

# Brecht's Dramaturgy and The Indian Scenario

Dr. Gullapelly Praveen Kumar

Mahatma Gandhi University Nalgonda, India,

Corresponding Author Email: [pravinkumareflu@gmail.com](mailto:pravinkumareflu@gmail.com)

Abstract— This paper draws its refrain from the ideas of Brecht vis-à-vis the Indian context Brecht always suffered the fact that he gets worked up to work for the people not to shake them off from their arm chair. Both Tendulkar and Karnad followed this dictum to the core as the so-called aficionados who come to watch their dramas could keep their hats on which watching their dramas. They never treated their audience as a bunch of simpletons. They appealed to reason. They help build bridges. At times bridging worlds, at times a bridge built across seeming differences, at times throwing 'hybridity', at other times jutting the irreconcilables, in short 'unconcealing' through the 'thingness' of things. The lived-in life of imprisoned ancestors has a story to tell, re-narrate, for the woes that confront apparently liberated grandchildren may very well be said to be a product of a faulty repossession or in the event of no such fault found, onus then be deemed due to a superstructure that was not constructed in accordance to spatio-temporal realities.

Keywords: Avant-Grade Theatre- Brecht, Tendulkar- Karnad.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Brecht, Tendulkar and Karnad, set down in their works to describe what happened, with a mutual fusion of live material and conceptual analysis. The hallmark of epic theatre is it's free from "muziness". It is built on uncompromising intellectualism.

Avant-Gard assumed significance in the aftermath of colonisation, especially considering its ideology, which at least some of like Karnad and Tendulkar choose to partially dwell upon, while others did attempt rather nevertheless its significance got heightened when we realise that the larger nation spaces still reverberate to its distant echoes. In spite of writing our own histories, in the course of over seven decades of 'independence' dramatists have not been able to efface a civilizational compulsion of impossible dependence and have been haunted by a passion fringing a dichotomy. This along with the persistence of otherworldly cultural effects due to erstwhile conditioning, certain structures left behind which were adopted as, and the certain set ups re-structuralized and the inter/intra dependence is there to stay.

Brecht's approach to drama seem to be a critical sojourn, into the courage of an artist, where the text and the world at large will aid significantly by defining certain movements and certain cultural moments, open out representative trends, strike the continuum and with the advent of yet another new that would automatically inure itself to the old.

It is to be under the shade of the umbrella of such enlightenment that Karnad and Tendulkar chose to go back to the past for sources. The very past if not a benchmark serves or proves a visual fingerpost to them. For, as Brecht felt after all great art is made to arrive from the future and peculiarly is engendered due to a grounding in its past.

Nevertheless due to the uniqueness Karnad's and Tendulkar's, inspiring voices insert themselves only unconsciously into psyche of culture and at times due to a position of privileges there is a conscious accident where it becomes either 'appropriation' or 'naturalisation'. For similar reasons there is an overlapping of different geographical spaces and different historical time, where at times, history accedes to myth, at other times itself gets mythified, a historicized.

But whatever be the reasons new beginnings are there and newness added texts and do lend them, if worthy, to integration and alignment so that it becomes part of the collective unconscious, the cornucopia from which really liberated grandchildren may draw from, and ground the histories that they will write.

An artistic foray into the past for sources thus, whether conscious or otherwise opens newer frontiers of meanings and that is perhaps the reason why Karnad and Tendulkar the core area of critical concern - too went back to the alternative texts of the said past. As claimed in different places and different times, by themselves, for which texts stand absolute testimony, we see the friendly shadows of Anouilh. Camus, Salre, Brecht and an entire pantheon of persons, circling auras in myriad ways, on the open pages of their books. There are others unnoticed yet implicated, deliberately or inadvertently who enjoy a speaking presence, and teasing them out or hearing their accounts in themselves, effects a newer trajectory of knowledge. This though of critical interest and consequential worth, what is personally gratifying to this search is the possible presence of someone else. There seems to be a benign ghost who also seems to haunt Karnad's pages, dwelling surreptitiously, a fellow traveler, a secret sharer, who seems to have retained his anonymity, so to speak

This study though would first define certain referential that would hopefully serve as notes to a method even while seeking to agglomerate diversities by virtue of the locations of the artists and their texts. It would consist of the following structuration:

A Aesthetic Conception, Aesthetic Achievement

- B Bridging the Poetic/Dramatic, the public/the private
- C Identical Quests
- D Accord in Texts
- E Certain Questions

In view of the aesthetics of Karnad and Tendulkar constructed with the backdrop of certain auras own prefaces to plays.

Aesthetic Conception/Aesthetic achievement: One may begin one's attempts to understand Tendulkar and Karnad by defining two Avant-Grade artists learning 'responsibility' of their similar aesthetics. One may be termed conception and the other aesthetic achievement. While Tendulkar and Karnad constitute the conditions that ideated folklore and *Tamasha*, not merely those supposed aesthetic conditions but also those larger social, political, cultural and material conditions which shaped their aesthetic, that are figured and re-figured in their work; coming to aesthetics the very content that they cultivated due to an individual slant of mind and due to the tenets of drama based on *Naytashastra* which they adopted as their own. It is obvious they are divergent but each to the other, the main stay of content and choice of aesthetics tension and this provided them that stylistic mode - in an evolved and ever evolving aestheticism - in which the endless possibilities of human behaviour could be realised with a reasonable amount of success. The aspects here are art, self and craft and in the context of Karnad it may be useful to locate craft more in the original language of his writing, i.e., Kannada and in the context of Tendulkar it is Marathi and Konkan. This is in spite of his English texts being his own translations and for the other Marathi being his mother tongue.

Bridging the art/dramatic the public/the private: For the achievement of an aesthetic poise, Brecht relied heavily on a symbolist aesthetic, which he made his own. His temperamental restlessness, his preoccupation with ideas of integration and alienation, both of which seemed to him human possibilities of equal importance, caused him to conceive of his essentially lyrical genius as fulfilling itself in dramatic terms. The dramatic offered to him the only mode in which the endless possibilities of human behaviour could be realised with a reasonable measure of success. For, only in an objective recreation could experience exist in all its varieties and contradictions. Moreover, the dramatic mode alone can embody the poetry of Personality, which exists in terms of a self in free engagement with its masks and its anti-selves. This notion of poetry as drama can be understood if Keats's 'negative capability', which refers to the poet's mind in a manner, Yeats' own theories of the anti-self do, is brought to mind. And Keats recognised this necessary quality for great poetry in the dramatic genius of Shakespeare. Brecht's dramaturgy was experimental and as such may always be deemed part of the private for he believed in collaborative writing. Further, the metaphors for his work were provided by his plays and one needs to just recollect the centrality for instance of *The Unicorn from the stars* (1908), and *The Player Queen* (1922) for a thorough understanding of the three annunciation works which by themselves were juxtaposed by aesthetic correlates under the watchful eyes of sentries who watched over also the artist his art and above all the his own insertion into his work. By virtue of which his private sphere was tempered by the larger Public, the audience of his plays, constituting thus a cyclical process. It is reasonable to assume that Private and Public spaces were not merely shifting categories on mutual bases but were also of an order cyclic like his own phases of mood in which the past and the present coalesced, in which new awareness rubbed knuckles with old experience, and in which old experiences were relived to purport a new the Chalk in Circle with new cheese.

In Karnad's and Tendulkar's case, other things being equal, such temperance may be said to be due to the inter-action between the sensibilities of Theatre and Cinema. Theatre now may be said to occupy the space of the private due to the logistics of performance and performance spaces and the larger public be deemed to be represented by the new art cinema in the age of mechanical reproduction, especially if one is desirous of making the performative spell possibilities. Like in Brecht where the lyrical dramatic and dramatic works provided a mobile perspective on shifting mutual bases, in Karnad's and Tendulkar's case, the Dramatic may be said to be tempered by the media and cinema.

In this context it would be interesting to look at the vision conjured image of the victim / perpetrator which Karnad Scripted and Directed and *Silence the court is in session* which Tendulkar scripted. At this juncture it is irresistible to refrain from drawing a parallel with the image that had all about it reeling, "shadows of the silence". The commonality of theme is the issue of violence, both man-made and natural in both the instances.

In Karnad, it is a snake caught in the warp of female subversion and male superiority, the story of his own immediate humanity, his areas of concern the man-made was deliberately made to lose its contextual focus of the social revolution for an universality, due to the deemed permanence of violence at the very core of the collective unconscious, in Karnad's protagonist, it is a deep rooted subconscious image perhaps but yet conjured from the "spiritus mundi". In both instances it is the reality of death and the actuality of a divide between "the best lack all conviction, while the worst / are full of passionate intensity." The childlike innocence is very much common Karnad and the woman since "The terror of all terrors that . ." that they bore in their selves was of a variable magnitude which was in consonance with their variable ages and acquired knowledge effects, in the face of which stature is lost. Further, woman has a foil in the indignant snake, which are in themselves composite, at one level and at another, likewise metamorphoses into similar counters elsewhere. They are in fact larger than counters as one may trace a progression

even in the making of the images, which are still spliced in the context of possessing independent identities for head and body and the inspired images unified with their respective half horse and half man -unified in body and mind - images in both writer and dramatist? But then they are an integral of the source and the inspired, so as of now just the linking of connections between the Public and the Private.

Karnad ranks with Brecht in the contrasting of public and private. It must be noted however that the use of folk and Marxian ideals are merely analytical and is underscored by the context that bears reference to merely the size of the audience. The tagging of drama as part of a private space is strictly by virtue of, as stated earlier, due to the differences of performance, like Brecht and performance spaces for a performative value, specifically bearing in mind an Indian context with its so many languages, so many different formations, borderlines, boundaries and frontier zones. The sharing of Cauvery waters between Tamil Nadu and Karnataka as an example of an internal boundary is a point in study. A purely Kannada or Tamil text may not have an impact in what is now alien spaces, each to its other, though part of the same nation space state, as even a self-translated text into English might. It is not as if the larger format is in a position to transcend said limitations but the fact of the materiality that underscores it, clearly spells for it a positional advantage. For after all if a venture or enterprise large has to survive the box-office it has to take-in the thrill of tills from different areas/zones.

Identical Quests: Though the quests may be said to be similar of Tendulkar and Karnad throughout their careers it would be pertinent to focus on the beginnings of their artistic forays as they serve a dual purpose. One, it does sufficiently help in establishing similarities, or at least it proves sufficient to shoulder the burden of this analysis, and two, it attempts to correct a reading of the beginnings of initial forays as marking different trajectories. The references are thus to Karnad's *Yayati* and Tughlaq deflected against 'Silence the court is in Session' Tendulkar ever alive to the possibilities of performance, was himself involved in the reordering of his early work into a sequence for the reader who comes to his play for the first time.

An intention can be read in this gesture - that of rooting the play in history rather than passion. Karnad's gesture is however not innocent, because it gives a deliberate gloss to the practice of theatre, which relied as much on the body, the mind and their hungers, as it did on the spirit, and an imagination which sought out broader cultural affiliates. He acts like Brecht who wanted his readers to believe that the three passions in the *Good Woman* - love, greed and repose -which are appropriate to his fashion, marking new beginnings, as it were, in modern Indian literary history.

The ideals of Brecht and Karnad and Tendulkar comprise those which are burdened with the sorrow of love, the fear of abandonment and the horror of mutability and those which seek objective correlatives to this emotion and which, thereby, direct attention from the suffering artistic self to the art in historical time. Yet the emotion in each set of plays is not unequivocal and there are ambiguities, of mood and theme, yet another hallmark of Brecht.

The tracing of the contours of a new land for the one that has been irretrievably lost exists as a curious exercise. India for instance exists as an apt image of the heart, the land of those Brechtian heart's mysteries. India was of course a colony, though in a different sense, and the Indian-German encounter belonged to that anti-fugal moment of colonialism, which, even as it oppressed and exploited cultures, brought them into interesting and creative juxtapositions. Brecht however never reproduces an Orientalist's India and this ancient drama had much to give. This space is reserved for memories, for the unfolding of common speech. What, then, is the function of this Orientalism? Considering Brecht's lifelong interest in Marxism, it may be surmised that this and other symbolic invocations of India were never attempted to signify an 'other' order of reality, one where the linear and empty time of colonialism cannot work its efforts. India in this sense was a kind of shorthand for a different order of experience, just as chalk circle would be, in a later and altogether altered context.

In the context of Karnad, the play *Tughlaq*, which narrated the saga of a "spectacular failure" was the one that actually marked his presence. 'Announcing as it did, a national theme and a dramatic determination to write and sing the nation' and consequently, a dramatist of seriousness, a national dramatist, whose obsession with his art and the making of it expressed his commitment and passion to re-imagining and inventing the nation. The disappointment with Nehruvian political policies, as the author himself has acknowledged marks a movement away from similar "heart mysteries" epitomised by a *Yayati*, which too haunted Karnad then and as his later plays testify, continues to do so now and perhaps will all his life.

Even in *Yayati* we find an attempt to trace the contours of a new land for the one that has been irretrievably lost and now exists only as a curious exercise. The India of the Mahabharata for instance exists as an apt image of the heart, the land of those "heart's mysteries". The difference is that Karnad sought a sojourn in a past, to escape from the uneasy presence of merely certain failed purposes and purported aspirations. Consequently, the land he sought to go back to is his own land, the same land in a distant past that would enable him to creatively engage and leap ahead into the future. One must also remember that he was reaching the shores of the coloniser at the moment of writing *Yayati*. A sojourn underwritten by a need to seek fraternity is thus not possible in Karnad's case and even in Tendulkar's case.

However, like Karnad, Tendulkar managed to produce only an Orientalist's India and not a political space; Karnad too is not able to conjure a modern political space. The fact of reign, rule and space, is of a distant past and is contained in a patterning modeled on ontology, or at least philosophy. Only in *Tughlaq* does the space 'dramatically' gets reserved for real tangible,

historical Indian memories, in a sense the unfolding of the common speech of the Indian oppressed, the Indian commoner. Similarly, in 'Silence' Tendulkar through the mouthpiece of Benare unfolds the brevity of commoner's speech a common trait nevertheless that shows the impact of Brecht's dramaturgy.

Further compared to Tendulkar, *Yayati* is just a play of responsibilities arrived at from the position of a personal self in contrast to *Tughlaq* which is a commitment through an informing by the larger order. Existential angst that so prevaricates a Karnadian text is merely in the order of oppression, while *Tughlaq* is an exploitation suffering. Both are thus plays that may not lend themselves to a mere sieved understanding of beginnings from myth and history unless they are treated as twinned. This idea further gets reinforced by the fact of the presence of corresponding aesthetic correlates in certain two other plays. A look at the beginning of *Tughlaq* and the ending of *Yayati*, as also the ending of *Tughlaq* and the beginning of *Hayavadana*, as providing contiguities and a continual is noteworthy.

The character/author in the prologue of *Yayati* when linked to the sense of loss that is the epitomised ending of this play - "Oh God in heaven! What does all this mean?" - will begin with an old man's astonishment in *Tughlaq* - "God, What's this country coming to!" - to only close action with a shrieking head that has not been able to understand the madness of God - "I have a Companion to share my madness now - the Omnipotent God" and which perhaps is also the reason that in *Hayavadana* we are told/instructed by the *Bhagavatam* "that the completeness of God is something no poor mortal can comprehend?".

In the case of Karnad it is that incurable need to "glimpse in to the past, lying neglected someplace in an old forgotten bag... a lost wayfarer groping in a huge cavern filled with the ruins of an old and unfamiliar mode of life...listen to the call of the past, give it the ears of the present", and tell not the story "of old earth's dreamy youth" but "old earth's...youth", which, its own dreams notwithstanding, archetypically dons the mask or tries to don the mask of age and wisdom. The reason in the shift from dreams to responsibility of Dramatist is merely apparent and is so by virtue of the different premises they begin with. If to Brecht the responsibility is in trying to breathe new life into Mother courage through 'dreams', to Karnad it is the donning of the mask of responsibility that will fructify for the now dead-living, the dreams of undead-life, proffered by a veritable past.

## II. SIMILAR PATTERNING

The similarity between Brecht and Karnad and Tendulkar is specifically in the context of how they chose to narrate their tales. In general, all the three worked towards conjuring the present as re-memory in a manner of speaking and the equation may be classified as follows.

Karnad		Brecht		Tendulkar
MYTH	X	ACTUALITY	X	FACT
PROPHECY	X	MATERIALITY	X	DIALECTICS
BEING [KARNAD]	X	MATERNALITY	X	HUMANITY
SYMBOL	X	HISTORY	X	CONTEMPORARY

The first works through the problem of race, the second through the question of Cultural sensibilities, the third through the identity of the nation. The difference in the context of cultural sensibilities arises because they are being rooted in the belief that art is the consequential, whereas with the epic theatre, the shift is towards an instruction emphasised by issues and questions relating to the Being. This being for the one, the vocal tradition for the other, the alternative that Brecht was familiar with, aligned a state of alienation of audience. While Karnad and Tendulkar become deliberately instructive because of an alignment with speculations of the Being, there was no scope for independently existing prophecy, visions, visits and visitations. It must be pointed out here that they tried to wrought and re-wrought art in the context of alternatives from the world of Bayalata and *Yakshagana* and Kabuki pattern apart from street play for similar reasons but then perhaps the need to self-consciously be instructive made the new linguistic medium that inured itself to a palimpsestic tradition fettered even as it constricted the autonomy of the different wordings.

Coming back, the first has to do with the issues of Knowledge, the second of Power, the third of desire. These sets of antinomies loop into and are embedded within each other.

The problem of race (caste in Karnad) gets translated into a quest and knowledge for the space of the ideal nation. It is done through the rooting in myth and romance. The land lost is not merely a lost land. It is also a land to be beckoned, a nation which will be, in the future. It is the geography of familiar loved spaces associated with particular emotions, yet it is also an imaginative space, a map drawn so many times over, preceding its historical referent. It is also tied to the moment of historical awakening, an hour heralded by annunciation whose history is to be figured. In the context of Brecht, it may be said to be a deliberate construction of a calendar of three worlds, the Aristotelian, the Marxian and the Christian, of course in the presence of alternative

wordings constituting its corresponding foils, for a period of at least 6000 years and in Karnad and Tendulkar the use of Mahabharata and even Bharata's text bear witness to a format of at least nine of the ten annunciations.

Tracing the progress of the epic theatre's path, it is seen that Brecht essays two different strains - the one seeks to root his art in openness of the heart and in attempting this, he seeks out his muse, object of action and desire and recalls her into his art through a series of images. The other strain has to do with the nation, whose image the beloved is, and which Brecht seeks to make arrive in verse that weaves in and out of themes of love and its other, which is the world of race and history, so that Mother Courage becomes the spokesperson of all and sundry.

The muse-as-art-object connotes a certain knowledge; a unity of cultural and national being, which the poet hopes, will become his people. Tendulkar and Karnad align this knowledge to a particular notion of culture, which stood embodied for in the practices of the Ascendancy class and which they now re-wrought as aspects of the new unity of being they wished to consecrate. Thus, possessed of his icons, which inform racial and cultural identity, they set about to re-make the nation. The place ceases to be geography, a space in history and instead emerges as an imagined land, an anticipated utopia, announced in a moment of frozen time and in language.

It can also be said that Karnad too essays two different strains. The one seeks to root his drama in mysteries of the heart while the other has to do with the nation of course Brecht doesn't sensationalise. *Hayavadana* in this context the third in the Karnadian series, which actually coincides with the 'Responsibilities', 'possessing' as such a similar new point of arrival, is in fact symptomatic in a manner of speaking of the entire aesthetic. Here Karnad maps the contours and contrasts of play spaces through the fictions and frontiers that govern the heart's desires. Two stories, representing two strains interlock to provide the spaces of the public, the private and the nation. Interestingly, the unfolding of both the stories is on the body of a woman. What is clear from a reading of these two stories and the two sets of images contained in each is the displacement of history - both of Padmini (muse) and the nation (the Karnataka Princess). Further for Karnad too, the nation is after all imaged like in Yeats as a woman. Since for the dramatist, the identity of the one rested on the identity of the other, their mutual effacement and re-figuring pose questions regarding the ontological as well as the epistemological status of his art. Is the nation thus consecrated approximate to history, to the people, men and women? Or is it a nation, which is less a community and more an imagined space? Moreover does time announced in art and which grants to art power through a mythic status, have a symbolic value, which cannot be granted to history and politics, the materiality of everyday life? I wish to leave the reading open-ended hence.

### III. CLOSE ARCHITECTONICS

As far as Brecht's 'Good Woman' is concerned it is an exposition of the good woman at the beginning of action. The audience will be gripped with interest regarding the responsibilities, with the body seller's room and the winding stair constituting the Catastrophe, the water courier would then make up the Rising Action. This tragedy of race, nation and self-possessed a unique facility for immediate re-play, with a qualm of an Emperor's marriage and commencing the action, new poems constituting the Crisis and on the boiler enacting the same Catastrophe - this time as farce? A new Catastrophe comes as a Voice of the God's, a Voice from the beyond, and a set of poems, constitutes the Epilogue in this scheme of things.

Karnad has produced six plays in six decades that may be plotted on a similar Freytag's pyramidal structure. Exposition constituted by *Yayati* with *Tughlaq* its other marking the beginning of action. The crisis veritably vests in *Hayavadana*. *Naga-Mandala* and *Tale-Danda* are part of a single Catastrophe, yet again twinned to close that which was expositied/begun by *Yayati* and *Tughlaq* respectively. *Hayavadana* thus veritably occupies an apex that contains twin streams both forwards and backwards. A close reading of *Hayavadana* stands testimony to it being a point of intersection where the lateral axes of *Yayati* and *Tughlaq* converge to diverge the very instant into the lateral axes of *Naga-Mandala* and *Tale-Danda* respectively. With The Fire and the Rain starting a new gyre, for after all the author himself has acknowledged how the idea of the play has been festering in his mind for over a thirty - seven year period, we have a rebirth that begins with a *Yayati* again. Though we must understand that the rebirth also entails the knowledge acquired through the experiences and instilled awareness of now someone who is no more a mere twenty three who can with impunity state, "How soon hath time, the subtle thief of youth, / Stolen on his wing my three and twentieth year!"<sup>81</sup> and don the mask of the old and the wise/ unwise - Puru wearing the mask of *Yayati*. This also answers for the certain self-conscious density in The Fire and the Rain that is thematically linked to a *Yayati* mind-set. Bali would have to mark a crisis, to middle the twin of the cone. In the context of Bali the new play, yet to be made available to the audience/reader living in India, and as such unavailable to me, if the line of reading is right, the point of contiguity will be in *Hayavadana*. The (temple space and the sword if it were to return, or the sacrifice of life returns in some form or the other one would be proven right. This would in fact also ratify the point of contiguity; doubly between THE TOWER AND THE WINDING STAIR and Karnad's own two plays that are his dramatic correlates. The sheer magnitude of Yeats' work may be said to have provided for him the facility of a body of work to determine the rise and fall in action points. In Karnad's case for obvious reasons it cannot be fixed with independent texts, though this is not to deny the presence of such markers but to state that they are contained within the trajectory between the former and the latter points singled out. Having said this, it is still possible to discern such defining moments from the realms of the larger sphere of art, cinema which Karnad alone had the chance to work and which may be said to provide the volume for his work.

Selfsame Devices: The question as to how far an artist is in a position to address such problems as he encounters, due to the universality of an aesthetic conception and the very structure he uses to particularise, is what is sought to be the highlighted here. In a sense a continuation of the dialogue enunciated under the subtitle, 'aesthetic conception and aesthetic achievement', to which this too, like the so many other parts, is organically linked. This may be answered by beginning with the artist's perception of his own time and space and by comprehending how and through what expressive means he forged an aesthetic, which would contain the buffeting presence of the self - the other of race, of history.

In the context of Karnad, certain muse affiliates being absent one could draw upon his own statements as regards the turmoil that surrounded his journey by ship to the land of the erstwhile colonial masters. It is not difficult to discern a biographical reference in the interplay between Puru and *Yayati* or to the knowledge effects juttied by the interpersonal situations. Old age and wisdom youth and sacrifice caught so beautifully in the tension between a son's responsibility to his father in the context of a demand by near and dear ones that there be a sacrifice - a Bali given.

In the case of Karnad biography moves forwards toward the masks, and then to the unity of being where one can perceive a felt consciousness and a conscientious effort to achieve a classic impersonality. It would be useful to recollect how the half horse half man image is nothing but a need to achieve such unification. The-biographical reference accedes to the son being a father's mask (This is advancing a point of View) at one level and at another the play *Yayati* by itself is transformed to become Tughlaq's mask and vice versa. This is further extendable to purport meaning in *Naga-Mandala* and *Tale-Danda* as a complimentary spin-off to underscore an attempt at a cyclic order of things. *Tughlaq* further reiterates the cyclical nature of movement through the presence of the characters Basavanna and Bijjala, who are after all parts that go towards the making of a complex character composition to suffer there the consequences of the action initiated by him. A king creates mayhem and another suffers the consequences of his actions? A leveling that does not choose or abide by the dictum some are more equal and levels king, saint and commoner, even while sparing the undeserving. Basavanna in a manner speaking, is the latent spiritual side of *Tughlaq* and as regards Bijjala he needs no explanation to stay a foil, and since both of them are only two parts that go towards making a many-part composite, there is a scope to include others, like for instance the son Sovideva - the undeserving that lives, to complete the continual, which is for its turn, consistent with the "free verse lyrics of Basavanna...Speaking of Shiva", that 'presences' the doctrine of evil as something that may be suppressed but never annihilated, the philosophy epitomised by the Dancing Shiva/Nataraja. It must also be remembered to the ones in the Shivaite tradition at least he is the God of the arts, a point that also surfaces from the play.

The reading of the composite nature of characterisation may be said to be a building on Naik's brief but exemplary insight - "...Seem to represent the two opposite selves of *Tughlaq*. ..", where he treats, Najib and Barani for instance as facets of the Sultan himself. Tangentially one could read similarities with Camus's Caligula for Karnad was very much influenced by him and his logic or the illogic of existentialism. Najib and Barani may be counter pointed against Scipio and Chera. Helicon who promised to get the moon, a polarised opposite in the character of Aazam. While the former is conspicuous by his absence, the latter subverts his presence. Is this the difference in similarity? Helicon embarked on the search for the moon, the impossible, while Aazam pointed to the foolishness behind wanting the moon as the impossible. As regards the ending of the plays, the Muezzin's call for prayer- "Allah Ho Akbar" - even to the shrieking head, (Page 86) and Caligula's "I am still alive" (Page 74) are both cries of relief, release and or liberation.

As regards the other strain, the movement from antinomies, and A Vision inspired and Play induced metaphors, that conjured types and archetypes, doubles and spectral doubles to result in a loss of substantiality, transmuting and transmogrification notwithstanding, is present in both the dead man and in the modification within the guts of the living. Is not the two-headed bird, engraved atop the door- frame symbolic, a transmuted "enamelled" image anticipating the events to come?

Concurring Traverses /Techniques: To illustrate this aspect we can quote to *Hayavadana*. It has been already stated that this consummate play middles Karnadian enterprise and is located in the apex of the cone. So is the case in Karnad. Seven long years had passed since the writing of *Tughlaq*, seven years to engender an opus that is rightfully accorded its principal space at the top of an apex.

## WORKS CITED

1. Auden, W. H. "In Memory of W. B. Yeats." Ed. Stallworthy. *Yeats Last poems and critical Essays*. London: Aurora Publishers, 1970. Print.
2. Harvey, David. *The Condition of Post Modernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990. Print.
3. Karnad, Girish. *Collected plays*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
4. Hayavadana. *Three Plays Nagamandala, Hayavadana, Tughlaq*. New Delhi: OUP, 2002. Print.
5. Interviewed by Tutun Mukherjee. *Girish Karnad's plays performance and critical Perspective*. New Delhi, Pencraft international, 2008. Print.
6. *Nagamandala: Play with a Cobra*. Oxford University Press, 1990. Print.
7. *Tale-Danda*. New Delhi: Ravi Dayal, 1993. Print.

8. *The Fire and the Rain*. New Delhi: OUP, 1998. Print.
9. *Tughlaq*. New Delhi: OUP, 1974. Print.
10. *Yayati*. New Delhi: OUP, 2008. Print.
11. Mukherjee, Meenakshi. *The Twice Born Fiction*. New Delhi: Arnold- Heinemann Publishers Pvt Ltd, 1971. Print.
12. Naik, M.K. *A History of Indian English literature*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1995. Print
13. Rajeswaran & Sridhar. *Historicizing The Colonial and the Post-colonial and the Diaspora of India a Method*. New Delhi: Prestige Books, 2000. Print.
14. Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994. Print.
15. Steiner, George. *After Babel - Aspects of language and Translation*. London: Oxford University Press, 1998. Print.
16. Tendulkar, Vijay. Interview by Priya Adarkar, Enact, 49-50, 1971.
17. *Silence! The Court is in Session*. Chennai: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
18. "The Vultures". Collected Plays in Translation. Trans. Priya Adarkar. New Delhi: OUP, 2004. Print.
19. *Ghanshiram Kotwal*. Collected Plays in Translation. Trans. Priya Adarkar. New Delhi: OUP, 2004. Print.
20. Walter, Benjamin. *Illuminations*. trans. Collins. Great Britain: Fontana Books, 1970. Print
21. Yeats, W. B. *Mythologies*. London: paperback, 1992. Print.