonists are lead to their tragic end respectively. The next section discusses the theme of the tragic end and the ensuing theme of the public sphere included in this end.

The Tragic End and the Public Discussion

The discussion in this section brings into focus the significance of the public sphere in the portrayal of the tragic end in *Kajoda* and *Kanya*. The female protagonists in both the plays die as noted in the synopsis, however, there are significant similarities as well as differences between the two *Kajoda* plays as well as in relation to *Lalita*. The death of Chandagauri in *Kanya* is similar to that of Lalita in that she dies out of pain and exhaustion, where as Chanchal in *Kajoda* commits suicide. In both the death of the protagonist becomes a matter of

public discussion: in *Kanya*, it is situated in the public as such, in *Kajoda* it leads to a legal investigation. However, in *Kanya* too, the public discussion refers to the code of law, as will be discussed below. In that sense, both the *Kajoda* plays differ from *Lalita* as in the latter the public discussion is more in terms of the tragic emotion rather than a matter of legal-religious code but the theme of lament at the end, as in *Lalita* is present in both the *Kajoda* plays too. The following paragraphs will discuss these similarities and dissimilarities further.

In *Kanya*, Chandagauri delivers a soliloquy in Act II, scene ii (Harivithaldas 35). She curses her evil parents who forced her to marry and made her miserable for a lifetime (35-36). In Act III, scene ii, she expresses her grief for the signs of her widowhood: she is inauspicious; her head will be tonsured; her hands are empty of bangles; the bindi on the forehead is removed (52). She questions the use of education of all the people (53). She reveals her dream of reformed domesticity; her marriage with a learned man; her joy of discussions with husband and mutual commitment (51). She suppresses her pain in her mind and faints out of heavy crying (55). In Act III, scene iv, Chandagauri expresses her unbearable condition; her legs ache; she feels giddy; she feels insane; her veins are stretched. She curses her parents again and again (59). In her laments, she dies out of madness (59).

In *Kajoda*, Chanchal has been assured by her friend Mahakunvar, that she would arrange a public meeting to discuss Chanchal's sorrow (Parikh 52-53). But in Act II, scene ii, Chanchal calls the public display of sorrowful tale futile (53-54). She considers it mathakut (wearing and tiresome insistence upon a subject) (53). She makes it clear that the parents are the true criminals (54). In this, she also rejects the idealist image of woman who commits suicide only out of frustration to show generosity; to make people aware of harmful consequences of child marriage. Rather, she wants to get rid of the personal problem. She slits her throat with the knife and dies (54).

The scenes that follow the death of the protagonists, in both the *Kajoda* plays, show the public implications of a domestic issue. Both the plays portray the contemporary debates on women's reforms through the speeches of spokespersons of reformist groups.

In *Kanya*, in Act II, scene iii, the writer tries to show the picture of two different groups: *sudharovala* (reformist) and *bigadavala* (regressive) (Harivithaldas 42). *Sadgun* is the husband of Chandagauri's friend *Hiralakshmi*. Earlier in the play, he has met *Jugaldas* to persuade him to stop

the forced marriage. He explains Jugaldas the harmful consequences of mismatch (41-42). He tries to convince the suffering in the woman's life in the unfit marriage and after the death of husband. He warns Jugaldas: "Kare te bhogve aa sidhant chhe". (It is an axiom that one reaps as one sows) (42).

Sadgun and his wife are the representatives of modern reform in the play. Clearly, they also represent the new trend of companionate marriages in the progressive state of colonial rule of Gujarat. In Act III, scene iii, Sadgun and all assemble at the dead body of Chandagauri (60). Sadgun regrets the death. He speaks against the cruel trend of selling daughters. Chandagauri's sister, Vidyalakshmi laments the tragic end of her sister. Sadgun claims that the greedy people misinterpret the *shashtras* (religious texts) to force the young women to get married (60). He gives the evidences from *Manusmruti* and the preaching of *Hemadri* (encyclopaedic treatise of socio-legal topics) that to sell the daughter or *dasi* is a great sin (61). He also advises the shudra people not to exchange money for their daughters (61). In scene iv, he explains the main reason behind the cruel act of *kanya vikray* (the practice of accepting bride price): "mukhya mukhya gyatio ma kusamp ni prabalta vadhvathi teni andar taanaa taan thai ne judi judi tolio bandhaati gai ane tethi tema kanyao malva na bija maargo rahya nahi" (61) (due to the prominence of dissention among main communities, tension arose among them and different groups were formed, and therefore, there were no ways left in getting girls).

Sadgun observes that it is the division of castes which has led to the break of unity in society and to the impossibility to resolve the problem of incompatible marriage. The play ends with a collective song (62). The song is addressed to the natives to be aware and act for the reforms. All pray to the God together for inspiration (62). The play ends with the couplets that invoke the example of Chandagauri's tragic end to act for the good of daughters and make their life progressive (63).

Against this public gathering, the end of *Kajoda* is striking for its elaboration and the inclusion of the theme of crime and corruption. In Act II, scene iii, Dahya finds Chanchal's body (Parikh 56). He and his relatives try to hide Chanchal's body but the news of their crime is informed to the police (57). But the news of suicide has spread in the city. The police magistrate is informed too (57). He sends his constables to investigate. In scene v, the constables stop the dead body (61). However, as noted in the synopsis, Chanchal's father-in-law and his relatives bribe the authorities to hush up the suicide (64-65).

In Act III, scene ii, the theme of analytical thinking is introduced through the appearance of Vigyandas, who inquires the reason behind Chanchal's suicide and comes to know the fact of her marriage-she is married to a boy (72). He questions about the administrative initiative to take her in-laws in custody (73). He is informed by Mahakunvar that the police magistrate has taken bribe from the father in law (73). Vigyandas determines to teach a lesson to the police magistrate for his unjust act (74). He expresses his confidence and defines the true religion: "Apna dharma pramane apne na kariye, to pachhi eva lanchiyaonu vaid kon kare! Mate hu to karvanoj" (74) (According to our religion, if we do not act, then, who will apply the remedy to such bribe takers? I will act). Vigyandas believes it his duty to justify the victimization of Chanchal who was innocent. He decides to file a case against the corrupt police because he believes he is educated and should perform his duty to the state.

Scene iii shows the trial scene (75). Vigyandas files the case against the police magistrate for taking the bribe from Dahya and avoiding justice. The writer uses the court scene as the public place to address the importance of legal awareness and faith in colonial justice. The judge calls Vigyandas and asks him to call Mahakunvar (76-78). Mahakunvar gives of her eyewitness account of the rotten act (78). The judge punishes the police magistrate and the father-in-law for the bribe (79). The writer highlights the just rule of the government.

Mahakunvar expresses her anger for the ignorant natives and considers them even lower than an animal in comparison (83). She informs the harms of corruption to the natives (80). She appeals the native to bear the spirit of nationhood to end immorality in the nation (83). Mahakunvar speaks on behalf of the poor class of society: "...athi desh ma kevi aniti thase! Laanch lai nyay karo, etle garib ne to bichara ne kadi pan nyay malvani asha j na rahi..." (80) (...hence in nation how immorality will occur! Taking bribe you just, therefore the helpless poor never has the hope to get justice...).

Mahakunvar demands the justice for the poor class of society. Mahakunvar's speech is significant for the faith in democracy in modern society (80). She advises the natives not to stigmatize the nation by taking the bribe. She expresses the anger on their action for making feel their mother shame (81). She also condemns them for spoiling the reputation of their status, and also for leaving a negative impression of the nation on the British administration (83). She demands to put emphasis on the punishment to the corrupt officer and the father-in-law who unjust the victim for the greed of money (78).

The incompatible marriage is not quite resolved in *Kajoda*. In Act II, scene vi, just before the trial scene, the in-laws of Chanchal are shown arranging an incompatible marriage again between Mani and Shivilal's daughter (65-67). Commenting on this, Mahakunwar compares the gentlemen of Nadiad to the gentlemen from Ahmedabad (84). She finds the gentlemen from Ahmedabad more orthodox and corrupt (84). In this way, *Kajoda* does not give resolution; it shows the repetition of orthodox custom.

Kajoda, in comparison to *Lalita*, represents the educated couple of Vigyandas and Mahakunwar. It is similar to the educated couple of Buddhisagar and Gulab. But Vigyandas, the husband of Mahakunwar, is more active in *Kajoda*; he does not appear just to offer admonition in the play.

In *Lalita*, the theme of sorrow is the outcome of the dramatic incidents besides the bad character of the husband. The dramatic element of melodrama is important, which shows the death of the jester in heroic manner. Contrary to such mode of realism, *Kajoda* shows the social realism with original names of town (Nadiad) and city (Ahmedabad). It shows the legal action taken by a rational hero against the convicts at the court. Chanchal laments for her sorrow and kills herself in frustration. In *Kanya*, Chandagauri's sorrow becomes a subject of forced widowhood. It imitates the similar places which are created in *Lalita*.

The dialogue between Dahya and Navi is different than the conversation which takes place between Jivraaj and Kamla in *Lalita* and between Jugaldas and Savitagauri in *Kanya*: the latter use songs in well formed manner and discuss in social decorum; whereas, in *Kajoda*, Dahya calls Navi with colloquial abuse such as raand etc (Dave 27-28; Parikh 20-21; Harivithaldas 44-46). Dahya tries to control the quarrel. When he abuses Navi with raand, Gammatdas comments that raand means a widow but Navi's hand is decorated with bangles (21).

Contrary to *Kanya*, in *Kajoda*, the suicidal act and the public display to compensate the voice of woman occurs in the middle of the play. However, the incident of public displays of sorrow in *Kajoda* seeks to expose deep seated contradictions by the protagonist's response. Chanchal, appearing with a knife in her hands, speaks in her soliloquy: "Kadapi jaaher karishu to loko jaanshe, pan tethi kaai sukh thai evu chhe! Naa. Tyare khali, te mathakut shu karva karvi pade" (Parikh 53) (If we make it public, people will come to know, but will it bring any happiness? No. Then why should one break one's head?)

Finally it can be said that the public display, in terms of the re-appropriation of the traditional form of lament in *Lalita*, and the portrayal of a modern public sphere, in the form of Sadgun's speech in *Kanya* and that of the legal court in *Kajoda* mark the difference in the effect of the tragic end. The end of *Lalita*, because of its invocation of women's laments, on the one hand, underscores the tragic effect essential to a tragedy, but on the other hand, it shows the development of a colonial modern form of tragedy that hinges on a traditional theatrical/public form of sorrow. In comparison, *Kanya* and *Kajoda* show a more definite form of a "modern" public sphere. However, both the plays also show a sense of realism in not offering a definitely resolvable solution to the tragedy portrayed in the plays.

The exchange of letters is one more similar feature in *Kajoda* and *Kanya* and *Lalita*. Act I, scene ii is set in Dahya's building (20). Kashad enters the stage. He comes to give Chanchal the letter written by her father, Ghela from her native town, Nadiad (20). In *Kajoda*, the letter is sent for Chanchal to ask her well being. Kashad keeps the letter like Panthiram in his turban. Dahya reads the letter like Jivraaj (28). Dahya is informed that Chanchal's friend has also written the account for Chanchal in the letter (29). Here, the letter is written in combined form from both of the sides. The friend writes as a way to detect the sorrow of Chanchal. Chanchal's friend identifies Kashad a jasus (detective) who can inform about the news at in laws.

In *Kanya*, the letter is given to the heroine who has two friends, Vidhyalakshmi and Hiralakshmi. In Act II, scene ii, Vidyalakshmi gives the heroine the letter sent by Hiralakshmi (Harivithaldas 35-37). Vidyalakshmi is Chandagauri's sister. She comes to console and share the sorrow. She gives Chandagauri the letter written by her close friend, Hiralakshmi (37). Chandagauri requests her sister to read it because she feels overwhelmed (37). Chandagauri is consoled by her friend. The playwright uses the letter to introduce the opinion of the modern Gujarati woman. It should be interpreted as a part of contemporary discourse on marriage. Hiralakshmi speaks:

...paranvu e var kanya vachche akhaa bhav no karar chhe. Apna rivaj pramane varni hayati ma to nahij parantu tena gujari gaya pachhi pan stri bijo pati kari shakti nathi. Tem chhata kanyani vati evo karar tena mabaap kare ej pratham to pasand karva layak nathi; ane vali kanya moti ummar ni thaya pachhi parnaavata pan e baabat teno abhipray puchhya vina maa baapo potane thik pade tem kare e to bahuj gervajbi ane sok kaarak chhe (37-38)

(...marriage is an agreement between a husband and a wife for the life time. As per our custom, woman can not marry again even after the death of husband. However, it is more unreasonable and sorrowful that the parents make such agreement with an old man without asking the daughter's opinion in the matter).

Chandagauri's friend expresses her conviction that the marriage between a woman and man is a life time agreement. She does not approve the widow remarriage as it is not allowed in the Hindu custom after the death of husband. However, she criticizes the parents because to marry Chandagauri to the old man is an invitation to widowhood. She considers it unreasonable and blameworthy to marry a woman without her concern. Hiralakshmi informs Chandagauri that she cannot come because of household responsibility (39). She informs Chandagauri that she has sent her husband to persuade the parents to stop the unjust mismatch (38).

At the structural level, *Kanya* is similar from *Kajoda* in act divisions but it is different from *Kajoda* in the scene division. In *Kanya*, Act I is divided in fourteen scenes. In *Kanya*, Act I is different for the inclusion of large number of scenes. Act II is divided in three scenes and Act III is divided in four scenes. In *Kajoda*, Act I is divided in three scenes only. Act II, as the middle part of the play, is divided in six scenes. Act III is divided in three scenes. Thus in scene division, *Kajoda* is more compact and balanced in comparison to *Kanya*.

It is seen that the theme of marital sorrow is not limited to the incompatible marriage with a bad husband. It is also taken in account in the *Kajoda* plays in terms of forced widowhood and repression of sexuality. So, it can be understood that the genre as a tragedy continued to be reformulated in the second half of the nineteenth century.

The dukhdarshak genre was well established by Dave. It became a viable means, in particular, for Parikh, as Gupta points out, the conjugal life was also "discussed explicitly" by the reformers who considered "sexual pleasure an important facet of modern married life" (59). The logic of morality can be made in Harivithaldas' imitation of the style of literary genre by using a Sanskritized language but it is a way to escape censure in fear of being criticized on the change of obscenity.

Thus the chapter focused the dukhdarshak content and found that the view of tradition with duty and respect (in the invention of tradition of dukhdarshak natak), which pertains to the social reality of Gujarati woman, is

reversed in the Kajoda plays producing a counter view of imitation of the newly invented tradition with fear of being banned but also satirizing, mimicking and repeating the experience of dukh which showed the different side of social reform. Following this observation, the next Section shows the implications of modernity in colonial context of Gujarati theatre.

Jagdish Dave, in his book notes that Dave felt the need to write and stage his “karun natak” not for the *vidvanvarg* (intellectuals) but for the *jantajanardan* (people) (29). *Lalita* deals with the theatrical consumption of entertainment with moral allegory of good wife and bad husband in more developed dramatic form. Dave appreciates the indigenous tradition of performance to modernize Gujarati theatre in new ways. Dave is eclectic in his adoption of theatrical conventions to satisfy the demand of the middle class audience of Bombay. Jagdish Dave defines Dave’s eclecticism: afto+khuno+rudan+gito+updes+sthul hasya+ satat badlata drashya= natak (disaster+ murders+ lament+ songs+ admonition+ dull laughter+ constant changing scenes= drama) (29). The plurality of dramatic elements in *Lalita* shows the influence of existing Parsi Natak Uttejak Mandali which performed Dave’s plays. S. K. Das observes the development of the Parsi theatre in 1870s “riddled with rivalries” and keeping in view its main motif of profit (183). Dave faces the commercial challenge too apart from a sense of responsibility to mediate Gujarati community and culture. He is thus selective in the mode of representation of Gujarati woman who can be visible in her cultural codes.

The emergence of tragedy in Gujarati theatre offers a “hybrid⁴” form in reformist context. Dave was the scholar Sanskrit dramaturgy (Mehta 43). Dave makes Panthiram, similar to Ranglo in Bhavai, tell the entire story of his journey to Snehpur to Lalita when he is provoked by her impatience and doubts. He compiled a book of translation of stories from Shakespeare’s plays in Gujarati entitled *Shakespeare Katha Samaaj* in 1867 (43). He supported the modernization of folk actors and indigenous tradition apart from his critique of its comic mode (Dave, *Natak* 48-52). He supported Shakespearean framework to design the plot of *Lalita* (*Natya* 74). The Gujarati women attained the public visibility in *Lalita* because of the new way of writing tragedy. The cultural sensibility is mobilized through the songs. However, Dave’s ideological position is marked with

⁴ I have used the term from Homi K. Bhabha, “Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817.” *Critical Inquiry* 12.1 (1985): 144-165. JSTOR. Web. 1 Jan. 2013.

ambivalence when he deals with the negotiation to blend Western genre with eastern sensibilities and defines *Lalita* as a literary genre. *Lalita* played important role in the formation of popular Gujarati culture and also exerted a massive influence on the nascent modern theatre in the Gujarati language. The women of high caste society exist within the religious discourse. The play is significant for the emotionalism which appeals the human side of thinking of women as social being. The episode of townhall offers cite for women's visibility in the play but the question of their political solidarity remains unanswered.

Vasudha Dalmia, in her article, "Merchant Tales and the Emergence of Novel in Hindi" argues that "the notion of rupture generally served as the guiding principle" (43). She notes that the emergence of novel showed a "symbiotic relationship with its own modernity" (43). In Gujarati, the emergence of tragedy shows such relationship too in Dave's attempt to define *Lalita* with lack of surety to approximate it as Western literary form. Dave, in his presidential lecture, states that the Gujarati literature developed in various forms after 1857 (when Dayaram, the medieval poet died) (*Chothi* 5). Dave evaluates tragedy in the rupture:

"...poorva na karta ek navin prakar nu vilkshan rang dharan kartu sahitya utpan thayu chhe, ane Te yuniversity dwara vadhare shikshane Pamela yuvako na haththi je navintar sahitya no arambh thava mandyo chhe, teni madhya na avkaash ni poorti karnaru chhe. E ubhay ne jodnaru chhe-sankalrup chhe-sandhirup chhe. Kharu jota e sahitya keval navin vicharo ni pradhanpane sankalna nathi, tem j te keval prachin nu anukaran pan nathi. Parantu sahitya na vividh bijo no tema nishep thyelo chhe.

(One new kind of literature has emerged forming into a special colour different than East, which is a provider to fill the space in the middle of the newer literature being started by the hands of more educated young students of the University. This space conjoins, meets and connects the old with new in mutual relation. Indeed, it is not primarily definition of new thoughts in literature, that way only it is not the imitation of ancient too. But it is a mixture of various seeds of literature in it) (6).

Dave admits sandhiroop sahitya (literature of mixture) as the marker of amara sahityano samay (time of our literature) (6). In this context, Dave considers the forms such gadya lekho (prose writing), natako (plays) and the participation of the Parsi in place of the Jains which determined modern literature in nineteenth century (6). He states that the new Gujarati writers started to imitate prose in

Gujarati in reference to “angrezi bhashama nibandh adi lekho gadhya ma hoi chhe te joi ne” (looking that essays and other writings is written in prose in English language) (6). He does not consider the native prose in vishista (specific) literature because he opines it useful as kathan (oral) tradition only (6). He accepts its presence in the translation of Sanskrit plays and expresses his admiration to his friend, Mansukhram for the constant addition of more Sanskrit words in his writings (6). He notes the vadvivad (debates) on the issue of bhashasuddhi (purity of language) in lekhan-shaili sambandh ma (in relation to the style of writing) (6). He appreciates Shankarlal to write a play entitled *Savitri* on the ideal image of woman first in Sanskrit and later in Gujarati (6). Neelkanth notes in his article that Dave also turned back to the history by searching the subjects based on *Purankathas*, historical accounts of Rajput, Muslim and Maratha which inspired the drama to be developed (83).

Dave’s does not suggest a fix definition of tragedy set in reformist discourse, the most contested issue in mid nineteenth century.

Bhabha offers hybridity as a key concept in the domain of colonial discourses. He raises the question of immediate presence of English as metaphors of authority and its reception as the process of internalizing the structured “gaze” of power (*Sign* 144-165). In this sense, Dave negotiated the dangers of cultural binarism (us/them) and the fundamentalist urge to seek ‘pure’ cultural form. Dave made a new genre through a filtration of various elements of literature, and it neither centralizes leading factor of modern ideas nor the ancient tradition but it unites both the tradition and modernity.

Whether *Kajoda* or *Kanya* was performed is unknown. *Kajoda* satirizes the social pressure on the ideal image Gujarati woman by showing the natural cause behind the sorrow: repression of sexuality in its repertory. The play mingles laughter and erotic in liberal way but strangely evokes the pathos in brief manner in the middle of the play only. It is more a farce. Gammatdas speak in between the characters. The literary form such as gazal, lavani, and sakhi are used in the play which confirm the plurality of the genre. It uses the allegorical story too. Chanchal represents a more personal and pessimist image in the play as she does not care of public display of her sorrow and so sympathy of others. Vigyandas is the embodiment of social rationalism. He represents the power in service of knowledge which demands justice to Chanchal’s victimization under orthodox of high caste society. The struggle between victimization of Chanchal

and the demand for justice is the rural version of Marathi farce popular in Bombay.

Hariviththadas develops the repertory in *Kanya* like Tamasha. He brings traditional characters such Vidushak, Sutradhar and Nati to begin the play from Sanskrit. He also uses the Hindustani form of song such as gazal zinzoti etc. He uses the popular comic character of a Brahmin who is mocked by Vidushak in the play for his quarrelsome nature. Vidushak appears to satirize the old bridegroom and the parents who accept the price of dowry. However, the writer is clear in asserting the cultural boundary as he defines sorrow in the forced widowhood and as the result of Chandagauri's tragedy.

Contrary to the karun rasa in Dave's rhetoric of dramaturgy, Parikh and Hariviththaldas uses the comic as dominant rasa integrated in the three act plot of *Kajoda* and *Kanya*. In this sense, the plays are traditional. Gammatdas and Vidushak are typical examples of the level of humor from which Ranglo of Bhavai descends. In both, *Kajoda* contains obscenities and gestures in Gammatdas and Chanchal's speech whereas *Kanya* also shows a more individuated and resisting bride in Chandagauri to some extent. Dave, as a puritanical reformer, expunges such impression in *Lalita* in late nineteenth century though not on the whole. But Dave succeeds in achieving the desired effect as he aims to entertain and reform the implied audience and develops the hybridity accordingly.

The final Chapter concludes the discussion in Chapter I and Chapter II.

WORKS CITED

- Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis* 28 (1984): 125-133. JSTOR. Web. 12 Jan. 2013.
- ."Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical Inquiry* 12.1 (1985): 144-165. JSTOR. Web. 1 Jan. 2013.
- Chatterjee, Sudipto. *The Colonial Staged: Theatre in Colonial Calcutta*. London, New York, Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2007. Print.
- Dave, Jagdish. *Gujarati ane Marathi Samajik Natak, 1850-1900* [Gujarati and Marathi Social Plays, 1850-1900]. Ahmedabad: Vasant Prakashan, 2000. Print.
- Dalmia, Vasudha. "Merchant Tales and the Emergence of the Novel in Hindi." *EPW* 43.34 (2008): 43-60. JSTOR. Web. 26 Jun. 2013.
- Das, Sisir Kumar. *A History of Indian Literature: Western Impact: Indian Response, 1800-1910*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademy, 1991. Print.
- Dave, Ranchhodbhai Udayram. *Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak* [The Revelation of Lalita's Sorrow]. Mumbai, 1866. Print.
- ."Natak no Prarambh" [The Beginning of Drama]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 46-64. Print.
- Gupt, Somnath. *The Parsi Theatre: Its Origin and Development*. Trans. and ed. Kathryn Hansen. Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2005. Print.
- Gupta, Charu. "Redefining Obscenity and Aesthetics in Print." *Sexuality, Obscenity, Community: Women, Muslims, and the Hindu Public in Colonial India*. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001. 30-66. Print.
- Hansen, Kathryn. "Languages on Stage: Linguistic Pluralism and Community Formation in the Nineteenth Century Parsi Theatre." *Modern Asian Studies* 37.2 (2003): 381-405. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2013.
- ."Research and Content Generation English Island Before the Parsi Theatre." Web<
<http://dfarzan.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/research.pdf>>.
- Harivithaldas, Keshavlal. *Kanya Vikray Khandan Natak* [A Play Denouncing the Practice of Accepting Bride Price]. Mumbai, 1888. Print.

- Mehta, Chandravadan C. "Shakespeare and Gujarati Stage." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 41-50. JSTOR. Web. 1 Sept. 2013.
- Pandya, Jagjivan Kashiram. Preface *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* [The Revelation of Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage]. Ahmedabad, 1883. Print.
- Parikh, Keshavlal Motilal. *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak: Ek Prasang* [The Revelation of Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage: An Incident]. Ahmedabad, 1872. Print.
- Patil, Anand. *Western Influence on Marathi Drama*. Goa: Rajhauns Vitran, 1993. Print.
- Ranade, Ashok D. *Stage Music of Maharashtra*. New Delhi: Sangeet Natak Akademi, 1986. Print.
- Sarkar, Tanika. "Performing Power and Troublesome Plays: The Early Public Theatre in Colonial Bengal." *Rebels, Wives, Saints: Designing Selves and Nations in Colonial Times*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2009. 53-191. Print.
- Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. "Chothi Gujarati Sahitya Parishadna Pramukhna Bhashanmanthi Avtarano [Extracts from the Presidential Lecture of the Fourth Gujarati Sahitya Conference]." *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 3-10. Print.
- ."Natyaprakash" [Light on Dramaturgy]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 74-75. Print.

CONCLUSION

Summary of the Main Argument

In colonial India the formation of a theatrical genre was a complex bicultural process. It was problematised by the discourse of nationalism in Gujarati theatre, particularly in its relation with the woman's question. The negotiations of this process are evident in the mixture of genres and the nature of language the formation of genre incorporated. Dave, in the making of *Lalita*, does not betray his native heritage and also copies the design of Shakespearean plot structure to suit the inclinations of a metropolitan theatre of Bombay. In a generic sense, he confirms the use of indigenous sub-texts while in linguistic sense; his use of language is replete with idiomatic phrases, verbal shades, figures of speech, colloquial speech patterns. Dave keeps the indigenous design in continuity though he chooses the tragic denouement to arouse pity for Lalita. The ambivalence at the literary and cultural crossroad is evident in the position of Dave. It is a significant phenomenon as it addresses the issue of reform of women in society. The play offers a new image of a Gujarati woman for the first time in the history of Gujarati literature. This modern image of a new Gujarati woman is introduced through a paradox. It introduces the image but shows it in the play as a failure in the socio-cultural domain.

An anonymous writer in his article "Lalitadukhdarshak Natak ane teno Prayog The Tragedy of Lalita-Dukh-Darshak" (Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak and Its Performance) gives an account of the playwright's attempt to make tragedy natural in Gujarati (98). The writer finds shokant natakna antvishay ma matbhed (difference in views about the end of a tragic play) in Gujarati (98). He appreciates the glory of Shakespeare for his tragedies. He takes Shakespeare's *King Lear* and finds difference in views in accepting it as a tragedy in Gujarati as it is claimed that the hero or the heroine should be kept alive to show the victory of nitipaksh (moral side) and teach bodh (moral) (98). The anonymous writer argues, in the light of Dave's treatment of his play, that "Lalita na man ane tan upar etla badha dukho pade chhe ke tyar pachhee tenathee jeevi shakai

e j ashakya chhe, tyar pachhee tenathee jeevavu e prakruti virudh vikruti j ganay" (Lalita's mind and body suffer so much pain that it is impossible for her to live after that, to be lived by her after that would be a perversion against the natural course of events.) (98).

In this way, the anonymous writer supports the idea of a 'natural' development of dukh parampara (the tradition of sorrow) and the possibility of the danger of kutrimta (artificiality) and sithilta (weakness) in the creation of an argument about dukh (sorrow) (98). He explains that Lalita's death makes the parents repent their action and the realization of bad deed is portrayed at the end of the play.

In this regard, Chapter I tried to highlight the relation between Dave and Shakespeare. It showed the influence of Shakespeare on Dave in writing *Lalita*. The influence was traced in the light of Dave's denial of dramatic unities and his attempt to experiments with the element of chance and establishment of decorum in the play. Dave's denial of dramatic unities suggests that the process of "Orientalizing" the "other" was at work (Mukta 26). On the other hand, Dave's critique of Bhavai in his article "Natak no Prarambh" (The Beginning of Drama) suggests his concern about Gujarati popular culture (48). It can also be observed in his support in sending the folk actors to Bombay to reform their language and enactments (50).

The resulting juxtaposition of high and low art was seen as connected to Dave's support of Shakespeare's dramatic idea of chance (*Natyaprapakash* 74). It is evident in the development of good and bad characters in the play. Against the idea of a tragic flaw in the protagonist, Dave is radical in his representation of tragic failure of 'good' characters in the play (48). The emergence of tragedy in Gujarati alludes to "the political framework of consolidating colonial state power" which extinguished the traditional images of sorrowful women and modernized the element of lament to mediate a new public (Mukta 26). Dave brought a new binary of kutrim/akutrim (unnatural/natural) in his theatrical discourse on the new proscenium stage (*Natyaprapakash* 75).

Chapter I confirmed Partha Chatterjee's argument that in colonial nationalism the woman is located in the "inner" domain of the "tradition" (Chatterjee 242). In *Lalita*, Lalita's sorrow and lament are ushered in the new public sphere. The chapter also confirmed Dipesh Chakrabarty's explanation of the making of "Lakshmi/Alakshmi" across "historical" and "modern" binaries (Chakrabarty, 183). Lalita does not imitate the path of Alakshmi (bad woman)

who is uneducated and quarrelsome, one who does not show the values of tolerance, gentleness, loyalty to husband and home in conduct but shows laziness, transgressive tendency and arrogance. In Anuradha Kapur's terms, Chapter I argued that it became imperative for Dave to confirm "identification" and achieve "theatrical modernity" through modernization of lament (located in inner) in the theatrical public (outside) (Kapoor 88) In the play, the fusion of private and public can also be marked which was seen in the rapid increase of print in the nineteenth century (Sarkar 164); for example, the emergence of several dukh-darshak natak which introduced new authors and recontextualised lament on stage.

Dave's nativism was seen to play a crucial role in achieving the historical sense of identity incorporating the three fold influence of dramatic tradition (Sanskrit, Bhavai and Shakespeare) in *Lalita*. He introduces mixed theatrical form which may be understood with the help of the concept of hybridity: the play opens in the Sanskrit drama tradition with Nandi, uses the rendering of Kalidas's *Shakuntala* in the scene of Lalita's fare well, the bee wonder around the body of Lalita when she is unconscious, the King's description of her beauty and in the scene of Buddhisingar's admonition from *Hitopadesh*. On the other hand, Dave imitates the five acts plot structure and clear climax, and uses of co-incidences in the play. Dave develops Ranglo (jester) of Bhavai in the character of Panthiram and succeeds to achieve public response by including popular songs, proverbs, riddles and puns. He uses the songs from the shared culture of Gujarati women and mobilizes the idea of a good woman through the character of Lalita who meets a tragic end due to her incompatibility with her husband who is a bad man.

The anonymous writer appreciates Dave's selection of songs in *Lalita* because it does not aim to satisfy the public with "shudra raag-shudra artha-shudra rasayukt padya" (poetry full of lowly tune, meaning and sentiments) (98). He divides the music in *Lalita* in two forms: marga and deshi (99). Marga includes the raga-ragini from the high art form. Deshi includes tunes popular in a particular region. He notes the use of *garbi* (Deshi tunes) in *Lalita*: in Lalita's letter, in Lalita's meeting with her friend Prabhavati (99). He appreciates the jatiya raag (generic tune) in the scene of Lalita's awakening from dream, her praying to god before jumping into the river (99). Similarly, at the level of the prose, Dave does not seem to have established the division between written and

spoken varieties. Thus the emergence *Lalita* marks new changes in the literary and cultural articulation with the several intertextualities.

Dave is successful in creating the realism in *Lalita* as he has dealt with the everyday speech forms, a secular world view (he also criticizes the superstitious belief), exclusive focus on subject that is contemporary and a style of acting that attempts to recreate the impression of reality (often by seeking identification with the role, understood in terms of given circumstance). On the whole, he does not depart from the folk language of medieval Gujarat, which had been a highly syncretised and shared by Hindu and Muslims alike. The note of Indo-Persian speech is evident in Pooranmal's character. However, the shared literary traditions seem to be stereotyped and stigmatized variously as belonging to women (the courtesans), the lowly classes (the fishermen) and the Muslim (Pooranmal as the abductor) as the anonymous writer notes in his observation (98-99). Chapter I thus considered *Lalita* as the pioneer of the dukhdarshak natak in Gujarati and as the template for understanding, with reference to two other plays, the development of the genre of dukhdarshak natak.

Chapter II was a comparative study which notes the dissimilarities and similarities of two other plays with reference to *Lalita*. It is found that the two Kajoda plays (plays on the theme of incompatible marriage) differ in many ways from *Lalita* even though they imitate the representation of sorrow and tragic end. In *Kajoda*, the issue of tragedy is not owing to the marriage with the bad character of husband but it is more to do with the repression of sexuality which forces the heroine to kill herself. It also differs from *Lalita* as it does not show the tragic end of the protagonist at the end but in the middle of the play. In *Kanya*, the issue of tragedy is dependent upon early widowhood. Though the protagonist is forced to marry an old man, she wants him to live any way so that she can assert her identity in the society. The death of her husband becomes the very reason of her tragedy.

In this case, Chapter II, with the example of *Kajoda*, argues that standardization of 'high' literature could not succeed in deleting the lesser print culture. The vigour of such print culture can be noticed in the writing of dukhdarshak natak increasingly in the last three decades of nineteenth century. The comparative study of three dukhdarshak plays becomes an important study because it attempts to understand the cultural processes occurring in 1870s and 1880s. The present study makes it imperative to locate the study of

Gujarati drama within these cross currents of social conflict and shifting literary values and establish the voice of this peripheral culture. So, the writing of multiple dukhdarshak natak should not be underestimated on account of their repetition of thematic aspect and borrowing of laments. Jagdish Dave has collected the dukhdarshak play texts in his published thesis in Gujarati: he discusses the thematic and structural facets of these plays. However, he confirms the plays as rough repetition of laments of victimized bride (23-131).

Chapter II showed that the difference between the Kajoda plays was an important element of discussion. *Kajoda* is full of the elements of farces. It addresses the issue of incompatible marriage with powerful depiction of the public sphere in form of a trial scene at the court where the victimized bride is justified, her father-in-law who bribed the police officer and the corrupt police man are punished. It challenges Dave's allegorical realism as it sets the play in naturalist setting by using the name of the original places in the play and the everyday language. *Kajoda* shows a frank and unabashed expression of the protagonist's sexuality and her free admission of its repression. It represents a protagonist blunt in her language and not idealized as in *Lalita*.

On the other side, *Kanya* differs from *Kajoda*. It shows an attempt to imitate *Lalita* in many ways. It uses the traditional characters from Sanskrit and portrays the speeches without the excessive elements. *Kanya* contains an element of parody. But unlike *Kajoda*, it is a parody of the Brahminical practices that harm society. The play was published in 1888 when Indian National Congress was founded in 1885. The play, in this context, appears nationalist. It does not portray the scene of town hall or court similar to *Lalita* and *Kajoda*, respectively. It is different from *Kajoda* because the heroine dies in the state of a forced widowhood. At the same time, it also confirms to the argument of Partha Chatterjee and suggests that the women cannot exist without husband in Hindu society as she has to maintain the code of cultural respectability (Chatterjee 245). The play shows another change: it shows two friends who sympathize the protagonist but they confirm the cultural taboo of widowhood only. In this way, *Kanya* does not really take up the issue of sexuality.

The farcical aspect in the both Kajoda plays indicates the nature of modernization of genres in Gujarati theatre. The implication of modernity allows the playwrights of Kajoda plays to extend the boundaries and social norms based on reforms around women's life. It is strategic in mode of representation. The repetition of traditional theme in modern form is dealt with

social questions of high and low by introducing underlying changes. The both Kajoda plays are new in the theatrical use of realism. They criticize the social reforms movements in Gujarat as causing sexual harm such as loss of virility in men and chastity in women. They are significant because they suggest the larger implications of these issues for the notions of public sphere, for questions of high and low art, and for the development of Gujarati theatre.

The Limitations of the Study

The present dissertation accepts the limitations of the archival work undertaken. It accepts the difficulty regarding the translation of paraphrases at required times. It attempts, however, with sense of inquiry, to bring important information. This study does not extend to the study of the performative aspects of the plays. It is limited to textual discussion. Such an approach naturally leaves out the question of how on stage the plays looked. The limitation in discussing the performative aspect of the texts is because it was almost not possible to find the material on the performance any of the plays.

The archival material used in this study is largely about *Lalita*, because it was easily available. An archival search for the reception of the Kajoda plays has not been included. It has become difficult to study how the Kajoda plays were received in nineteenth century context in the lack of archival material. It has not been possible to understand the popularity of the Kajoda plays.

At the textual level, the study of the various genres and their implications is limited and it does not study all aspects of the indigenous as well as Western forms. It is clear that this study needs a deeper understanding of the issues of popularity of Western influences as well the local genres for framing the question of 'bold language', and the embedded issue of sexuality. This last aspect is especially important for the understanding of the issue in impersonation and portrayal of seductive and ideal femininity.

Further Scope of the Study

The emergence of tragedy is part of the total literary and cultural movement in the nineteenth century Gujarati drama. It makes the scope of the study clear

with reference to the experience of modernity and challenge posed by it for the new playwrights in Gujarati. The outcome of major literary plays as new genre including both comedy and tragedy trace the influence of English literature. The subjective position of the playwright, however, is an important issue of study for further research. It questions the relation of the playwright and the 'text' in the reformist/nationalist framework.

Further, at the same time, particularly taking in account the outcome of dukhdarshak natak and the emergence of new authors, the study also allows us to examine how numerous cheap presses in Bombay and Ahmedabad made widely known wide ranging literary tastes and opened a space to different divisions of Gujarati middle classes to voice their own distinctive concerns. It must be noted that the production of dukhdarshak natak is traced with the literary experiments. K.T. Travadi, in his play *Neelvanti Dukhdarshak Natak*, adopts a new mode where "the characters themselves narrate other characters' story" (Dave 124).

In the process of literary output, new literary shifts are marked in the history of Gujarati drama, particularly, in the history of emergence of tragedy in Gujarati. By the end of the nineteenth century, Dahyabhai Dholshaji Zaveri invents a new tradition- to write a prefix, 'Navin' in the title of dukhdarshak natak (Dave 132). His first play, *Shree Navin Umadevadi* is noted to be performed in 1898. In the play, Nati declares that to avoid monotony Uma represents ideas for the king Hamir in the matter of justice and politics instead of reflecting the out dated impression of sati (the ideal women) who is true enough like Lalita to protect her chastity (Dave 138). Zaveri highlights Uma similar to Portia of *The Merchant of Venice* (138). Zaveri's second play *Shree Navin Veenaveli Natak* is noted to be performed in 1899. It also shows how the heroine reforms her domestic life with the help of her intellect. In the context of Gujarati theatre, the literary shifts can be noted when Zaveri started to write plays with the prefix "'navin'" and the fashion of writing plays with the suffix "'dukhdarshak natak'" was seemed no more in fashion in the end of the nineteenth century (J. Dave 45).

It offers us a scope to examine further the use of Shakespeare's plays in new Gujarati plays in form of free adaptations. It is important also in regard to the women's question because new shifts are seen in the representation of heroine not as tragic but as skilled in handling domestic affairs.

WORKS CITED

- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Limits of the Bourgeois Model?" *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010. 178-201. Print.
- Chatterjee, Partha. "The Nation and Its Women." *Subaltern Studies Reader, 1986-1995*. Eds. David Arnold and David Hardiman. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. 240-261. Print.
- Dave, Jagdish. *Gujarati ane Marathi Samajik Natako, 1850-1900*. (Gujarati and Marathi Social Plays, 1850-1900) Ahmedabad: Vasant Prakashan, 2000. Print.
- Kapur, Anuradha. "Impersonation, Narration, Desire, and the Parsi Theatre." *India's Literary History*. Eds. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 87-118. Print.
- "Lalita Dukhdarshak natak ane teno prayog The Tragedy of Lalita-Dukhdarshak" [Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak and Its Performance]. *Samalochak* 1.3 (1896): 63-68, 94-99. Print.
- Mukta, Parita. "'The Civilizing Mission': The Regulation and Control of Mourning in Colonial India." *Feminist Review* 63 (1999): 25-47. JSTOR. Web. 30 Oct 2013.
- Sarkar, Tanika. "Domesticity and Middle Class Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Bengal." *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010. 157-177. Print.
- Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. "Natyaprakash" [Treatise on Dramaturgy]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 74-75. Print.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acharya, Dr. Jayshankar. "Gurjar Rangbhumina Prakhar Subhechhaknu Sansmaran" [Remembrance of the Passionate Well-Wisher of Gujarati Stage]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 223- 225. Print.
- Awasthi, Suresh. "Shakespeare in Hindi." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 63-72. JSTOR. Web. 25 Aug. 2013.
- Banerji, Rangana. "'Every college student knows by heart': The Uses of Shakespeare in Colonial Bengal." *The Shakespearean International Yearbook. No.12: Special Section, Shakespeare in India*. Ed. Sukanta Chaudhari. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012. 7-27. Print.
- Baradi, Hasmukh. *History of Gujarati Theatre*. Trans. Vinod Meghani. New Delhi: National Book Trust, 2001. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis* 28 (1984): 125-133. JSTOR. Web. 12 Jan. 2013.
- ."Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical Inquiry* 12.1 (1985): 144-165. JSTOR. Web. 1 Jan. 2013.
- Bharucha, Hiralal. "Ranchhodbhai-Gujaratna Shakespear" [Ranchhodbhai- The Shakespeare of Gujarat]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1937. 213-215. Print.
- Bhatia, Nandi. Introduction. *Modern Indian Theatre: A Reader*. Ed. Nandi Bhatia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. xi-xxxix. Print.
- Bose, Buddhadev. "Modern Bengali Literature: A Study in Indian-Western Relations." *Comparative Literary Studies* 1.1 (1964): 47-53. JSTOR. Web. 29 Aug 2013.
- Burton, Antoinette. *At the Heart of the Empire: Indians and Colonial Encounter in Late Victorian Britain*. Berkely: University of California Press, 1998. Print.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Limits of the Bourgeois Model?" *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010. 178-201. Print.

- ."Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts?" *Subaltern Studies Reader, 1986-1995*. Eds. David Arnold and David Hardiman. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. 263-288. Print.
- Chatterjee, Partha. "The Nation and Its Women." *Subaltern Studies Reader, 1986-1995*. Eds. David Arnold and David Hardiman. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. 240-261. Print.
- Chatterjee, Sudipto. *The Colonial Staged: Theatre in Colonial Calcutta*. London, New York, Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2007. Print.
- Chavda, Vijay S. *Modern Gujarat*. Ahmadabad: New Order Book, 1982. Print.
- Dalmia, Vasudha. "Merchant Tales and the Emergence of the Novel in Hindi." *EPW* 43.34 (2008): 43-60. JSTOR. Web. 26 Jun. 2013.
- . *Poetics, Plays and Performance*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.
- Das, Gupta R.K. "Shakespeare in Bengali Literature." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964):16-26. JSTOR. Web. 25 Aug. 2013.
- Das, Sisir Kumar. *A History of Indian Literature: Western Impact: Indian Response, 1800-1910*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademy, 1991. Print.
- ."Shakespeare in Indian Languages." *India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation and Performance*. Eds. Poonam Trivedi and Dennis Bartholomeusz. Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2005. 42-65. Print.
- Datta, Amaresh. *Encyclopaedia of Indian Literature*. Vol. 2. Delhi: Sahitya Akademy Press, 1998. Web. 4 June 2013. <http://books.google.co.in/books?id=ObFCT5_taSgC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
- Dave, Jagdish. *Gujarati ane Marathi Samajik Natako, 1850-1900*. (Gujarati and Marathi Social Plays, 1850-1900) Ahmedabad: Vasant Prakashan, 2000. Print.
- Dave, Ranchhod Udayram. "Gurjar Rangbhumini Vartman Paristhiti" [The Present Condition of Gujarati Stage in Colonial Period]." *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 42-45. Print.
- . *Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak* [A Play Revealing Lalita's Sorrow]. 6th ed. Mumbai, 1866. Print.

- ."Mehlomani Prachin Natakshala [The Ancient Theatre of Palaces]." *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1937. 67-73. Print.
- ."Natakno Prarambh" [The Beginning of Drama]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 46-64. Print.
- ."Rasaprakash-rasa [Light on the Sentiment]." *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1937. 12-19. Print.
- Deshpande, G.P. "Dialectics of Defeat: Some Reflections on Literature, Theatre and Music in Colonial India." *EPW* 22.51 (1987): 2170-2176. *JSTOR*. Web. 30 April 2012.
- Ebeling, Sascha. Introduction. *Colonizing Realm of Words: The Transformation of Nineteenth Century Tamil Literature in South India*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2010. 1-20. Print.
- Freitag, Sandria B., ed. *Culture and Power in Banaras: Community, Performance, and Environment, 1800-1980*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989. Web. 5 Sept. 2013. <<http://ark.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft6p3007sk/http://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/view?docId=ft6p3007sk;brand=ucpress>>.
- Ghose, Ajit. "Modern Bengali Literature." *Modern Indian Literature: Plays and Prose*. Ed. K. M. George. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademy Press, 1994. 71-94. Web. 5 Aug. 2013. <<http://books.google.co.in/books?id>>.
- Gupt, Somnath. *The Parsi Theatre: Its Origin and Development*. Trans. and ed. Kathryn Hansen. Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2005. Print.
- Gupta, Charu. "Redefining Obscenity and Aesthetics in Print." *Sexuality, Obscenity, Community: Women, Muslims, and the Hindu Public in Colonial India*. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001. 30-66. Print.
- Hansen, Kathryn. "Language, Community, and the Theatrical Public." *India's Literary History*. Eds. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 60-86. Print.
- ."Languages on Stage: Linguistic Pluralism and Community Formation in the Nineteenth Century Parsi Theatre." *Modern Asian Studies* 37.2 (2003): 381-405. *JSTOR*. Web. 4 Feb. 2013.

- , "Making Women Visible: Gender and Race Cross-Dressing in the Parsi Theatre." *Theatre Journal* 51.2 (1999):127-147. JSTOR. Web. 21 May. 2013.
- , "Research and Content Generation: English Island Before the Parsi Theatre." Web<
<http://dfarzan.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/research.pdf>>.
- Harivithaldas, Keshavlal. *Kanya Vikray Khandan Natak* (The Play Denouncing the Practice of Accepting Bride Price). Mumbai, 1888. Print.
- Isaka, Riho. "Gujarati Intellectuals and History Writing in the Colonial Period." *EPW* 37.48 (2002): 4867-4872. JSTOR. Web. 8 Sept. 2012.
- , "Language and dominance: The debates over the Gujarati language in the late nineteenth century." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 25.1 (2002):1-19. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 11 January 2012.
- Jaaware, Aniket and Urmila Bhirdikar. "Shakespeare in Maharashtra, 1892-1927: A Note on Trend in Marathi Theatre and Theatre Criticism." *The Shakespearean International Yearbook. No.12: Special Section, Shakespeare in India*. Ed. Sukanta Chaudhuri. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012. 43-52. Print.
- Jani, Balwant. *Lokgurjari* [Folk Literature of Gujarat]. vol. 23. Ed. Balwant Jani. Gandhinagar: Gujarat Sahitya Academy, 2011. 113. Print.
- Joshi, Sanjay. Introduction. *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010. xv-lvi. Print.
- Joshi, Swati. "Dalpatram and the Nature of Literary Shifts in Nineteenth-century Ahmedabad." *India's Literary History*. Eds. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 327-357. Print.
- Kapur, Anuradha. "Impersonation, Narration, Desire, and the Parsi Theatre." *India's Literary History*. Eds. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 87-118. Print.
- Lal, Anand. "A Historiography of Modern Indian Theatre." *Modern Indian Theatre: A Reader*. Ed. Nandi Bhatia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. 31-40. Print.
- "Lalita Dukhdarshak natak ane teno prayog The Tragedy of Lalita-Dukhdarshak" [Lalita Dukhdarshak Natak and Its Performance]. *Samalochak* 1.3 (1896): 63-68, 94-99. Print.
- Mehta, Chandravadan C. "Shakespeare and Gujarati Stage." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 41-50. JSTOR. Web. 1 Sept. 2013.

- Moorthy Rao, A. N. "Shakespeare in Kannada." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 63-72. JSTOR. Web. 1 October 2013.
- Mukta, Parita. "'The Civilizing Mission': The Regulation and Control of Mourning in Colonial India." *Feminist Review* 63 (1999): 25-47. JSTOR. Web 30 Oct 2013.
- Naregal, Veena. *Language Politics, Elites, and the Public Sphere*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001. Print.
- Pandya, Jagjivan Kashiram. Preface. *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak* [The Revelation of Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage]. Ahmedabad, 1883.1-7. Print.
- Parekh, Madhusudan. *Gujarati Sahityano Aaswad* [An Appreciation of Gujarati Literature]. Ahmedabad: Chandramauli Prakashan, 1981. Print.
- Parikh, Keshavlal Motilal. *Kajoda Dukhdarshak Natak: Ek Prasang* [The Revelation of Sorrow of Incompatible Marriage: One Incident]. Ahmedabad, 1872. Print.
- Patil, Anand. *Western Influence on Marathi Drama*. Goa: Rajhauns Vitran, 1993. Print.
- Rajadhyaksha, M.V. "Shakespeare in Marathi." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 83-94. JSTOR. Web. 1 Sept. 2013.
- Rajamannar, P.V. "Shakespeare in Telgu." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 127-131. JSTOR. Web. 1 Sept. 2013.
- Ranade, Ashok D. *Stage Music of Maharashtra*. New Delhi: Sangeet Natak Akademi, 1986. Print.
- Raval, R. L. *Mahipatram*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 2002. Web. 24 Jan. 2013. <<http://books.google.co.in/books?id=EXgBme2yVVQC&pg=PP6&lpg=PP6&dq=Mahipatram+The+Makers+of+Indian+Literature.>>.
- Sarkar, Tanika. "Domesticity and Middle Class Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Bengal." *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Ed. Sanjay Joshi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010. 159-167. Print.
- , *Hindu Wife, Hindu Nation: Community, Religion and Cultural Nationalism*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001. Print.
- , "Performing Power and Troublesome Plays: The Early Public Theatre in Colonial Bengal." *Rebels, Wives, Saints: Designing Selves and Nations in Colonial Times*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2009. 53-191. Print.
- Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. "Chothe Gujarati Sahitya Parishadna Pramukhna Bhashanmanthi Avtarano [Extracts from the Presidential Lecture of the Fourth Gujarati Sahitya Conference]."

- Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 3-10. Print.
- , "Natyaprakash" [A Light on Dramaturgy]. *Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdismarakgranth*. Eds. Shree Ranchhodbhai Udayram Shatabdi Samiti. Mumbai: n.p., 1938. 74-75. Print.
- Shukla, Sonal. "Goverdhanram's Women." *EPW* 22.44 (1987): 63-69. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 July
- Singh, Jyotsna. "Different Shakespeares: The Bard in Colonial/Postcolonial India." *Modern Indian Theatre: A Reader*. Ed. Nandi Bhatia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. 77-96. Print.
- Singh, Lata. Introduction. *Theatre in Colonial India: Play-House of Power*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. 1-23. Print.
- Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: The 'manly Englishman' and 'effeminate Bengali' in the late nineteenth century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995. Print.
- Solomon, Rakesh H. "Towards a Genealogy of Indian Theatre Historiography." *Modern Indian Theatre: A Reader*. Ed. Nandi Bhatia. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009. 3-30. Print.
- Subramanyam, Ka. Naa. "Shakespeare in Tamil." *Indian Literature* 7.1 (1964): 120-126. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Aug. 2013.
- Sugimoto, Yoshio. "'Boys Be Ambitious': Popular Theatre, Popular Cinema and Tamil Nationalism." *Senri Ethnological Studies* 71 (2008): 229-240. Web. 5 Oct. 2014. <http://ir.minpaku.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10502/1139/1/SES71_010.pdf>.
- Sukla, Ramesa Ma. *Navalram*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademy, 1998. Print.
- Thakar, Dhirubhai. *Abhigyan* [Recognition]. Ahmedabad: Bhagvati Mudranalaya, 1991. Print.
- Thakkar, Usha. "Women and Social Reform in 19th Century Gujarati Society." *EPW* 32.1/2 (1997): 46-52. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 May. 2012.
- Thapar, Romila. "Ideology and the Interpretation of Early Indian History." *Review* 5.3 (1982): 389-411. *JSTOR*. Web. 02 Feb. 2013.
- Trivedi, Poonam. "Impudent Imperialists: Burlesque and the Bard in Nineteenth-Century India." *The Shakespearean International Yearbook, 12: Special Section, Shakespeare in India*. Ed. Sukanta Chaudhuri. Surrey and Burlington: Ashgate, 2012. 7-27. Print.

- , Introduction. *India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation and Performance*. Eds. Poonam Trivedi and Dennis Bartholomeusz. Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2005. 13-39. Print.
- Vasunia, Phiroze. "Aristophanes' *Wealth* and Dalpatram's *Lakshmi*." *The Classics and Colonial India*. UK: Oxford University Press, 2013. 279-297. Web. 5 July 2013. <
<http://books.google.co.in/books?id=GcWoqkmFJW4C&pg=PA279&lpg=PA279&dq=Vasunia,+Phiroze.+%E2%80%9CAristophanes%E2%80%99+Wealth+and+Dalpatram+Lakshmi>>.
- Yagnik, Achyut and Suchitra Sheth. *The Shaping of Modern Gujarat Plurality, Hindutva and Beyond*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2005. Print.