



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Vol. 9. Issue.4. 2022 (Oct-Dec)

INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA
2395-2628(Print):2349-9451(online)

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SELECTED PLAYS OF VIJAY TENDULKAR: *KAMALA*,
SAKHARAM BINDER, *GHASHIRAM KOTHWAL* AND *KANYADAAN*

Dr. SURETE

Email:gsureeti@gmail.com



Article information

Received:20/09/2022
Accepted: 28/10/2022
Published online:06/11/2022
doi: [10.33329/ijelr.9.4.41](https://doi.org/10.33329/ijelr.9.4.41)

ABSTRACT

The caste system and social stratification based on caste and class in India are major themes in the current work. Additionally, it exposes patriarchy's control over society's female population. The patriarchal components that Vijay Tendulkar included in his plays are carefully examined, and efforts are made to highlight them. Additionally, initiatives are made to highlight the caste-class divide in society that is emphasised in his plays. The dramas *Kamala*, *Ghashiram Kothwal*, *Kanyadaan*, and *Sakharam Binder* are taken into account. Elements of caste, class, and patriarchal power may be seen in all of the aforementioned plays.

Keywords: patriarchic dominance, matriarchy, social inequality, caste class based social division, chauvinistic biased male dominated society etc.

Introduction

Famous Marathi writer Vijay Tendulkar is widely recognised. He made a significant and valuable contribution to Indian English literature. He used to write on social and political issues affecting Indian society. He has included a number of themes in his plays, such as the objectification and marginalisation of women by a male-dominated patriarchal society, the division of society along caste and class lines and the issues that people are dealing with as a result of this inequality, and social political issues of power politics and gender discrimination that are clearly highlighted in his plays. Beena Agrawal rightly observes about Tendulkar as she writes, "Vijay Tendulkar is a Marathi writer who started his career as a journalist. In the capacity of a journalist he saw all pervasive corruptions, violence, injustice and the loss of moral values in the society. He started his dramatic career with *Grihashta* in 1985. In association with Karnad, he challenged the dramatic tradition of well made play. He tried to evolve a new dramatic form with the mingling of naturalism and the technique of expressionism." (Agrawal, *Introduction*, p 18)

He composes for readers who have inquisitive brains. The concept of gender inequality is at its zenith in the play *Kamala*. Jaisingh Jadhav's commodification of Sarita and Kamala is really prominent throughout the drama. Power politics is another major element in the drama *Ghashiram Kotwal*, which also addresses the subject of male dominance of women and the objectification of Gauri by patriarchal system of society. A daughter is handled as a test subject by father Nath in *Kanyadaan*. Nath, a supporter of Gandhian ideals, wants to enact equality in the community, which is segmented along caste and class lines. As a result, he consents to the intercaste marriage of her daughter Jyoti, a Brahmin woman of upper caste, to Arun, a Dalit man of lower caste. A person who lacks faith in the structure of marriage is referred to as Sakharam in *Sakharam Binder*. He provides housing for widows or abandoned women who have lost their spouses for different reasons. He

receives bodily pleasures from them in exchange. As a result, every play deals with crucial political and social challenges.

According to AmarNath Prasad and Satish Barbuddhe: "All his plays deal with the complexity of human relationships. Each play contains a subtle critique of modern Indian society. His commitment to human values and ideals can be felt while reading his plays. The evil in the world has been nicely portrayed by Vijay Tendulkar in his plays. He thinks that someone should narrate the ugliness in man's life. Tendulkar has often been accused by critics of appropriating ideas from Western plays and films. Tendulkar himself has admitted to being 'generally influenced in his early days by Western films. He has read the works of Arthur Miller, Tennessee Williams and J.B. Priestley. He has been inspired by real life experiences, hearsay, news items, films, plays and literature in general. The projection of ideas is his own. He is a playwright with a sensitive vision. Like a living volcano, his anger erupts through his plays. His approach to life is essentially affirmative, but he cannot forget the harsh realities of life. Political corruption, which is at the root of all evils and miseries in our society, does not escape the searching eyes of Tendulkar. For their petty selfish interests, the politicians do not hesitate to sacrifice the large sacred national interests. The selfish, dishonest political leaders, intoxicated by power, have forgotten the magnificent sacrifices made by the people, some of whom are now forgotten. He exposes the rapid moral degeneration of political leaders." (Prasad and Barbuddhe)

Gowri Ramnarayan points out about the nature and essence of the works of Tendulkar as he observes, "With his exposure to Marathi theatre from childhood and journalistic background, Vijay Tendulkar turned contemporary socio-political situations into explosive drama" (Gowri: The Hindu, 16).

Tendulkar recognises the value of characters in both theatre and literature. In writing, characters are described in line with the author's intentions, but in theatre, a character "must come to life" as soon as he steps onto the stage. Dialogue modes cause the difference because discourse affects how speech patterns vary. The word combination in speech varies as a result of the sound and idea provided in it. When used in a theatrical presentation, the same words may cause different people to respond or perceive things in different ways. Indian dramatic philosophy places more emphasis on 'rasa' while seeking to comprehend character emotions. Tendulkar usually uses a realistic tone in his plays. His latter two works, *Safar (The Tour)* and *Niyatiyoa Bailala (To Hell with Destiny)*, are centred on imagination, in contrast to his *Ghashiram Kotwal*, which is steeped in tradition. His performance in the play "Silence! The Court is in Session" (1967) thrust him to the centre of a heated national debate. The term "angry young man of Marathi theatre" has already been assigned to him. He was viewed as a departure from the culture's established norms, which were largely conventional. Marathi conservatives were astounded by the realistic portrayal of lust, sex, and violence in the political archetypes *The Vultures* (1971) and *Encounter in Ubugland* (1974). Even more than *The Vultures*, Tendulkar's most realistic play, *Sakharam Binder* (1972), shocked conventional society. He switches from writing in a realistic style to using folklore in *Ghashiram Kotwal* (1972), where he explains the power struggles in Indian politics. The actual tale Ashwin Sarin told in The Indian Express is the inspiration for the (1981) drama *Kamala*. Another disputed drama that has been branded anti-Dalit is *Kanyadaan*. It aims to illustrate the fallacy of our romantic ideals.

Realistic writing was used in the drama *Kamala*. Although *Kamala* is not in any manner a political play, it is a current drama that was inspired by a real-life event. In Ashwin Sarin's Indian Express exposé, it is claimed that he really bought a lady from a local flesh market and presented her at a press conference. Tendulkar utilises this event as a jumping off point to raise some basic questions about the value system of today's success-driven generations, who are prepared to forgo human principles even in the name of humanity itself. The drama emphasises the unmatched mocking and derision directed at the humanity of male chauvinists as well as the fundamental principles of dualism in middle class India. It is clear that people treat women unjustly. On the one hand, people promote women as goddesses and teach that they are superior to men and equal to them. On the other hand, women are accorded a lower status by the same society. The 20th century's fiction writers have been deeply concerned with the social split brought on by disparities in value systems based on gender inequality. Gender anomalies are pervasive in society, and social, cultural, and religious ideas that uphold sex-based norms are steadily canonising them. In the scheme of things, Man has the capacity to decide, and because of this concentration of absolute power, he has devalued the notion of domestic virtues and consigned women

to servile tasks. After losing her right to take centre stage, woman has been so far pushed back that she is unable to think about herself even at the level of her bodily ego. Everybody has the capacity to care for, control, and solve gender-specific issues. However, during the extensive history of subjugation, women were forced to limit their roles to those of childrearing and household management, suppressing their ability to reason and make decisions.

The play's main character is a conceited journalist named Jaisingh Jadhav, who regards the woman he has bought from the flesh market as things that may win him a promotion at work and a good reputation in his industry. He is one of the contemporary individuals that pursues their goal unwaveringly and with a single-minded purpose. Jadhav never even considers what may happen to Kamala if this revelation becomes public. In this scenario, Sarita is simply referred to as a "lovely bonded labourer." She faithfully returns his calls, obeys his commands, and attends to his physical needs. Jaisingh is prepared to do everything it takes to fulfil his goals and aspirations. In order to achieve his ambition, he disregards Sarita, his beloved wife, and treats her like a slave in the home. Sarita is comparable to a naive cow that is meant to bolt at the sound of Jaisingh's voice and submit to him without question. Jaisingh is a tyrannical husband, and the words he says when he calls for Sarita in a serious tone accurately unveil Sarita's position in Jaisingh's life, as he orders her :

JASINGH: Oh, and also bring some tea. And that suitcase has four days worth of dirty clothes in it. Take them out and give them for a wash. But hold your nose while you do it. They must be stinking. Don't tell me I didn't warn you. (8)

Jaisingh is solely interested in creating a stir during the press conference so that he might get recognition. Kakasaheb wants to know Jaisingh's intentions with regard to Kamala's predicament. He is shocked by it. Jaisingh's remarks demonstrate that Kamala's existence as an aware, sentient human being has no significance to him. Even though Jaisingh's journalistic perspective is strange, it sheds light on the oddity that occurs in those who are associated with the media. For them, the media no longer serves as the voice of the people but rather is a tool for securing the means of power, with little concern for the welfare of the general populace or their feelings. If Kakasaheb tried to instil a feeling of nationalism via journalism, Jaisingh employed it to get success for his own selfish purpose. Prior to the press conference, he decides to present Kamala in the worst light possible to support his point. He won't allow her take a bath and demands that she wear the same soiled, worn-out saree to the press conference. Sarita's anguish at the trade in women's flesh is evident when Jaisingh informs her of the reality of this practise as he talks:

Jaisingh: They sell human beings at this bazaar...They have an open auction for women of all sorts of ages." He continues, "The men who want to bid handle the women to inspect them...How they feel in the breast, in their waist, in their thighs and..." . (*Kamala* 14).

Devi expresses her views and says, "There is a cruelty in the heart of man. Even though man is a civilized being now, there is still the savageness of primitive man in him. With savage selfishness Jaisingh doesn't allow Kamala, the woman he bought in the flesh market to take the bath before the Press Conference whereas he enjoys the luxury of bath after the tedious journey." (Devi, *Vijay Tendulkar's Kamala : The Theatre of Cruelty*, p. 143)

Through Jaisingh's persona, the drama depicts the egoism, domination, selfishness, and hypocrisy of today's success-obsessed male culture. Jaisingh exploits both Sarita and Kamala in the play. Sarita is a convincing depiction of a modern Indian woman trapped in the conflict between tradition and modernity and suffering as a result. When Sarita interacts with Kamala, the blinders are abruptly gone, and she realises that she has been used as a puppet by Jaisingh since their marriage. At first, Sarita is unable to recognise her husband's greed. Sarita's viewpoint alters as a result of Kamala's presence in her life, and she begins to recognise that marriage has rendered her a permanent slave and an object of pleasure for Jaisingh. Kamala's ideas have too much of an impact on Sarita, and one of her innocently offered queries causes the curtain to fly up, allowing Sarita to speak with a feeling of self identification. Kamala asks Sarita:

KAMALA: I said, how much did he buy you for? (*Kamala*,34)

After witnessing Kamala's thoughts, Sarita's perception is changed, and she makes a commitment to treat herself and her relationship with respect. Prior to the press presentation, Sarita blindly obeyed Jaisingh's directions, but when Jaisingh decides to give Kamala to an orphanage, Sarita disagrees with the decision and rejects to go to the party thrown in her husband's honour to commemorate his success. She is so enraged and outraged that she thinks of organising a press conference to expose Jaisingh's selfish behaviour. Her words clearly show how agitated she is when she says,

SARITA: I am going to present a man who in the year 1982 still keeps a slave, right here in Delhi. Jaisingh Jadhav. I'm going to say: this man's a great advocate of freedom. And he brings home a slave and exploits her. He doesn't consider a slave a human being – just a useful object. One you can use and throw away....Listen to the story of how he bought the slave Kamala and made use of her. The other slave he got free—not just free—the slave's father shelled out the money- a big sum. (*Kamala*,p.46)

The complex relationship between Jadhav and his wife Sarita is deftly examined, as is the interaction between men and women. Kamala is a female-centered drama because Sarita, the main character, develops during the course of the play from a docile wife to a self-assured, competent, and powerful woman. Since Sarita must submit to her husband's whims while still upholding the family, the character of Sarita demonstrates that even in contemporary society, modern women do not have the same level of freedom as their male counterparts. Sarita understands that her standing in the family is equivalent to Kamala's. But rather of rebelling against Jaisingh once he is fired from his job, she provides him emotional support. She tells Kakasaheb :

SARITA: ... But a day will come, Kakasaheb, when I will stop being a slave. I'll no longer be an object to be used and thrown away. I'll do what I wish, and no one will rule over me. That day has to come. And I'll pay whatever price I have to pay for it. (*Kamala*, p.52)

Waghmare remarks,

"Women have been standing at the cross- roads of history for centuries with tears in their eyes and milk in their breasts. Ours is a man-centred world."(Waghmare, *Literature of Marginality*, p.24).

This statement suits Sarita's current position when even after realizing her position in Jaisingh's life she instead of revolting is making herself ready again to support him in this time of need when he is alone and jobless.

The next most controversial of Vijay Tendulkar's plays is *Kanyadaan*. It discusses a very sensitive social and political issue that is still pervasive in many parts of India: the conflict between the upper caste (Savarna) and Dalits. He was reprimanded and subjected to Chappal tossing from the audience when the performance was performed in Marathi, though. The playwright's main intention was not clear to the audience, who viewed it as an anti-dalit drama. In his award speech, Tendulkar said that as a writer, he admired both perspectives. Only a few characters appear in the two acts and five scenes of the drama *Kanyadaan*. Tendulkar examines the tribulations, anxieties, and tensions of urban, middle-class, white-collar employees in his plays. His razor-sharp social dramas that relentlessly and viciously explore society and the human psyche frequently spark debate. Their primary focus is on the struggle and conflict between the individual and society. The angry and disgruntled protagonists of his plays are actually the victims of dreadful living conditions in the so-called modern, civilised society. By rejecting conventional or traditional views and values, these young men and women express their wrath and dissatisfaction. As a result, certain characters' harshness represents twisted humanity, and their desire to bring agony to others represents a desire for payback on society. They provide the world a set of social attitudes that are anti-establishment, anti-culture, and even anti-humanitarian in the existential sense, in opposition to established, cultural, and humanitarian values. The rest of the world does not recognise their bravery, humanity, or struggle for existence. The rejection of neurotic disease within the context of caste- and religion-based orthodoxy is a veiled sign of civilization's "discontent." It also shows how worried individuals are able to survive in their present circumstances. The atrocities of caste discrimination generate a sense of powerlessness, which eventually evolves into hatred. *Kanyadan* is possibly Tendulkar's most disputed play. It

investigates the psychological impact of casteism on social tensions in India, as well as Jyoti's change from a cultured and soft-spoken Brahmin girl to a staunch Dalit wife. Similarly, it demonstrates how Nath's mind has evolved. As a result of traumatic life circumstances, the persistent optimist transforms into a disillusioned realist.

As the title suggests, the fundamental subject of the drama is the marriage relationship. Jyoti, a degree-holding lady, is from a Brahmin family that values politics and social justice. She decides to marry Arun Athawale, a young Dalit poet. Tendulkar aims to reinvestigate the far-reaching implications of "civilization's discontents" in the drama *Kanyadan* via the fury and bitterness of a Dalit teenager born of caste oppression. The play's protagonist, Arun Athavale, is a scavenger by caste who, by chance, appears as a sadist and rebel. The accumulated rage and hatred caused by harmful cultural conventions have wrecked his existence. As a result of realising his own personal agony, he loses faith in societal fairness, love relationships, and even the reality of human life. Despite being the son of a scavenger, Arun possesses keen intelligence and deep intuition. Srivastava observes, "It is very difficult to understand Nath as a father. He talks like a revolutionary politician and becomes the cause of Jyoti's misery. He does not think about Jyoti's future. He only thinks that he can uproot casteism if his daughter Jyoti marries to a dalit." (Srivastava, *Kanyadan : The Admission of Defeat and Intellectual Confusion*, 2008, p.107)

Violence is depicted in three ways throughout the drama: physically, psychologically, and verbally. Arun's cruel, inhumane treatment of Jyoti is clearly psychological violence, but it also serves as a technique for him to overcome his feelings of inadequacy. The horrible pleasure he derives from it is astounding. It sends a clear message about our culture's backward castes or Dalits and their distinctively degraded way of life. Arun's foul and filthy vocabulary comprises aggressive words. Nonetheless, it is the everyday language of the Dalit people. As a result, it is not surprising in any manner. Despite being based on true events, the play appears to symbolise Tendulkar's critique of Indian society, particularly the friction between the upper and lower castes. As a result, whether he is accurate or not, Arun Athawale may be seen as the voice of the disgruntled young Dalit community in post-1970 India. Beena Agrawal aptly comments on Dalit psyche, "Jayprakash being a young blood has a rational insight into the whole matrix of violence adopted by Arun. He accepts that sadism on the part of exploited and oppressed is a method to justify the violence done to them. For oppressor, violence is not a method of self defence only but a mode of revenge that implies emotional contentment. He tries to generalize the whole phenomenon and concludes, "Yesterday's victim is today's victimizer." (Agrawal, *Kanyadaan : A Voice to Reconstruct Dalit Consciousness* .2010,p.190)

Jyoti after getting married to Arun clearly understands the true reason behind his barbarous attitude and she finally accepts Arun as he is. About Arun, Wadikar says, "Throughout his life, he has seen his father coming home over drunk and beating his mother half dead...Jyoti has the same experience after marriage. Arun returns home roaring drunk. She notices a savage beast in his eyes, his lips, his face and cannot isolate this bestiality from his personality. He is at once both the beast and the lover, the demon and the poet. These twin traits are so closely bound that, she finds it impossible to distinguish the one from the other. In the course of time, she comes to the conclusion that filthy courting and physical torture while engaged in sex with her is a part of his frenzied love. Arun is made up of all this horrible stuff and she has to accept him as he is." (Wadikar, 2008. *The Theme of Casteism in Vijay Tendulkar's Kanyadaan*. P.101)

Beena Agrawal says about Jyoti, "She seems to have a true realization of the sparks of violence burning within the consciousness of Arun. Jyoti confirms what had already been confessed by Arun. The sympathy of elitists only generates greater chaos and nothingness. In the sympathy of Nath, her own self-respect distorts and gradually it transforms in the silent fury. She negates her identity as the daughter of a Brahmin and makes an open confession of her identity as the wife of a Dalit." (Agrawal, *Kanyadaan : A Voice to Reconstruct Dalit Consciousness*. 2010. p.192) In order to incorporate Arun into society, she gives up her personal identity and emphasises her status as the wife of a scavenger. She realises that a woman is expected to accept her husband. Why should she be forced to disavow Arun's scavenging status? Her speech makes this clear as she says:

Jyoti: I am not Jyoti Yadunath Deyalikar now; I am Jyoti Arun Athavale, a scavenger. I don't say 'harijan'. I despise the term Don't touch me. Fly from my shadow, otherwise my fire will scorch your comfortable values. (Kanyadan,70).

Arun's insecurities drove him to act rashly. He felt nervous since Jyoti belonged to a Brahmin family, which is regarded an upper caste in society, and Arun belonged to the Dalit caste, which is considered a low backward and scavenging group in society. As a result of this social disparity, Arun became enraged and angry, and in order to relieve the anguish that the Dalit class had been experiencing for centuries, he used to beat Jyoti in order to get revenge on the upper class. Jyoti Arun feels bad the next morning after being beaten. Jyoti was able to grasp the mindset of a low-income person after marrying Arun. She was able to comprehend Arun's heinous actions. Thus, when Nath criticises Arun's autobiography, Jyoti speaks on his behalf, or more accurately, on behalf of the whole Dalit community, as she opposes his father's useless ideals and views. She demonstrated that understanding the Dalit mentality and thinking requires thinking on humanitarian grounds. Tendulkar has so shown caste injustice and patriarchy extremely well in this play.

Tendulkar uses a character-centric approach in *Sakharam Binder*, but by exploring the character's socio-psychological spectrum, he has sought the sickness at the core of both society standards and interpersonal connections. Tendulkar creates light on the stage by combining naturalism and reality. The location is a mofussil town, and the action takes place in a lower middle-class dwelling. The thorough stage instructions assist in creating a realistic and compelling image of the economically disadvantaged elements of society. Beena Agrawal writes about Sakharam: "In Sakharam's scheme of contractual relationship, there is no question of subjugation and domination. Sakharam Binder admits that the institution of marriage is a great hazard for self survival. He condemns the traditional roles of husband and wife in which the betrayal is implied." (Agrawal, *Sakharam Binder : Affirmation of Private Morality against Social Conventions*.2010, p. 89) Sakharam gives shelter to homeless women and wants them to act as his wife and obey his commands. He promises them two sarees initially and one saree every year. He does not believe in marriage and says that he is not double faced person like other men in society who marry a woman and then use her lifelong as a captive slave and throw out of the house whenever wanted. Sakharam says that any woman who is willing to live in his house should obey his orders and be a wife to him. He also respects personal decisions of the woman and says that whenever the woman wants she can leave the house and he will not stop her from taking the decision of leaving his house. He is a clear cut straightforward person and hates double standards of the conventional society. Sakharam considers his deal as a partnership in which mutual understanding is essential for both spouses. Despite coming from a repressive home, Sakharam argues for a liberal and caring outlook. He recognises that Lakshmi has the same ability to make decisions as he does to maintain his own independence. As a result, he gives her a choice:

Sakharam : you can go your way. I can go mine. You don't owe me anything, I owe you nothing either. Let's be free of each other (Sakharam Binder, 151)

Beena Agrawal says, "Sakharam's commitment to the cause of human sensibility and his resentment for the conventional morality is expressed in the scene VI of act one where Lakshmi is found busy in the Aarti of Ganpati. On the suggestion of Lakshmi, he joins her but when she does not permit his friend Dawood to join it because he was a Muslim, Sakharam fails to control his rage. As an immediate reaction, he slaps at her face. This sudden contemptuous reaction of Sakharam suggests that his contempt is directed not against Lakshmi only but against all those conventions that are responsible for the failure of personal relationship." (Agrawal, 2010, 92) Sakharam complaints about society :

Sakharam: People! Why do I owe them or their bloody fathers? Did they feed me when I went hungry? I lay dying in the Miraj Mission Hospital. Did anyone bother to find out whether I was alive or dead? Don't talk to me about people ... Run after whores themselves and crap at others. Nobody in this place can be cleaner than me. Every single one of those dammed fellows is soiled, filthy trying to look clean outside. Stuffed with dirt inside. Don't talk to me about people. If there's anyone better than us, its those whores (173).

Arundhati Banerjee in Appendix 1 , comments, "Sakharam, though apparently crude, aggressive and violent, has his own laws of personal morality. He is a man who is primarily honest and frank. This openness of

his personality becomes in itself a criticism of the hypocrisy of the middle class. Sakharam ridicules the double standards of the middle class. His straightforwardness in dealing with helpless women such as Laxmi demands a certain admiration." (Banerjee , *Collected Plays in Translation*, 2003. p. 577)

Ghashiram Kotwal, Vijay Tendulkar's most well-known and divisive drama, illustrates how revenge affects a man's intellect and sensibility to the point that he disregards all moral and common sense conventions. Ghashiram is not Prince Hamlet, quietly studying the topic of revenge and always prolonging the crisis under the pretence of grasping the most beneficial opportunity, which he seldom obtains. He acts quickly to escape the tornado that incarcerates his sensitivity and clouds his vision. Tendulkar criticises high caste Brahmins in *Ghashiram Kotwal* for being punished for retaining traditional ideas during the British era of Indian administration. Traditional Brahmins were labelled as "Natives" by Britishers as morally immoral individuals. In his book *Ghashiram Kotwal*, author Maroba Kanhoba shows the moral depravity of Brahmins through the eyes of a Brahmin scholar. After then, revivalists resort to literature and other kinds of culture to restore the Brahmins' previous glory. The plot centres around Ghashiram, a North Indian Brahmin who comes to Pune to make his wealth. However, after being wrongfully accused of thievery by the Brahmins, he vows to make Pune a "city suitable for dogs." To do this, he barter his minor daughter Gauri to the amorous Nana Phadnavis in exchange for becoming the Kotwal of Pune. He then wreaks havoc on the city by slicing off their hands. It's quite nasty. The drama opens with the dance and singing of Ganapati, the Hindu deity, and the goddesses Saraswati and Lakshmi. In this play, the dramatist depicts two phases of Brahmins: first, they are highly devout and devote to God in the light of the day, and second, they behave like animals in the dark night. They head to the red light district, Bavannakhani. They never give accurate information. When asked, they give the erroneous addresses. Their ladies live by alone in their homes. However, the drama illustrates the fact that Brahmin women wait for someone else. They arrive, embrace, and proceed inside. Human nature is shown realistically here. These really show the Brahmins' moral degradation as they try to conceal their passion under religious respectability.

Ghashiram's wife and daughter's well-being are at danger, but so is his ego as a Brahmin. He declares that he is reluctant to make any concessions to Poona's laws. He says:

Ghashiram: I am a Kanauj Brahmin. But I've become a Shudra, a criminal, a useless animal. There is no one to stop me now; to mock me, to make me bend, to cheat me. Now I am a devil. (*Ghashiram Kotwal*,376) When Ghashiram was beaten and mis treated by poona Brahmins he decides to take revenge from them. It is Ghashiram's natural fury. And he pursues vengeance in an unusual manner. He is aware of Nana's weakness: she is a woman. Ghashiram hides his weaknesses behind his daughter, Lalita Gauri. However, because he is in such a hurry to achieve his goal, he never considers the consequences of his actions. Ghashiram was annihilated indirectly. His daughter has been sent to Nanasahab, and he likes her. Ghashiram, disguised as a servant, is also present and examines Nana Sahab's responses. Nana pats Gauri's shoulder because he wants to touch her. However, the defenceless Gauri is embarrassed by his acts, feels fear, and leaves the scene like a startled deer. Ghashiram, on the other hand, aspires to wield authority. As a consequence, he returns and gives his daughter to Nana. Nana dances sensuously with her and develops a love interest in her. Ghashiram witnesses it from a distance and is happy to see that he has succeeded in luring and capturing Nana. Ghashiram is overjoyed to encounter Nana, given his current sexual situation. Ghashiram is presently seeking appropriate recompense for his submission of a daughter. He aims to arouse Nana's desire for sexual experiences by refusing to send her under the pretence of getting her married off.

Thus in order to take revenge Ghashiram shamelessly uses her daughter as a bait to capture Nana's mind and gain kotwalship of Poona from him to fulfil his revenge on Poona Brahmins for insulting him and treating him like a scavenger. Thus he wanted to fulfil his promise he made to himself : "T'll come back to Poona. I'll show my strength. It will cost you! Your good days are gone! I am a Kannauj Brahman, but I've become a Shudra, a criminal, a useless animal. I'll come back like a boar and I'll stay as a devil I'll make pigs of all of you. I'll make this Poona a kingdom of pigs. Then I'll be Ghashiram again, the son of Savaldas once more." (17). Ghashiram kills his conscience and overthrows morals in order to carry out his retaliatory plans. Ghashiram is aware of his fatherly perfidy even as he gleefully celebrates his success in wooing Nana through seduction using her daughter. Bandhopadhyaya observes, "Ghashiram is a discourse of power, power grabbed through the nastiest of barter

arrangements, Ghashiram grabbing power by a nasty sell-out of his daughter's modesty. Thus this power game is 'played out against a background of political and moral decadence and degeneracy, with sexuality impinging on strategies of power.' (Bandyopadhyay: *Introduction to Ghashiram Kotwal*, 2002, p.3).

After attaining the kotwalship of Poona he started torturing the people in many ways. But in this process of revenge he forgot that he had given his fragile daughter in lecherous arms of Nana. When he comes to know about death of Gauri during pregnancy he gets mad with rage and started behaving furiously. He put more and more tortures on public of Poona. He was fallen into Nana's trap when once he suffocated twenty Brahmins to death in prison who were caught stealing mangoes from the trees. This story quickly circulated across Poona, and people sought justice. This time, Nana, knowing that Ghashiram may be hazardous to him, orders the public to murder Ghashiram. Poona public harassed and murdered Ghashiram. As a result, he meets a sad end. Or we may argue he paid the price for his actions. He used his only daughter as bait to capture Nana, and his daughter paid the price. As a result, the play paints a vivid image of women's objectification. Nana treats women as a source of pleasure and is unconcerned about performing shameful things in front of Ganpati idol. This drama clearly depicts power dynamics, caste-based vengeance, and women's marginalisation. N.S. Dharan observes the play as , "dramatic expose of the latent violence, treachery, sexuality and immorality that characterize contemporary politics" (Dharan: *Tendulkar's Thesis on Power Politics*, p.98).

Conclusion

The caste system and social stratification in India based on caste and class are important themes throughout this work. Furthermore, it reveals patriarchy's grip over society's female population. The patriarchal elements that Vijay Tendulkar inserted in his plays are extensively explored and highlighted. Furthermore, efforts are made to highlight the caste-class difference in society, which is emphasised in his plays. Kamala, Ghashiram Kothwal, Kanyadaan, and Sakharam Binder are among the plays considered. All of the aforementioned plays have elements of caste, class, and patriarchal dominance. Tendulkar no doubt is a prolific dramatist who has very aptly presented and highlighted various social political problems in his plays and the effect of those socio-political issues on human relations.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Tendulkar, Vijay. "Sakharam Binder" translated by Kumud Mehta and Shanta Gokhale. *Collected Plays in Translation*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014. Print.
- Tendulkar, Vijay. "Kamala" translated by Priya Adarkar. *Collected Plays in Translation*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014. Print.
- Tendulkar, Vijay. "Kanyadaan" translated by Gowri Ramnarayan. *Collected Plays in Translation*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014. Print.
- Tendulkar, Vijay. "Ghashiram Kotwal" translated by Jayant Karve and Eleanor Zelliot. *Collected Plays in Translation*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2014. Print.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Agrawal, Beena. "Introduction" in "Dramatic World of Vijay Tendulkar : Explorations & Experimentations". Aadi Publications. Jaipur. 2010. p.18.Print.
- Agrawal, Beena. *Kanyadaan : A Voice to Reconstruct Dalit Consciousness* in "Dramatic World of Vijay Tendulkar : Explorations & Experimentations". Aadi Publications. Jaipur. 2010. Print.
- Agrawal, Beena. *Sakharam Binder : Affirmation of Private Morality against Social Conventions*. "Dramatic World of Vijay Tendulkar : Explorations and Experimentations". Aadi Publications : Jaipur. 2010. Print.
- Bandyopadhyay, Samik. *Introduction to Ghashiram Kotwal*, translated from Marathi by Jayant Karve & Eleanor Zelliot, Seagull Books, Calcutta, 2002.

-
- Banerjee Arundhati. *Appexdix 1, "Collected Plays in Translation"*. New Delhi : OUP. 2003. Print.
- Devi, P. Pramila. "Vijay Tendulkar's Kamala : The Theatre of Cruelity". *Studies in Indian Drama in English* (ed.) Amar Nath Prasad. Bareilly: Prakash Book Depot, 2003. P. 143. Print.
- Dharan, N.S. "Tendulkar's Thesis on Power Politics". *The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar*. New Delhi: Creative Books, 1999
- Prasad Amar Nath and Barbuddhe Satish, *Preface. "The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar : Critical Explorations"*. Sarup & Sons. New Delhi : 2008. Print.(p. v- xvi)
- Ramnarayan, Gowri. " A New Myth of Sisyphus!" (Vijay Tendulkar and Girish Karnad in Conversation with Gowri Ramnarayan). *The Hindu Folio on Theatre*. Feb. 1998
- Srivastava Rishi Shilpi, *Kanyadan : The Admission of Defeat and Intellectual Confusion*. (ed.) "The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar: Critical Explorations". Sarup & Sons. New Delhi. 2008. Print.
- Wadikar B Shailja, *The Theme of Casteism in Vijay Tendulkar's Kanyadaan*, (ed.) "The Plays of Vijay Tendulkar: Critical Explorations". Sarup & Sons. New Delhi. 2008. P. 101. Print.
- Waghmare, J.M. "Literature of Marginality", in N.M. Aston (ed.), *Literature of Marginality: Dalit Literature and African- American Literature*, New Delhi: Prestige Books, 2001, Print.
-