



POLITICS OF COLONIAL REPRESENTATION AND INDIAN RESISTANCE: SHAKESPEARE IN INDIAN PLAY HOUSE

Prashant Kumar,
Research Scholar, Deptt. of English,
Maharaja Agrasen Himalayan Garhwal University

Dr. Ravindra Kumar,
Professor, Deptt. of English,
Maharaja Agrasen Himalayan Garhwal University

ABSTRACT

This paper examines intersections between Shakespeare and the British Empire in India in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, using as case studies four interpretive situations: the transmission of Shakespeare books in India in the eighteenth century, the editing of the plays for use in colonial classrooms in the early nineteenth century, the emergence of Shakespeare as an academic subject in Britain with the introduction of English language and literature in the Indian Civil Service Examination in 1855, and uses of Shakespeare in family readings in middle-class Bengali homes in the late nineteenth century. Theatre has its own importance as a source of history writing. Theatre, with its varied forms is the most important literary genre and medium for social communication. It has constituted an important part of cultural life and entertainment in India from ancient times. Since late 19th century theatre has remained central to social and political movements and questioned and contested authoritarian structures through the use of aesthetic forms. English theatres in Calcutta entertained a largely British audience of officers, merchants, scholars and clerks of the East India Company. Theatres were not only an important aspect of English social life but were also instruments of empire. Nourished by a steady stream of histrionic talent from London and patronized by prominent colonial dignitaries, performances of plays by dramatists such as Shakespeare kept alive the myth of English cultural refinement and superiority. Underscoring theatre as a popular site of people's power and struggle against colonialism, this paper is an effort to situate the discursive representation of Shakespeare in its historical context and show how colonial power operated by legitimizing Shakespeare as the authoritative English text. This paper gives an overview of the colonialist function attached to Shakespeare in promoting and privileging their cultural hegemony and to maintain control over the natives. The present study also shows how over time, vernacular appropriations of the Shakespearean plays emerged that were deployed for multiple purposes including the subversion of colonial authorities, for reviving ancient Hindu culture and rising anti colonial nationalism. It shows how the local reconstruction of Shakespeare disrupted the "singularity" accorded to Shakespeare through claims about his "universality" and "timeless transcendentalism" and how his plays were translated and adapted to be used as a tool for striking back at the colonial authorities.

Keywords: *Social communication, political movements, colonial nationalism*

INTRODUCTION

Theatre with its varied forms is the most suitable literary genre and medium for social communication. It synthesizes all arts: dance, drama, music, ballads, songs, folktales etc. It is most public of all art forms and

has logic of its own whereby the cultural and the social context of the production determines the nature of the play-text. This cultural production has performative aspects, which create an interactive relationship with viewers and generate immediate responses. Dramatic activities convey ideas in a manner quite different from other print medium. It has potential for promotion of reformatory ideas as it attracts large masses through entertainment. Theatre is an age-old tradition in India. It has constituted an important part of cultural life and public entertainment in India from pre-colonial times. Since late 19th century, theatre has remained central to social and political monument and as a cultural terrain; it contested and questioned authoritarian structures through the use of aesthetic forms. However, in colonial studies the place of theatre is marked by ambivalence and marginality and has received the least amount of critical attention even though it was an important forum for progressive writers and political activists and tied to national question, represented and generated highly varied responses.

Modern theatre's beginnings can be identified in the colonial encounter that resulted in the influence of western and European models on local theatrical traditions. British theatre formed a part of cultural life as early as 1757 when Bengal came under the rule of the East India Company and saw a proliferation of playhouses, prominent among them being the Calcutta Theatre (built in 1775), the San Souci Theatre (1839), and the Chowringhee theatre (1813) which flourished under the patronage of the colonial officials. Theatres were not only an important aspect of English social life in the growing colonial metropolis of Calcutta, but were also the instruments of Empire. English theatres in Calcutta entertained a largely British audience of officers, merchants, scholars and clerks of the East India Company and insulated themselves from the natives so much so that even the ushers and doorkeepers in the Calcutta playhouses were English.

When the English came to Calcutta, they brought with them the plays of Shakespeare which began to be staged in the theatres that the local Englishmen had set up in the city for their entertainment and relaxation. A trend of regular performances of English plays at these theatres including *Hamlet*, *Richard III*, *Henry IV*, *Julius Caesar*, *the Merchant of Venice* and many others typified the range of the prolific theatrical activity in and around Calcutta that continued well into the middle of the nineteenth Century. Supported and patronized by various Governor Generals and other colonial dignitaries, the Shakespearean plays figured prominently in these theatres and were significant in promoting and privileging the culture of the colonizers- both among the English expatriates as well as the elite Indians who gradually became associated with these theatres. The initiation of Shakespeare into the Indian Academy coincided with the passage of the Indian Education Act of 1835 and subsequent introduction of the discipline of English language and literature in India, which became an important part of the Educational curriculum after the establishment of Universities in Bengal, Bombay and Madras in 1857. In doing so, the colonial rulers were not being egalitarians, but rather, were engaged in a '*hegemonic activity*' to idealize the project of the empire, while occluding its harsh, exploitative effects. Shakespeare developed a strong link between English literature and the consolidation of Empire. On the pretext of offering a liberal Education, Shakespeare served as an instrument for the British '*to secure the consent of the ruled through intellectual and moral manipulation rather than through military control*'. Within the Educational system, the importance of Shakespeare was promoted in various ways. Constituting the core of English literature courses, Shakespeare's works shaped by colonial politics, became the central texts for upholding the "humanistic" ideals of British "civilization" and as the legitimate object of study in India and served as an icon of British cultural superiority.

The inclusion of Shakespeare on the syllabus of the ICS examination facilitated the infiltration of English literature into the Indian colleges and became a necessary evil to be studied. Thus, mediated by the Civil Services, English literature (and Shakespeare) became a means to establish British cultural authority and "*Anglicize the Indian sub-continent*".

The dominance of Shakespeare in academics as well as administration made the playing of his plays a popular activity in school and colleges. The number of Shakespeare performances began to increase with the increase in the number of theatres in Bengal. In addition, the numerous theatre companies, especially the privately funded Parsi theatre disseminated Shakespeare to a cross section of the population which had no access to his works through the Educational curriculum in the elite theatre, thus bringing 'Shakespeare' into the popular cultural life of the nation.

While the English Play houses, by their production of English, especially Shakespeare's plays created an appetite for theatrical performances, the foundation of the Hindu College in 1816 and the teaching of Shakespeare by eminent teachers like Richardson (who also founded the Chowringhee theatre) created in the minds of Modern Bengali Intelligentsia- a literary taste for drama as such, and taught them not only how to appreciate Shakespeare critically but also to recite and act scenes from his play. This fashion gradually spread to every academic institution. The Bengalis to whom the box sets, foot lights and proscenium stages were obvious novelties, sought to emulate western productions, while affecting distaste for indigenous theatricals. In 1837, Bengali students staged scenes from *The Merchant of Venice* in the Governor's house, in 1852 and 1853 the students of *Metropolitan Academy* and *David Hare Academy* staged Shakespeare's plays. The students of the *Oriental Academy* staged *Othello* in 1853, *The Merchant of Venice* in 1854 and *Henry IV* in 1855. Shakespeare's dramas, thus, became an indispensable part of English Education and a popular item in all Cultural functions.

During the colonial rule, several famous Shakespearean actors and acting companies regularly visited India to stage Shakespearean play in Educational institution as well as on public stage and further secured the iconic place of Shakespeare. Through the proliferation of English theatres that attracted elite native audiences, the colonial authorities attempted to suppress and contain cultural threats to the existing order by simultaneously repressing "seditious" productions. Thus, it is no co-incidence that when the Swadeshi movement for self rule (1905-08) spawned a fresh debate regarding methods of policing drama, visits of companies from abroad increased. By 1905, Vernacular newspapers such as *Kesari*, *Bangabasi*, *Bande Mataram* and *Yugantar* were commenting on various political issues. The British Govt. viewed most of these as disloyal or pursuing dangerous political policies.

Following the partition of Bengal in 1905, the *Swadeshi* movement brought renewed nationalistic energy expressed in native drama, literature and pamphlets, which had become major tools for communicating political ideas. For example between 1898 and 1905, Nationalist leader *Bal Gangadhar Tilak* attempted mass politicization through popular festivals in Maharashtra. Similar efforts were expended through the 'Jatra' practices perpetuating messages of peace building and national independence. As a result, the Govt. sought to enforce more stringent measures of censorship through the 1876 censorship Act as well as the Press Act in 1910, banning a number of Indian Plays especially in Bengal, the target of Government Censorship.

Coinciding with the suppression of native drama, troupes from London such as those of Charles Allen (1909), Matheson Henry (1911 & 1912) and Harding & Howill (1918) visited India to give performances of Shakespeare plays such as *Macbeth*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar*, *The Merchant of Venice*, etc.

The colonial rulers represented Western literary knowledge as 'Universal', 'trans-historical' and 'rational' and tried to produce a 'class of persons', who were in the view of Macaulay, "*Indian in blood and colour but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect.*" The British were of the opinions that by conversing with the best and wisest Englishmen through the medium of their works, the Indian formed right ideas of British nation than if their intercourse was of a more personal kind.

The image of Shakespeare, therefore, was further secured in schools and colleges through memorization of speeches from his plays, for which contests were held and prizes were awarded to those who could reproduce them without forgetting a single word. However, behind such mechanism of discipline and proper learning, Shakespeare became instrumental in the dissemination and legitimization of British Culture.

In the context of 19th century theatre in India, one can recognize the significance of the Empire's cultural and political investment in the Shakespearean text- both as a literary and dramatic text. However, the history of Bengali theatre in Calcutta from the mid nineteenth to twentieth century suggests both an admiration and ambivalence towards English plays, most notably those of the Shakespeare. While the early 19th century productions of Shakespearean plays seem to have originated in a desire to imitate the English culture, they gradually became a part of indigenous theatrical entertainment as Indian producers freely and quite eclectically adapted and revised the original works. Through performance, as opposed to critical discourse, native appropriations of Shakespeare, mediated by the heterogeneous forces of race, language and native culture, often displaced the cultural authority of the Universal colonial bard, even while expressing a reverence for his works.

At a time when Calcutta was the intellectual and political centre of colonial presence in India, a native gentleman named *Vaishnav Chandra Adhya* performed the role of *Othello* in a production at the *Sans souci* theatre, the famous English playhouse in the city. *Adhya's* entry marked a moment of generating possible resistance what *Jyotsna Singh* identifies as an “*alternative choice of 'playfully' disrupting rigid categories of difference through simultaneous mimicry and resistance*”. It can be seen as an intervention in the cultural discourse of colonialism that raises the possibility of undoing the “*master discourse*” not in entirely oppositional terms but through partial displacement of the English text via his speech and colour, which act against authorised colonial versions. *Adhya's* dramatic identification with the Shakespearean role of *Othello* complicated and displaced the stark ‘*Manichean*’ dichotomy of ‘*black and white*’ which governed the relations between European colonizers and their non-European subjects. A Bengali youth in an English play in an English theatre catering to a largely English audience in the 19th century, is certainly a memorable event in the history of Calcutta theatres.

After being introduced in India, the Shakespeare didn't remain confined to European playhouses. It was translated into several Indian languages including Hindi, Sanskrit, Bengali, Punjabi, Gujarati, Marathi, Tamil, Sindhi, and most recently Dogri, etc. Language became the deciding factor in the decline of the English plays and the development of a vigorous vernacular theatre. It seems that a period of direct subservience to English theatrical models was over. From 1870 onwards, the plays of Shakespeare began to be staged in Bengali translations and adaptations by the commercial playhouses of Calcutta. In the backdrop of dramatic censorship, cultural productions provided the nationalist intelligentsia with an avenue for circulating Political literature which complicated the political life of the British leaders. These theatrical productions became an important hegemonic site of the emerging middle class who claimed itself as the sole representative of the nation. Disaffection among the educated segment from frustration regarding unemployment, exclusion from high executive posts and smaller wages had resulted in a backlash from the natives. At this time, artists and playwrights who turned to theatre as an avenue for protest, found Shakespeare not only familiar but also relatively safe from the rigors of censorship. Shakespeare, thus became the model for such nationalist playwrights as *Girish Chandra Ghosh* of Bengal (1844-1912) and Hindu writer *Bhartendu Harishchandra* (1850- 85). *Harishchandra's* translations and adaptations of Shakespearean plays particularly ‘*Durlabh Bandhu*’ (Dependable Friend, 1880), an adaptation of *The Merchant of Venice* which was written soon after the passage of the Vernacular Press Act of 1879, exposed specific colonial practices through its focus on issues pertaining to legal justice and economic drain. Framing the central struggle between Indian and British, it became a parable for independence from the growing encroachment of British authority.

The appropriation of the play conveys how the playwright smartly used the knowledge of the colonial models and transformed it into a tool for striking back at the colonizer. Although the story sticks closely to the original text, Harishchandra's work can also be seen as a literary challenge to the Shakespearean drama. The play, with the construction of the virtuous, chaste, honourable, spiritual, highly educated and intelligent woman in the role of Purushri (Portia), also provides an occasion to counteract colonial portrayals of Indian women as oppressed. However, in Harishchandra's plays, the critics find an orthodox nationalism, that privileges Hindu society as the norm and uses it synonymously with Indian society, thus constructing the authority of an internal hegemonic order.

Such consolidation of the Hindu society that started with Harishchandra continued through literary critical comparisons of Shakespeare with Indian writers such as Kalidasa. The modern intelligentsia found in the revival of ancient Hindu writers such as Kalidasa a way of restoring their cultural historicity and recuperating the civilisational qualities of their literature. Comparisons of Kalidasa's works with the works of Shakespeare became an enabling strategy for bolstering the reputation of Hindu literature and culture so much so that the critics began to call "*Kalidasa*" the "*Indian Shakespeare*." The valorization of the Hindu texts continued through comparisons between Shakespeare and ancient Hindu scriptures such as the *Ramayana* and through the translation of Shakespeare into Sanskrit. However, even while making comparisons between the ancient Indian literature and that of the Shakespearean, one finds the hidden indebtedness to the English theatrical traditions. Sanskritists not only came to hold Shakespeare as the model or high water mark of dramatic art but even when they studied Kalidasa and other Sanskrit dramatists, they applied to their appreciation of the Sanskrit drama the conceptions and values which they had learnt in their study of Shakespearean criticism. Further, every critic used a Shakespearean yardstick to judge another drama and every dramatist cited Shakespeare in justification. Thus, while countering colonial attitudes towards Indian texts, the Shakespearean translations and adaptations reinforced the iconic image of Shakespeare. Combined with the claims that insist on Shakespeare as the supreme token of English literature and culture, such comparisons reinforced the image of the bard as the life force of "great literature".

The *Parsi theatre* that emerged between 1860 and 1930 and remained a dominant form of dramatic entertainment in urban India blended certain European practices of stagecraft and commercial organisation with Indic, Persian and English stories, music and poetry. These theatre companies followed a vigorous tradition of adapting or translating and staging Shakespeare in Urdu in which the European influences and native popular traditions of dramaturgy and performance were interwoven by arranging the scenes of the original texts with a view to pander them to indigenous tastes and values. Parsi Playwrights like *Mehdi Hasan Ahsan, Agha hashr Kashmiri and Narain Prasad Betab, Khori and Aaram* treated the English bard as little more than a treasure house of interesting, highly melodramatic stories and characters and took from him basic underlined ideas which they refashioned in their own style in order to make the *Elizabethan bard* more acceptable to the Indian audiences. The texts commissioned and produced by the Parsi theatre companies were unique both in their popularity and in the fact that they took great liberties with the original.

Even while adapting Shakespeare's works to the local milieu, the Bengali productions in the mid and late 19th century seem indebted to English theatrical traditions. Exposed to Shakespeare and other classic writers, they sought to emulate western productions while affecting a distaste for indigenous theatres. However, from 1930 onwards, the Bengali theatre gradually broadened its audience, becoming more responsive to the social and political realities of the Indian masses. Thus, when Shakespeare's plays reappeared on the stage, they were hybrid in their style and form. The revival of Shakespeare on Bengali stage in the late 1940's and early 1950's marked a wider distance from the colonial bard which can be seen in the works of *Utpal Dutt* who was highly creative in his

use of Shakespeare without the conventions of proscenium in 'jatra' style in the rural areas that enabled him to tackle topics pertaining to the political turbulence of post- independence India and effectively convey his social message to his target audience who had never figured in the colonial project of edification. In addition to such appropriations, in this context, *James Ivory and Ismael Merchant's* film '*Shakespeare Wallah*' becomes an important intervention in the dominant discourse surrounding the Shakespeare industry in India. The film became a metaphor for the end of the British Raj. It frames the many contradictions, ambivalences and complexities central to the proclaimed "natural" love for Shakespeare. Not only does it exposes the European performance of Shakespeare as a site of Raj nostalgia; its focus on the retreating interests of Indian audiences in Shakespeare also provides a frame for the reinterpretation of the many meanings assigned to Shakespeare, opening in the process a space for an alternative discourse.

Urdu adaptations of Shakespeare appearing between 1890 and 1910 were free and often melodramatic renderings of the original. The addition of a large number of songs and extra subplots were used to satirize contemporary ideas of social behaviour among the audience. These productions did not presume the audience's familiarity with Shakespeare but obviously adapted the work to appeal to popular tastes.

In these obviously irreverent and eclectic adaptations, the Shakespearean text is no longer sacrosanct; rather, it is invaded by '*heteroglossia*' or a multiplicity of styles and forms that disrupts the cultural authority of the official English Shakespeare. Thus, while the colonial theatres of Calcutta, promoted the bard as a central source of '*high culture*', later performances of his plays reproduced varied, heterogeneous Shakespeares.

However, throughout the course of study what is interesting that one finds is despite of the years long efforts to '*Indianize*' Shakespearean performances, critical and pedagogical discourses in the Indian academy continue to be shaped by the myth of the universal bard- a myth that reveals and perpetuates a 'complicity between indigenous and imperial power structures' in the post- colonial era.

The encouragement given to Shakespeare studied and performances continued even in the Post-Colonial India through Government sponsored agencies, theatre groups and touring companies from Britain that kept alive "the myth of English Cultural Refinement and superiority". Particularly significant among these were the *Geoffrey Kendal's company Shakespearana* (1947-53), which owing to the encouragement and hospitality of the Indian Government, continued to tour India until 1985, performing and doing "Shakespeare" for the natives, alongside a repertoire of other English plays, *Marshall's Shakespearean troupe* (1948) and *the acting troupe of Eric Elliot* (1951). Sponsored by agencies such as 'the British Council' through a well established system of funding, grants, patronage, publications, libraries and workshops, these tours were not free of attempts to exercise neo-colonial control.

Moreover, the patronage given by the Indian Govt. to the home grown productions of Shakespeare in the 1950s and 1960s contributed to the further valorisation of Shakespeare and its performances. In contrast, the political theatre organizations such as 'IPTA' struggled for survival during this period due to lack of funds and the censorship.

Thus, the withdrawal of British from India in 1947 as a political force didn't seriously affected the study of Shakespeare in our colleges and universities. For years, A.C. Bradleys "*Shakespearean Tragedy*" began to dominate the academic curriculum and the main stream theatre in India and contributed to the development of a monolithic discourse. A number of translations and adaptations of Shakespeare plays were made and performed all over India. There are many socio-economic factors that continued to legitimate and promote English literary

studies in India. The Indian bourgeoisie who were passionate to maintain their own privileged position found the continued use of a European language advantageous for social and political control. The official, critical and pedagogical discourses on the study of Shakespeare constitute and naturalize all (students, teachers, readers) including the un-anglicized majority as the admirers of the universal Shakespeare. The encouragement given to the study of Shakespeare in India offers a crucial instance of the systematic and powerful nature of the “*master discourse*” of colonialism and exposes that colonial domination was and is as much a cultural as a political process. A critical analysis reveals how the reproduction of the English plays—both as dramatic and literary text in theatrical productions and Educational institutions in the 18th and 19th centuries became an enabling strategy for bolstering the reputation of the English literature and culture.

CONCLUSION

The scattered evidence of material Shakespeare in private and institutional collections from the eighteenth century that I have brought together and analyzed here aims to generate a new understanding of the material uses of Shakespeare in India in the eighteenth century in the context of a fast evolving empire. Its importance lies in recovering Shakespeare’s evolving importance in the knowledge system underlying Britain’s assumption of imperial stature at the turn of the eighteenth century. The resulting transformation, I have shown, involved a shift from an attitude of indifference and cultural secondariness towards Shakespeare to his cult-like status, becoming an integral component of British imperialism and spilling beyond the expatriate community. Thus, we find that the theatre was an important cultural site of a hegemonic contest of dominant political forces and a counter hegemonic struggle during the colonial period in India. It was an important hegemonic site of colonialists who tried to legitimize their rule by asserting their cultural superiority, claiming it as ‘high’ culture while relegating indigenous cultural forms to a ‘low’ status. However, society is far too complex to permit a monolithic hegemonic control of dominant section over every aspect of cultural production and reception according to one master system. Within or alongside the dominant ideology, other oppositional ideologies always struggle for cultural space and sometimes even modify or replace the prevailing ideology to a significant degree. Likewise, the assertion of European superiority through colonial cultural texts had simultaneously produced the conditions for the possibility of resistance. Nonetheless the polyphonous responses to Shakespeare led to alternative discourses, marking an important illustration of the complex interplay of colonial power and its subversion, and race, class and religious politics in a situation born out of imperialist expansion and specific local struggles.

In the end of the paper, I would like to say that it is no denying the fact that the colonialists made the Elizabethan bard the representative figure of the culture of empire and proclaimed the Shakespearean text as “universally transcendental”. Critics are of the view that Shakespeare, as shaped by colonial politics, served as an icon of British cultural superiority but despite of all this one cannot underestimate the literary power of the great poet, novelist and dramatist. The post-colonialist assertion that Shakespeare’s fame is a colonialist manifestation becomes bunkum if one critically analyse that along with Shakespeare, colonialism also brought its Miltons, Wordsworths and Tennysons but they were not able to produce such magical impact and love for literature and drama as that of Shakespeare. Thus, it is no wonder that Shakespeare became a favourite with Indian dramatic imagination. The work of an artist be it a painter, singer, dramatist, cannot be bounded by the human made caste, class, race, community or the physical and territorial boundaries. His work always has a universal appeal. Thus, what is required is to understand the Shakespeare’s rich dramatic poetry resounding with the clash and clangour of the old and the new, in our context.

REFERENCES:

- Anil seal, *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism: Competition and Collaboration in the late nineteenth century* (Cambridge University press, 1968), p. 140.
- Balwant Gargi, *Theatre in India*, New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1966. Also see Lata Singh, *Theatre in colonial India Play-House of Power*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2009, pp. 1-5, 155-60.
- Bheem Bakshi, "Shakespeare In Indian Play House: the Politics of Colonial Representation and Indian Resistance" *JIAJRM*, ISSN: 2320-5083, Volume 4, Issue 3, April 2016
- C. R. Shah, *Shakespearean Plays in Indian Language Part I, the Aryan Path* (November 1955), pp. 485.
²⁸Rajeshwari Sunder Rajan, "After Orientalism: Colonialism and English literary studies in India", *Social Scientist* 158(July 1986): 31.
- Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A cultural history from the Restoration to the present* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989) pp. 194, 374.
- Javed Malick, *Foreign origins/ Native Destinations Shakespeare and the Logic of Vernacular Public Stage*, in Lata Singh, *Theatre in colonial India Play- House of Power*,(ed.), Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2009, pp.155-173.
- Jyotsna Singh, *Different Shakespeare: The Bard in colonial/Postcolonial India*, in Nandi Bhatia, *opcit*, p.78.
- Nandi Bhatia, *Modern Indian Theatre A Reader*, Oxford University press, New Delhi, 2009, pp.xi-xv.
- Nandi Bhatia, *Multiple Mediations of Shakespeare*, *Op. cit.*, pp. 68-75.
- Nandi Bhatia, *Multiple Mediations of Shakespeare: 'Cymbeline in a Hindu playhouse'*, in *Acts of authority/Acts of Resistance Theatre and Politics in colonial and Post colonial India*.
- Norman Marshal, *Shakespeare Abroad in "Talking of Shakespeare"* (ed.), John Garrett (London: Hodder and Stoughton 1954), p. 103.
- Rustam Bharucha, *Rehearsals of Revolution The Political Theatre of Bengal*, University of Hawaii Press, 1983, pp. 55- 63.
- S. K. Bhattacharya, "Shakespeare and the Bengali theatre," *Indian literature* 7(1964): pp. 31-32.