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PREFACE

The Governing Body of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute is privileged to bring out, to mark the Valedictory function of its Golden Jubilee on 10th July 1996, a monograph of an edition with critical study and English translation of a little known unique farce, the Paṇḍumandana (P.M.) of Harṣīvāna Miśra, a poet scholar who lived in Jaipur in the 17th century.

The Prahasana (comedy - farce) and Bhāna (one-man show) are two minor play-forms described by Bharata in his Nāṭyaśāstra under the general category of ‘Daśāntipaka’. All the post-Bharata dramaturgists also dealt with them. Although distinct in their technical format, the Prahasana and Bhāna are rightly clubbed together by Bharata as they are both of pure entertainment value (raṇjakapradhāna) and form an important medium to expose the weaknesses of society in general or contemporary to the author. Naturally, comical and satirical elements are dominant in both of them.

It is noteworthy that amongst the ten (or eleven) drama-types, besides the full-fledged Nāṭaka, only the Prahasana and Bhāna as preferred by many poets, are represented by a large number of specimens from the early centuries to the present times.

As part of my D.Phil. thesis at the University of Oxford during 1969-71 I had an opportunity to critically study for the first time the characteristic features and presentability of the genre of Bhāna as available in the theoretical texts from the Nāṭyaśāstra (2nd century B.C. to 2nd A.D.) to the Raśāramavasudhākara of Sīghabhūpāla (14th century A.D.) and correlate and evaluate it with such information as gleaned from the available printed specimens. Subsequently a similar
study was undertaken by Dr. Ramaratnam, Professor of Sanskrit, Vivekananda College, Madras, for the Prahasana.

The P.M. and its author Harijivana Misra (H.M.) deserve a special place in the history of the Prahasanas. H.M. is, in the present state of knowledge, the only writer who has composed as many as six Prahasanas including P.M., each of them endowed with some features not usually found in the Prahasanas. They form a substantial contribution to the comic theatre of India. Amongst them P.M. is on all accounts the master-piece of the author.

Until the sixties H.M.’s Prahasanas were not known even to the specialists in ancient theatre as they were all available only in mss. and that too in the Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner, not easily accessible, and in the India Office Library, London. In the early sixties, Dr. George Artola, then at the University of Hawaii, U.S.A., undertook a project of studying some unpublished Prahasanas which included those of H.M. In this connection he worked at Madras with Prof. V. Raghavan, whose life-long scholarly pre-occupation with the study and practice of classical Sanskrit Theatre is well known. In May 1965 Artola presented a paper on H.M. and his Prahasanas at the sixth annual meeting of the Samskrita Ranga, a unique organisation founded by Dr. Raghavan in 1958 for putting on boards authentic versions of a range of Sanskrit dramas from the ancient to the present times as available in print and in mss. In this talk Artola highlighted the variety of comic situations created by H.M. in five of his Prahasanas - the Adhikutaratadviga (waves of marvel) in three acts caricaturing persons in the royal court, most probably of the author’s patron king Rama Simha of Jaipur (17th century); the Prasaṅgika rich in humour arising from the use of play on specific words; the Vibudhamohana providing joy for the the learned men; the incomplete Gṛṭakulyāvali on the house-holder Gṛṭakulaśāla giving choories to brahmans instead of the usual dakṣinā; and the P.M. The sixth Prahasana Sahārayāṇanda is somewhat serious, as it is replete with the technical matters on the Alāṅkāra Śāstra. Dr. Raghavan’s paper at the same meeting was on this Prahasana. The above lectures were subsequently printed in the Samskrit Ranga Annual volume IV. 1966.

An edited version of the P.M. as from mss. was also successfully staged on 12th May 1966 at Madras as directed by Dr. Raghavan with the assistance of Dr. C.S. Sundaram and myself. A couple of photographs from this presentation as from the Samskrita Ranga photo album are included in the present edition of P.M.

Two of H.M.’s Prahasanas, namely the Vibudhamohana and P.M. were published by Dr. Raghavan through the issues (I. 1966 and III. 1973) of the Bulletin Malayamārūta sponsored by the Rashtriya Sanskrit Samsthan.

Although efforts were taken by the two scholars as seen above to bring to light all of H.M.’s Prahasanas, the authorities of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute though it would be worthwhile to publish P.M. alone with an additional English translation along with its text and the critical information already available. The early issues of the Samskrita Ranga Annuals are not available for purchase. Also the bulletin Malayamārūta has become defunct after bringing out usefully some minor unpublished Sanskrit compositions through its
four issues during 1966 to 1978. The Rashtriya Sanskrit Samsthan and its Vidyapeetha family have during the last 2½ decades, grown in size in many ways. The general students and specialists therefore look forward to the revival of the publication Malayamārutha in the near future.

My assisting Prof. Raghavan in the production of P.M. by the Sanskrit Ranga in 1966 provided me an opportunity to study the text of P.M. The inclusion of my English translation of P.M. in the present publication gave me a second occasion after 30 years to study the text closely, enjoy its subtleties and evaluate it critically. I would now like to give some extra information about the dramatic and literary aspects in P.M. that would add to its uniqueness amongst the Prahasanas.

Firstly about the satirical elements in the play. H.M. as seen from P.M. is quite original and a past-master in satire. Of course he has in this context satirised the preferences of the brahmin pandits from the different parts of India, Maharashtra, Andhra, Bengal, etc. for edibles and drinks prohibited in the Smritis and Dharma Sāstras as they enrich only tamo and rajo guṇas. As shown by Drs. Raghavan and Artola, the names of the characters in the play indicate their addiction for the prohibited edibles. It is noteworthy in this connection that within the span of a short Prahasana of 13 verses and connecting dialogues, the author has introduced a variety of foodstuffs peculiar to the different regions of India. This includes basic materials used in cooking like coconut and tamarind specially associated with the South Indians; root vegetables like small and big onions, garlic, mostly used by the southerners; red edible roots and mushrooms; soups like boiled fluid dish (Kaṭhika), especially the sour gruel made from the fermentation of boiled rice (śōrāṭa), and a special soup favoured by the people in Karnataka and Maharashtra, as prepared by putting the ready-made powder of a mixture of fried rice, pulses and fenugreek in curds (when it would be some sort of the present day ‘raitha’), or in fresh tamarind juice. This could be easily prepared at the arrival of some unannounced guests. Occasionally this is part of the menu in our house and we call it ‘mendiyiṭu’, or ‘vendiyiṭu’ because mendiam / vendiyam or fenugreek is a chief ingredient in it. Besides these eatables and soups H.M. has introduced also a favourite sweet of the people in Karnataka called ‘pōli’ or ‘pūrṇa pōli’. This is prepared from a pastry filled with a mixture of cocoanut gratings and boiled jaggery fluid called ‘pūrṇa’ or ‘pūrṇa’ and cooking it on a pan like dosa. At the end of the play the Bengali brahmins’ favourite of fish comes to prominence. What a variety!

H.M. had a keen sense of humour and knew how to satirise cleverly. As already noted by Drs. Raghavan and Artola, H.M. was a brahmin from the eastern Gauda country, who came originally from the most eastern part of Rajasthan. He may have known fairly well the eating habits, directly or indirectly of spurious brahmins all over India. Consciously or unconsciously H.M. has effected an integration of some regions of India by creating kinship among the characters created by him. The hero is Liṅgoj Bhaṭṭa, a passionate old man, obviously a northerner. His nuptials with his second wife, the youthful Cīṅcā, is the main theme of P.M. Her very name Cīṅcā (tamarind) and her description as “one whose limbs are smeared with turmeric”, reveal her to be a southerner. Liṅgojī’s first wife is Pūrṇapōlikā, a sweet
edible associated with the Karnataka region, Liṅga's brother Tryambaka (cocoanut), the latter's wife Kvakthikā (boiled fluid dish), their two sons, Garlic and Small Onion, show that the whole family is associated with the southern region. The Pandits who attend the garbhādhiṇa function are drawn from Tamil Nadu, Andhra, Karnataka, Bengal and Maharashtra (specially the Cittāvans).

The main thrust of the play is of course the funny situations set up by H.M. in depicting the consumption of prohibited vegetables, specially onions, mushroom, and garlic by the so-called orthodox priests, openly and stealthily. These vegetables are used to spice the various food preparations at the ritual function. H.M. criticizes this nature of the brahmins adequately in simple and appropriate similes and metaphors. H.M. says that without small onions "dishes will be tasteless like the grassy food of mammals", that "the bulbous root of garlic is like the moon while the onions are like fire-flies", that a "good collection of big onion shines like the multitude of stars". The gorgeous description of garlic in verses 8 and 11 and of small onions in verse 9 could be seen in this connection.

It is noteworthy that not only human beings including the priestly class, enjoy eating food dishes seasoned by onions and garlic but also the divinities, gods and demons. In the Nādi verse itself Śiva is described as "enjoying all kinds of food and drinks" and "delighting in varied tastes".

In and through the play the peeling of garlic and onions are described as scattered all over in large quantities. The funeral pyre of Laśuna Panta is made up of only such peeled skins. The sacrificial platform at the garbhādhiṇa function too is covered with the peelings of garlic and onion, instead of the Kuṣa grass. Not only men, but all the womenfolk too, conceal a lot of these prohibited vegetables in the pleats of their saris and these roll down on the floor when they serve the food for the guests!

The funniest part is at the end of the play when H.M. effectively describes a brawl arising from the mutual criticism of the orthodox Southern and Bengali priests and pandits. The Southerners are not able to put up with the unorthodox nasty smell of rotten fish. In the same way the Bengalis strongly criticize the Southerners relishing assiduously the foodstuffs seasoned with the strong-scented onions garlic. Being learned pandits they cite the Śrīvī texts to document their respective views. This disputation ends in the imprisonment of the Bengali pandits by the policemen and royal official on the argument manipulated by the "crafty" southerners. Accordingly the latter point to the accumulated red and white peelings of onions and prove that the Bengalis were trying to perform some tantric rite to kill them all! This calamitous event proves to be not only a great disturbance but also time-consuming. The auspicious time fixed for the ritual was also over by then. Hence the announcement is made that a more suitable auspicious day is to be fixed for the garbhādhiṇa ceremony of Liṅgoji and Cīṛcā. It is evident from this development that the southerners headed by the 'respected' guest Paṅḍu Maṇḍana had the final say on all matters including foodstuffs and rituals so that the title of the play becomes most appropriate and significant.

Besides criticising the eating habits of people in some parts of India
which is a novel idea of H.M., following his predecessors, the author also makes fun of a few social customs prevalent in South India. In fact, an event that is dealt with at some length in this short play and that prevents even the initiated garbhādhāna to be celebrated, is the fixing, by the aged Liṅgoji and his first wife Pūrnāriṇī (with the assistance of his youthful second wife Āqāriṇī), the marriage of their adolescent daughter Raktamūlikā “fresh like mango blossoms”. Raktamūlikā was already in love with her paternal uncle’s youthful son Grījanāḍri, who also favourably responded to her. But the young girl is suddenly betrothed by her parents to Grījanāḍri’s elder brother Laśuna Panta who is wealthy, too old for marriage, and sickly. This oral agreement was fixed on account of the would-be bridegroom Laśuna Panta agreeing to offer to Liṅgoji and his wife, large sums of cash in gold coins and also some of his fertile lands where he was profitably growing garlic, onions etc. This gift was to cover his own intended marriage and for his anticipatory cremation rites. That anything may happen to Laśuna at any moment is clear from what happens immediately after his betrothal. For, like a dutiful daughter Raktamūlikā agreeing to the new arrangement, comes affectionately to Laśuna Panta and moves towards him. He also happily tries to laugh but getting a spasm falls down in a swoon. Luckily he is revived within a short while. Liṅgoji and others are of course glad that the rich old son-in-law is alive and Raktamūlikā’s marriage as well as property have been secured. H.M. while highlighting the greed for money of a few characters, indicates in the Nandī verse itself that even lord Śiva advocates the second purusārtha of Artha and has also “acquired abundant wealth” (pracaravibhava - karī). The above incident also involves a local custom prevalent in the South Indian families, namely of marriage alliances among related cousins. In the play this practice is said to be a matter for gossip amongst the South Indian pandits themselves who are declared to be, among other things, those “openly making fun of marriage with the maternal uncle’s daughter” (mānula-kanyakapāla-vikasvarāth). At a later occasion also, while the pandit guests from the North India are announced, the dramatist says that the South Indian pandits “who are ridiculing the mutual marriage amongst uncle’s daughter and such other topics could be averted since the northerners who are capable of exposing others’ faults satirically have just arrived”.

It could be seen therefore that the hāsya situations and characters presented in P.M. are not of the usual type that are found monotonously in many Prahasanas, old and new. The humour sometimes degenerates to obscenity, as in the low quality of the different types of invitees for the garbhadhāna function (pp. 46,47). However this coarseness and “slapstick” is an integral part of the features of Sanskrit farces.

As shown by Drs. Raghavan and Artola, H.M. had a knowledge of all the Śrāstras, especially the Alanākāra Śāstra, as is proved in his Sahādayānanda.

The style of H.M. is classical, simple, and smooth, and quite fits in with the general trend of a prahasa. The alanākāras used by him are apt and original. His vocabulary is quite ordinary. Only in some contexts he uses words like “catura” and ‘poṭikā” in special meanings. In a short work of dialogues and 13 verses, he has used as many as 8 metres - Anuṣṭubh (verse 13), Indravajrā (v.12), Upendra
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HARIJĪVANA MIṢṆA AND HIS SHORT SANSKRIT PLAYS
Dr. George T.Artola, University of Hawaii

On several occasions Professor Raghavan has spoken on the comic element in Sanskrit literature and in the course of his discussions he has not failed to mention the short comedy-farcæs, called prahasanas, which appear sporadically in different parts of India from the time of Mahendravikramavarmen of Kancipuram to the time of Aurangzib in the seventeenth century. Most of the authors of prahasanas have contented themselves with the composition of one or two prahasanas or in the case of Veṅkaṭeśvara, of three prahasanas (Bhāṇuprabandha, Lambodara and Unmattakavikālaśa). It is unusual to find a dramatist whose reputation relies on as many as six prahasanas, a dramatist who has, so to speak, devoted himself to the composition of prahasanas. Such a dramatist is Harijīvana Miṣrā. A manuscript of each of the six prahasanas he has written is found in the library of the Maharaja of Bikaner (formerly called the Anup Sanskrit Library) in Rajasthan. The titles of his prahasanas are:

Adhutataraṅga
Prāṣaṅgika
Gṛṇṭakulyāvalī
Pañḍumāṇḍana
Vibudhamohana
Saṅdayānanda

Our first knowledge of the comedy-farcæs of Harijīvana Miṣrā we owe to two scholars who were commissioned to catalogue the manuscripts of the Anup Sanskrit Library, Dr. Kunhan Raja and

---

1 Particularly at Oxford (1953) and Chicago (1964) Dr.Raghavan spoke on the theory and practice of the comic element in Sanskrit literature in comparison with that in the West. These lectures were published as a monograph posthumously by the Samukritī Ranga in 1989.
Sri Madhava Krishna Sarma. In an article in *The Adyar Library Bulletin* (XV, 1951, pp.68-71) the latter has described for the first time the six manuscripts in the Bikaner collection. What we learn from his description is that each one is written in Devanāgarī and, with the exception of one of them, the *Adbhutaratārāṇa*, they are brief, as we would expect *prahasanās* to be. The *Ghṛtakulyāvallī* is unfortunately incomplete: at least two folia towards the end are missing, which in a short manuscript of seven folia means that the more important part of the text is lacking. The other five manuscripts are complete, and on the basis of copies of them which are in the possession of Prof. Raghavan it is possible to discuss their contents. Taken all together, the *prahasanās* of Harijīvana Miśra are a substantial contribution to the comic theatre of India.

Although they do not have great literary value, they should not be neglected in any discussion of Sanskrit dramatic literature. My object here will be to analyse those *prahasanās* of Harijīvana Miśra which I have been studying, and in the case of one of them, the *Sahṛdayānanda*, Prof. Raghavan will add his analysis of it since its subject matter has a special interest for him and he is eminently better qualified to discuss it.

The first play which Harijīvana Miśra composed was not on a voluntary basis. He informs us in the colophon of the *Adbhutaratārāṇa* that he was ordered to write this *prahasanā* by Mahārāja Rāma Simha I (1635-1689) of Amber. From this we may assume that it was the desire of his royal master to have this play performed in the palace at Amber. We learn from the Italian adventurer, Nicolo Manucci, who visited several of the courts of the Mahārājas who were loyal to Aurangzib, that it was considered an honour to witness dances, plays and the chase. Manucci himself

---


"King Rāma Simha promoted eager activity in the field of poetry and the arts and he was devoted to nāṭakas, sājakas, prahasanās, ākhyānas and prabhāndhas; he was resplendent like the royal swan on the milky ocean of the literature of the purāṇas, together with the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata."

Thus, fifty-five years after his death, Rāma Simha was praised for his interest in all of these fields. During his life-time this same high praise was heard in his own court, for in the prastāvānā of the Śṛṅgāravāpikā, a four-act nāṭikā of Viśvanātha Mahādeva Rāṇade, the sūtradhāra says that his court, filled with poets and wise men, laughs at heaven (dīvam hasati); the brahmans there rejoice with the discussions of different sciences and literature. His generosity to all of them was so great according to this court playwright that even Brahmā would not create another liberal donor like him (Brahmāpyanyam vādānyam srjati na). Several of the prahasanās of Harījvana Miśra mention as one of the favourite courtly diversions the discussions of pandits on a variety of subjects. Before he composed the Ādhibhutaraṅga, Harījvana Miśra may already have had a fine reputation as a pandit who actively took part in the literary discussions which Rāma Simha attended. Perhaps in these discussions it was evident to the Mahārāja that Harījvana Miśra had a particularly keen sense of humour and therefore Rāma Simha encouraged him to compose prahasanās which could be staged in the palace.

ADHBHUTARĀNGA

In writing the Ādhibhutaraṅga, Harījvana Miśra does not seem to have felt the influence of any previous writers of prahasanās. The play is unique in that, instead of being a one-act comedy-farcce, it is actually a three-act piece in which each act comprises a different prahasanā. Unity of time and place are maintained, and each act corresponds to a division of day so that the third act ends with the arrival of dawn. The common factor is that the plot of each act unfolds in a royal court. We get the impression that the author witnessed himself the action of each prahasanā, and that by emphasizing the caricatural side of his personages, by exaggerating their characteristics, he has produced a series of scenes which were easy to amalgamate. The three acts are quite unequal in interest, in literary merit and in humour. In each one an amazing thing (adbhuta) occurs, and hence the title Ādhibhutaraṅga, the waves of marvel. The text of the first act is better preserved than that of the others. The second act concerns the activities of some low characters, including a drunkard, who have gained entrance into the court. The third act is merely a satire on the behaviour of vaishnava ascetics. What begins as a simple religious ceremony, the vaishnavadīkṣā, ends in a free-for-all. Who should perform the ceremony and how, is the occasion for a great dispute and it is settled only by coarse slapstick. The first act is sufficiently interesting to be described in detail.

Gauḍharasa Miśra, a vaishnava brāhmaṇa, enters the court of King Madanānāgavikrama. Hypocritically he blesses the king although he knows that the latter had ruined his father. The king, expecting a ceremonious salutation instead of a blessing rebukes him and threatens punishment. Who will pronounce the proper punishment? It must be a brahman well-versed in dharma śāstra. The king has his door keepers summon Viḍvāv-viḍhvamsaka. He turns out to be more of a hypocrite than Gauḍharasa Miśra. The description of him attests to this:

---

He is to be punished too, and his punishment is the same as that of Gaudharasa Miśra. In the course of the conversation, Yamānuja admits that he is not experienced enough to perform this kind of penance, and he suggests that a prostitute named Rāmārcanacandrikā be brought as a guru. Just as he says this, one of the door-keepers enters to say that she is waiting at the door. She is permitted to enter. Meanwhile, the Vidūṣaka named Jambhaka is asked to prepare the bed-room. To carry out the punishment, the wife of Vidhavāvidhvamsaka is summoned, but it is Jambhaka who enters disguised as her. At the same moment a poor brahman, Mithyākūṭa Bhaṭṭa, who is as incompetent as the others; enters the court. He turns out to be the former lover of Vidhavāvidhvamsaka’s wife. Immediately Jambhaka embraces him in a peculiar manner and of course he is astonished, although he somehow suspects that it is Jambhaka after all. He does not reveal this in his willingness to go along with the masquerade. Yamānuja and Jambhaka enter the bed-room and it is there that the former discovers the true identity of the one he thought to be Vidhavāvidhvamsaka’s wife. The king surmises that Jambhaka had gone out and had returned disguised as Vidhavāvidhvamsaka’s wife. To be sure of this, the king asks his door-keeper to summon Jambhaka, but the door-keeper only smiles and remains silent. It is at this point that the king understands how well punished his incompetent physician really was; for him this is the adbhuta, the amazing thing.

PRĀSAṄGIKA

On the basis of the experience he had gained in writing the Adbhutatarāṇga, Harījīvana Miśra then undertook the composition of his second prahāsana, the Prāsaṅgika. Once again the scene is the royal court, which as the action develops, is gradually changed from a court of justice into a menagerie. The characteristics of a standard comedy-farce are found in the Prāsaṅgika. The most notable one is

Varmācchāḍita-vigrahaḥ pratipadam vyāghātayān paksīnaḥ kvāpi kvāpi ca sāraneya-sīṣūbhī samkrīḍane taparāh | mihyācāroparāyano bahuvidham jalpan sadācāratām svāmini eva vibodhyayā smṛtipathāḥ vyāmohanaṃ panditāh ||

"He is a pandit dressed in armour, hitting birds at every step, playing here and there with puppy dogs, doing religious things in a hypocritical manner, speaking always of good conduct and creating confusion in the manner of explaining the smṛtis."

The king asks him what is the punishment prescribed in the smṛti of Yājñavalkya. He replies that anyone who pronounces punishment without citing the authority of the śāstras is a killer of brahmans. After consulting a śāstra he says that since he, suffering from piles, cannot satisfy his own wife, Gaudharasa Miśra, a healthier man, will have to replace him "in the altar of the fire of Kāma" (kāmāṅgikṣudra) as his punishment. The king becomes angry upon learning that the royal physician Yamānuja (a name meaning 'the younger brother of the God of death') did not cure the suffering of Vidhavāvidhvamsaka and he has his door-keepers summon him. When the physician arrives, his medical accomplishments are described in these terms:

Lokā mūḍhadiyo vimūḍhavacasi prāmāṇyam evamvidham krtvā dīnajanam gatārtham api tam saṁjñīvayanty eva hi | asmākam tu paramparārjitaṃ idam sarvasvarūpam phalam dṛśmāraṇaṁ vibūktim eva karavāṅyevanvidham niścitam ||

"Foolish people believe the words of other foolish people, taking them as authoritative, and thus they save suffering people, but this is the most precious fruit which is handed down in my family: I, to be sure, give salvation (i.e., death) to people by simply looking at them."
the use of word-play, in this case, a comic alliteration. One of the characters insists upon using in his long, involved sentences only words beginning with pra and the effect of this on the audience, even if they knew little Sanskrit can well be imagined.

After the usual type of prastāvanā the play begins with the entrance into the royal court of king Pratāpapañkita, who is accompanied by his Vidūśaka, Preraka. The king informs Preraka that his mind to-day is interested only in learned discussions with the court pandits and he wishes them to be called. "But am I not a pandit?" asks the Vidūśaka. The king dismisses his question saying that there will be a discussion of Vedas and Sāstras. "But aren't the Vedas known to me" asks the Vidūśaka and immediately he begins to recite some verses, indicating the tones with his fingers. The king becomes annoyed with his silly actions and orders him to stop the recitation. At this moment the door-keeper enters to say that Kerala Bhaṭṭa and Prakṛṣṭadeva and his wife are standing at the door. As soon as they enter Kerala Bhaṭṭa blesses the king. Prakṛṣṭadeva objects to what was said, for the words of Kerala Bhaṭṭa, according to him, are defective words (prahīna - vacana), because they lack pra (prahīna - vacana, words without pra). For Prakṛṣṭadeva, every word must begin with pra and with this his wife agrees in the following dialogue:

Prakṛṣṭadeva-re, re, preta, tavaitaih prahīnavacanairme prāṇāṁ pramaṇāḥḥ | yato hi prakṛṣṭārtham vihāya kim anyat prayaojayasi prasabham |

"Oh, oh, you dead soul! With these low words of yours, (defective without pra) my life-breaths are stifled, because you, lacking the important thing (i.e., words with pra), use forcibly something else."

Prakṛṣṭipriyā (vihasya)-pṛāyō sti prayaojanam pratārakasyāya svāma praharaṇarāpam |

"[laughingly] - Probably this best of deceivers has some purpose for this, which is getting blows for himself from us."

Thereupon they attack Kerala Bhaṭṭa with blows. The king, seeing this, exclaims: "What is this! What is this!" Prakṛṣṭadeva insists that Kerala Bhaṭṭa be punished for not using words beginning with pra for pra means the best. Kerala Bhaṭṭa replies that such words are disagreeable to his ears. Prakṛṣṭadeva then insists that the king use pra also. The king naively says: "No doubt all should use pra which means the best, and it exhibits one's learning." His sentences are then full of words beginning with pra and in delight Prakṛṣṭadeva exclaims: "Prāṇjalam, prāṇjalam," which is then echoed by his wife. Kerala Bhaṭṭa then realizes that he is caught in the company of foolish rogues, and in order to please the king he must say prāṇjalam, prāṇjalam, but when he tries to say it, out comes sādhū, sādhū. Prakṛṣṭadeva gets angry and tries to force him to use prāṇjalam, prāṇjalam, but Kerala Bhaṭṭa refuses. This entire scene, which was supposed to be largely a learned discussion of Vedas and Sāstras, has become a silly and petty quarrel—and we are set to wonder how much truth Harijiśa Miśra has brought forth in his clever satire of the erudite discussions of court pandits.

While the quarrel continues, the door-keeper enters to announce that some people from Kerala have come to seek justice and they are waiting at the door. The king permits them to enter. Yonīmaṇḍarī, holding in her arms her young son, is accompanied by her husband Vyaṇjanamukha and Bhaṭṭamārā, her former lover. The dispute concerns the true parentage of the child. They present their case to the king. In the course of their conversation a monkey enters the room and attacks Prakṛṣṭipriyā, throwing her on the floor and
untiring the knot of her sari. The king, upon seeing this, orders the Vidiṣṭaka to catch the monkey. The Vidiṣṭaka hesitates, saying that under the circumstances it is dangerous to interfere. When his wife is finally released by the monkey, Prakṛṭadeva exclaims, with good reason: "Oh beloved one! May nothing inauspicious happen to you!" Then just as Vyaṇjānamukha takes a big stone to hit the monkey, the latter gets caught in the braid of the hair of Yonimañjarī, and they struggle together to get released. The Vidiṣṭaka brings a piece of burning wood and waves it in front of the monkey. Yonimañjarī and the monkey go round and round and it is only when the ribbon of her hair gets burnt that the monkey is freed. The monkey then runs away and the Vidiṣṭaka is fast in its pursuit. After all this disturbance and confusion, Prakṛṭadeva suggests to his wife that they leave the court. Bhaṭṭāṃśa takes the suggestion also, and he prepares to leave with the child, but the Vidiṣṭaka, who has just returned, detains him and tells the child to call him father which he does. Thereupon Vyaṇjānamukha and his wife feel very sad, for they are aware of the confusion of the child. A sudden uproar indicates that the monkey has entered the harem, and this delights the king who says that the important thing is to catch the monkey. Both he and the Vidiṣṭaka follow the monkey into the harem, and the play ends with the exit of all those whom they left behind.

Inspite of manuscript which is full of incorrect Sanskrit, many scribal errors and substandard Prakrit, it is possible to understand at least seventy-five percent of the text. The Prakrit which is spoken by Yonimañjarī is similar to the Prakrit of the other prāhasanas of Harijīvā Miśra in that it is one which has been invented by the author, since in the seventeenth century the standard theatrical Prakrits were no longer in use. Harijīvā Miśra’s Prakrit is close enough to Sanskrit so that a contemporary audience could follow it without difficulty. It is unfortunate that we do not have additional manuscripts of the Prāsaṅgika which would enable us to edit critically the text. Notwithstanding very few objectionable references, that is by comparison with other late prāhasanas, the Prāsaṅgika is highly humorous and fast moving and in its well-constructed plot it is a decided improvement over the three farces of the Adbhutaśātāṅga.

Among the comedy-farcés of Harijīvā Miśra the only one which lends itself to a critical edition is assuredly the Paṭāṇḍuṣaṅgana for there are at least three manuscripts6 of this prāhasana and a comparative textual study of them can result in a satisfactory text.7 The Paṭāṇḍuṣaṅgana is decidedly the comic masterpiece of Harijīvā Miśra and it demonstrates beyond a question his talent as a composer of comedy-farcés. The other plays which he composed later, although he calls them prāhasanas, are not characterised by those traits which we normally associate with prāhasanas. They lack the comic elements which we would expect to find in a prāhasana. The Vibudhamohana and the Sahālayāṇanda represent the culmination of the dramatic art of Harijīvā Miśra; they are works in which he puts into practice his own specialised knowledge of alamkāra sāstra, demonstrating his skill in theory rather than in practical stage technique. Relatively devoid of action, they seem to be exercised in erudition by means of which the author wishes to show his superior knowledge of the tenets of alamkāra sāstra. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that they are the last of his dramatic productions, composed sometime after his longer plays, the Vijayapārijāta and Prabhāvalī. About these nātīkās I am

6 Besides the Bikaner manuscript, there is another one in the India Office Library, London: cf. Keith’s Catalogue, II, p.1226. There is a third manuscript in the private library of the Maharaja of Jaipur.

unlable to speak at the present time. The only manuscripts are located in the private library of the Maharaja of Jaipur. Some day it may be possible to obtain copies of them, and then a study may be undertaken on the entire theatre of Harijivana Miśra. That study may reveal that Harijivana Miśra is the last of the good Sanskrit dramatists, that he continued in his own way the time-honoured tradition of the classical Sanskrit theatre, and finally that he does not deserve the oblivion into which he has fallen.

PALĀṆḌŪMANḌĀNA

The Palāṇḍūmanḍāna-prahasana derives its name from one of the characters, a brahman who loves onions. Most of the characters have names which indicate their preferences for different types of foods, so that this comedy-farce immediately reveals itself as a satire on the eating habits of brahmans from different regions of India. The action, and there is much of it, takes place in the home of Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa on the occasion of the celebrations of the garbhādhāna of his second wife Cīca. After a prastāvanā in which the sūtradhāra announces the praahasana and urges the nāṇī to prepare for the arrival of the guests, the comedy begins with the entrance of Prajāpatideva who foretells of the arrival of Palāṇḍūmanḍāna and the others. Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa’s sister Kvathiṅka asks about the health of his daughter Raktamūlikā, and her mother Purṇapoliṅka indicates that she is in love with her cousin Gṛijanāḍri, the son of Kvathiṅka and Tryambaka Bhaṭṭa. They assure her that he also is in love with Raktamūlikā, but any thought of their marriage would disappoint Laśuna Panta, an old man who expects to marry her. Just as they are discussing this, Laśuna Panta enters and what follows immediately is a delightfully funny discussion of the marriage of Raktamūlikā. The women are only interested in his wealth and in the fact that, with his love for laśuna (garlic), he has not long to live. In this, one of the truly humorous scenes of the play, much discussion is made about dowries and money settlements and finally poor old Laśuna Panta has a gastro-intestinal attack. A variety of medicines is suggested; most of them are herbs and vegetable roots which have no place in a religious ceremony. Each character produces effortlessly his favourite edible and the whole room becomes cluttered up with articles which belong to a kitchen. In free flowing poetical stanzas each of the guests defends the foodstuff which is sure to revive Laśuna Panta. At last the old man is restored at about the time of the arrival of the Bengali brahmans, Bhaṭṭācārya and his pupils. As Bhaṭṭācārya enters the house, he closes his nostrils for he cannot tolerate the smell of onions. The South Indian brahmans, led by Palāṇḍūmanḍāna, say that they cannot stand the smell of rotten fish, the kind that Bengalis eat. Bhaṭṭācārya assures them that fish is not prohibited in the śāstras, but they shout in unison that that refers to the other yugas, not to the kaliyuga. They immediately engage in a heated argument, disagreeing violently with each other. Jagadiśa, one of the South Indians, slips out of the house and calls the police. By stratagem he convinces the police that Bhaṭṭācārya is in the wrong. The police enter the house and accuse Bhaṭṭācārya and his pupils of having defiled a religious ceremony when they see stewed about the room all kinds of harsh-smelling vegetables. They arrest the Bengalis and take them away. The South Indians shake hands with each other and congratulate Jagadiśa who did such a clever turn by summoning the police. The garbhādhāna has to be postponed, according to Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa because of all the confusion. The comedy ends with the departure of the guests.

The Palāṇḍūmanḍāna is the last truly comic play which Harijivana Miśra produced. In it are found some of the characteristics of his earlier comedies, especially that of antithesis. A serious religious ceremony, the garbhādhāna, is turned into a brawl, just as in the Prāśāṅgika what began as a discussion of court pandits becomes, with the entrance of the monkey, a kind of lewd
circus; as in the first and third acts of the Abhutataranga, the final scenes of the Palandumandana are coarse and slapstick, against the serenity of the beginning of the play. Certain themes of standard farces are found in all of these prahasanas of Harijivana Misra. The change of sex motif (Jambhaka disguised as a woman), the difference of age motif (Lasuna Panta is to marry Raktanilka), the animal as lover motif (the monkey seduces Prakritipriya)—all these are utilised by Harijivana Misra in order to obtain the maximum comic effect. That he was successful in producing some fine humorous plays cannot be denied. That he knew what would be a good subject for satire and that he knew how to satirise skilfully cannot be denied either. His satire on hypocrites and medical quacks may not be as detailed and as ruthless as that of his contemporary in France, Moliere, but for his similarly sophisticated audience it was equally as effective.

VIBUDHAMOHANA

In my discussion of the prahasanas of Harijivana Misra, I have purposely omitted a summary of the Vibudhamohana until now, for as I have said previously the Vibudhamohana is not strictly speaking a prahansa. However, the play is of sufficient interest for me to discuss it briefly: The scene once again is a royal court and what takes place in the play could easily have been witnessed by Harijivana Misra. The piece begins in medias res, without the nandi and the prastava which are usually present to introduce the play; they do not come until later. Puspakalika, daughter of a retired pandit Sakalagamacarya, visits the palace of king Pratapa Martanda and she rejoices at the sight of its beauty. In her admiration she cites, among others, two verses, one from Harshas Ratnavali and the other from Bhavabhuti's Maalai-Madhava. She sees the king and falls at his feet. Then she displays before him her learning in courteous behaviour, quoting authorities for each of her actions. She leaves the stage and later returns to recite the nandi-stanza before the entrance of the sutradhara. The sutradhara says that Sakalagamacarya has left the burden of his household on his sons, each of whom is specialising in his own branch of stasras. His daughter Sahityamala is to be married to Akhandananda, but the marriage and the maintenance of the family will not be possible without the efforts of his sons to secure by reason of their knowledge the favour of the king. The father urges his sons to go to the royal court for at this moment the king wishes to engage in a discussion with his pandits. When they finally appear before the king, each one pronounces in favour of his own stasra, but in the end it is Akhandananda who fascinates all present by his knowledge of poetics. The king agrees to grant him all favours, but he wants neither silver, nor gold nor an elephant; he wants only Sahityamala, for she has stolen his heart. The brothers are at first rejected, but then the king assures them of enough money so that the family will be maintained and Sahityamala may be given in marriage.

Harijivana Misra demonstrates with much ability his knowledge of all the stasras, especially alarka stasra, and once again plays on the names of his characters; each one of the brothers has a first name which indicates his special branch of knowledge (Tarkakarika, Patanjalanlha, Vaiseshikabhaatjacarya, Bhatramimamsa, Paarcaratrika, etc.). Unfortunately the present state of the manuscript, the only one we possess, does not permit a detailed study of the play and at this moment it is not possible to state in any definitive way the purpose for which Harijivana Misra composed it. One may even doubt whether it was written for a court performance.

What I have said about it, in a general and superficial way, may also be said about the Sahrdgayananda. But let us hear from Prof. Raghavan about this play.
As in the Vibudhamohana, in the Sahīdayānanda (Sā), Harijīvana Miṣra takes up a literary theme and turns it into a short play. In the Sā, the ideas of Sanskrit poetics, Alākārā Sāstra, are made into characters and a farce is built on them. Prakṛt is used, following the ancient convention, for women and lower characters and as there is only one manuscript and that badly preserved, it has been difficult to present a more detailed account of the play than what is now given. It requires a close acquaintance with the concepts of Sanskrit poetics to interpret the farce.

Even as he enters, the Sūradhārā has a fling at Alāṅkārikas, literary critics, who have been hoodwinking the learned assembly. He refers to an altogether new kind of Nāyikā or heroine (Vilakṣaṇa Nāyikā); this Nāyikā is Vyāñjanā or suggestion who manifests śṛṅgāra and other Rasas; she is referred to as Vi-lakṣaṇā with a pun, meaning that Vyāñjanā is beyond Lakṣaṇā or secondary signifiicator capacity. Critics however consider Vyāñjanā to be merely a name, i.e. not existing in reality. Now from behind the curtain is heard an approbatory exclamation and the Sūradhārā identifies it as of Kamalapāni. Exit Sūradhārā and Prastāvāṇa ends.

Enter Kamalapāni exclaiming that rhetoricians, with their talk of Nāyaakas (heroes) and Nāyikās (heroines), have duped the world like other religious frauds. The assembly he enters is called Kāmamugdha (innocent of love). He refers to the undesirable Alāṅkārikas, devoid of knowledge of the constituents of Rasa and their friend, the Vidūṣaka, clown, named Paḥkajavadana (the Lotus-faced), and their impending entry. Now is heard a voice from behind the curtain praising the heroine.

The Nāyikā is described as Brahmānanda-janani (the producer of ineffable bliss) which by śleṣa refers also to Rasa-Vyāñjanā.

The audience live by her grace. The audience are described as Parama-rasikas (great persons of taste).

There is now some voice from behind and Kamalapāni departs.

Enter Vidūṣaka along with Ālaṅkārikas who are accompanied by their Nāyikās - Abhidhā (the primary signifiicator capacity), Lakṣaṇā (the secondary capacity) and Vyāñjanā (suggestion). These three are characterised in terms of the three well-known types of Nāyikās, as Śvīya, Paramā and Śāmānyā.

As the expressed sense is something closely related to the word and strictly confined to its own meaning, Abhidhā is aptly likened to Śvīya and Pativrata. What type of Nāyikā Lakṣaṇā is likened to is not immediately clear as, for a time, we hear only of the variety of Lakṣaṇā called Nirūdhala- lakṣaṇā; but much later, Lakṣaṇā is mentioned as the ‘Vāra-vaḍhā’, and is therefore to be taken as the Śāmānyā Nāyikā, the courtezan. The aptness is reinforced by describing her as fond of arthālaṅkāras (meaning also money and ornaments); and indeed Lakṣaṇā or metaphorical usage is at the basis of very many figures of speech ; and although fascinated by the Parāśā (Vyāñjanā) the Ālaṅkārika has some inclinations towards the courtezan of alaṅkāras, i.e. Lakṣaṇā. Abhidhā bemoans to her Četi, the Nirūdhala- lakṣaṇā, that her lover (the Ālaṅkārika) is going after the Vāra-vaḍhā of Lakṣaṇā because of his taste for figures:

Abhidhā-(Śvārtham i va Ālaṅkārikam anvesayaṇi samantaśdavalokeya): Nirūdhala- lakṣaṇē! mama priyo arthālaṅkāraramaṇi vāra-vadhām lakṣaṇāṁ anusāret iti turkayāmi |
Vyañjana is represented as Parākhyā, as she transcends the restrictions pertaining to Abhidhā and sets the latter aside and has a peculiar over-riding fascination for the Ālaṅkārika. Consequent on this, Abhidhā the Pativrata is in separation and is suffering. Nirūḍha-lakṣaṇa says:

Bho bho, Vyañjana-parakhyāsakta-ālaṅkārikaḥ, kim kriyate. Viṣamaḥ khalu kāmaḥ. Tat etena carnadandena paramapavitvraṭāyāḥ. . . . . . . abhidhāyāḥ virahasantiṣ apahartum..

Nirūḍha-lakṣaṇa, the variety of Lakṣaṇa in which a word although based on transfer becomes, by usage, restricted in a fixed sense, is introduced aptly as a Ceṣi or Dāsī, hand-maid, of Abhidhā, and the aptness may be appreciated when one recalls the nature of the Nirūḍha-lakṣaṇa which is tantamount to Abhidhā: Nirūḍhā lakṣaṇaḥ kacit sāmarthyād abhidhānavat. The play itself refers to the dictum of Rūḍhi, long fixed usage, taking away the Yoga or the specific basis of the application. From the point of view of the farce, we may note that Nirūḍha-lakṣaṇa comes along with the Vidiṣaka, talks with him although in Prakrt and carries with her a strap or stick of leather. This last is a thing which is carried by one of the characters in the vernacular folk-plays and with which he or she strikes the other actor off and on. This ‘slap-stick’ is part of the features of the farce. As the two are making some observations against the Ālaṅkārika and are also afraid that the latter might overhear their talk, the latter makes his appearance, exclaiming that Sāhiya is the essence of learning and Vyañjana is the essence of Sāhiya and the source of joy. The Ceṣi, Nirūḍha-lakṣaṇa, observes that the Ālaṅkārika has gone after the Paraśīyā lady called Vyañjana and his own Pativrata, the chaste wedded wife viz. Abhidhā, is undergoing the pangs of separation.

The Ālaṅkārika now addresses his beloved Vyañjana, recites a verse suggestive of the season of rains and Vyañjana purposefully points to Abhidhā. The Ālaṅkārika makes here references to Rūḍhi supplanting Yoga and to Tālparyārtha, Sāmānyā-lakṣaṇā, Phala and Vyañjana.

For the first time now, Abhidhā, addresses her Dāsī (or Ceṣi) viz. Nirūḍha-lakṣaṇa and says that she is afraid that her lord Ālaṅkārika is going after the courtezan (Vāra-vadhū) Lakṣaṇā. There is then a round of dispute among Abhidhā and Nirūḍha-lakṣaṇa on one hand and the Ālaṅkārika and Vyañjana on the other. The Vidiṣaka and the Dāsī Nirūḍha-lakṣaṇa exchange some horse-play and there is a reference to Śrīgāraasa becoming degraded (ābhāsa) to Bīhatsa. There is also a reference to the crooked walking stick of the Vidiṣaka (kuṭilaka-danda) which Abhidhā compares to the poetic prose (daṇḍaka) with inapt alliteration (vilakṣaṇānuprāsa).

Now a general tumult is heard from the streets and it is reported that a procession is coming of two asses each carrying a pair of men with shaven heads and a pair of women being stoned by street urchins. All of them propose to have a look at the asses. But Abhidhā alone does not want to stir and Vyañjana remarks that such an exemplary Pativrata like Abhidhā is rare to find and she does not want to look at anybody else, para-puruṣa. Here ends Act I.

Act II opens with a washerwoman with a rope, weeping and striking her breasts. Horse-play or, to be more precise ass-play, now starts. The washerwoman addresses her beloved, the washerman. They have lost their ass. A brahmacārin named Dīkṣādanda arrives on the ass; the washerwoman asks him how he got the ass. The brahmacārin hits her down and asks her to wash his dhoti immediately and is about to undress. The washerman rushes with his
club on seeing two persons on an ass. Dikṣādana, the brahmācarin and another mendicant, Naśṭhikānanda, and the exchange between them and his wife; he flings his club at them, taking their ass to be his own missing one. He then decides to report to the Kotwal the loss of his ass, when he sees on another ass a pair of ladies, one of them in maledress, and the two hugging each other.

The Kotwal arrives on his own ass and surrounded by his retinue. He sends for the judge, Dharmādhikārīn, to make an enquiry.

Enter Dharmādhikārīn, he being called Rasa-pratibandhaka, the impediment to Rasa-realisation with two pupils of his, named Vākyārthaparihṛṣṭa and Gunāpakara, i.e. inconclusive or uncertain import and the absence of guṇas as appropriate to the context i.e. doṣa or literary flaws. Both of them are known to be hindrances to the understanding of a piece of expression (Abhidheya-artha-pratibandhaka). The symbolism, from the side of poetics, could be easily understood. In the further dialogues of the teacher and the two pupils, Guṇas like Ojas, Prasāda and Mādhurya and Doṣas like Śruti-kaṭu figure. The Kotwal now enlightens us that it was at the behest of the Dharmādhikārīn that he had sent round the city the two pairs on asses for the sake of making public their guilt and now asks the Dharmādhikārīn what final punishment is to be meted out to them. The Dharmādhikārīn, Rasa-pratibandhaka declares that not only these, but all those who consider themselves sahṛdayas and are eager to enjoy rasa should be sent round on ass-back.

The pupil Vākyārthaparihṛṣṭa represents that according to the theorist Lollatā, Rasa is in the actor too and therefore, there is not much point in punishing spectators of drama with ass-ride. Dharmādhikārīn now calls Vyāñjana characterising her as a debaucherous woman, and orders that she must first be punished. Vyāñjana protests that without Abhidhā, she was nothing (or makes no sense): abhidhāyāḥ sambandham vinā aham nirarthāḥ. Behind the curtain, Abhidhā and Laksana overhear this. Abhidhā remarks that Vyāñjana has ruined her Vṛti (profession as well as significatory capacity). Laksana asks her not to raise her voice as Dharmādhikārīn might seize them both. Along with the crowd of people like Śruti-kaṭu the Doṣa, they keep looking on.

It is suggested by the Kotwal that the Dharmādhikārīn Rasa-pratibandhaka may himself be punished with a clean shave of the head. Dharmādhikārīn looks nonplussed, at his two Śīyas.

At this point, pushing the crowd aside, the Ālaṅkārika enters, calling forth Vyāñjana as the very life of those immersed in rasa:

Ayi vyāñjane! tvam sahṛdayopajīyasi…………….rasarāṣau nimbajamānānāṁ vyāñjana jītyate.

Vyāñjana says that she suspects Rasa-pratibandhaka was really a foreigner (Dvīpāntariya). Ālaṅkārika agrees and says that as Rasa-pratibandhaka ordered that everybody should be sent round on ass-back, he, Rasa-pratibandhaka, is the first to deserve that honour. Everybody, including the Kotwal, is happy and they jump. Smarting at this, Rasa-pratibandhaka wants to tear the book in his hand to pieces.

The situation which is critical for Rasa-pratibandhaka is suddenly relieved by the announcement of a woman-fiend, a Dākini called Vyāñjananālā. We have to be brief about the nature and make-up of this character, as they are obscene, Vyāñjana here meaning the sexual index. Obviously the inventive skill of the poet had failed him here. What he wanted to represent symbolically is perhaps the
concept of vulgarity and openness, the flaws of Astāla and Aşıūtha which are inimical to Rasa and Vyāñjaṇā. For this, he introduces this Dākinī in obscene make-up. She is Rasapratibhāka’s eldest wife, Jyeṣṭha-patrī. The two embrace and indulge in merriment, losing their garments. Vyāñjanamālā has evidently an attendant called Pātakapoṣikā, daughter of sin. The whole sequence is full of badly preserved Prakrt dialogues.

Two other lady characters are now introduced as seated upon a tree. One is Vākyasphoṭikā and another, Smṛti-vibhramā, their names being quite clear about the ideas they stand for. They get down from the tree, mount rams (meṣa) and come round to meet Vyāñjanamālā. A ram-fight follows. The hubbub and the noise are called off by the announcement that king Rāma Singh, the poet’s patron, had returned from his hunt. The Dākinīs disappear and the Bharatavākyā is pronounced.

PALĀṆḌUMANĀṆANA - SYNOPSIS

The whole action of the play is enacted in a hall within a house where arrangements are afoot for conducting the religious ceremony of garbhādhāna. The priests and other brahmins gather for the ceremony and the feasting. The food habits of these Pandits from different parts of India, Maharashtra, Andhra, Bengal and other parts of the north are used as a means of making fun, particularly their desire to taste articles of food like onion, garlic and others which are prohibited by the Śāstras but which they consume stealthily. The poet works in also an additional episode of the fixing up, for the sake of large money, the marriage of a young girl with a wealthy old kinsman. The characters are mostly named after the vegetables and dishes which they are fond of.

Prajāpati Deva, the Purohita enters the marriage hall where the religious ceremony has to be conducted for the husband and wife, Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa and Cīṛcā. He finds that the guest-brahmins Palāṇḍumāṇana etc. are turning away from the place and looks out for the reason; the brothers-in-law Tryambaka Bhaṭṭa and Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa are discussing the marriage alliance of their children and the guest-pandits who had come to attend the religious function and participate in the feast were hence leaving. He wants to go and fetch them back. The auspicious time for the religious function (garbhādhāna) arrives and he wants that the feasting of the brahmins should be gone through quickly. He would now go out to fetch Peram Bhaṭṭa and Kavakāṅkurācārya who are to join the function.

Enter the husband and wife, Liṅgoji and Cīṛcā. Enter also the elder pair Tryambaka Bhaṭṭa and Kvathikā. While Liṅgoji is enquiring about the delay in the arrival of the brahmins, Kvathikā asks her
brother's wife Ciṅcā about the welfare of Raktamūlikā, daughter of her brother Liṅgoji's first wife Pūṇapopikā. Ciṅcā enquires of the welfare of the Kvathikā's son, Grīñjanādri. It transpires from their talk that Raktamūlikā and Grīñjanādri are in love with each other.

While all the elders talk as if they are favourable to this marriage alliance, Liṅgoji's first wife Pūṇapopikā raises the difficulty that Laṅsuna Panta being the elder brother of Grīñjanādri, passing him over and marrying the younger would kill the elder. In reply it is said that the elder had become too old for marriage. They are all therefore finally agreed and happy about the marriage of Grīñjanādri and Raktamūlikā.

Now enters Laṅsuna Panta, elder brother of Grīñjanādri, and an invalid. He too is desirous of marrying Raktamūlikā and says that Grīñjanādri, his younger brother can wait. Pūṇapopikā is first afraid of the old Laṅsuna Panta's plan to marry Raktamūlikā. Kvathikā however thinks that if the old Laṅsuna Panta would offer a large sum of money, the marriage could be fixed. This tempts Liṅgoji and Ciṅcā and Laṅsuna is not only prepared to give a large sum of cash but also to make over some lands where he was growing garlic etc. Everybody, on the male and female side, decides to give Raktamūlikā to Laṅsuna Panta.

Enter young Grīñjanādri. Liṅgoji, to put him off the track of marriage, turns to the feasting of the brahmins which has been arranged for. Behind the curtain is heard the call of the different persons who had come for the feast.

Enter Palāṇḍumaṇḍana, Cittapāvana and others. Palāṇḍu displays abhorrence of the Cittapāvana. The latter lets out the secret of the former eating onions etc. Lest each one should expose the other, they become friends. The conversation now turns on the comparative excellence of onion and garlic among the respective adherents, each praising his own favourite.

Enter Prajāpati Deva to hasten the feasting. Ciṅcā observes that there will be some delay as onion, garlic etc. have to be added to the dishes. But in the meantime Prajāpati Deva says he would arrange the leaves for the feast and does it.

Behind the curtain is heard the voice extolling the smell of onion and garlic which, while driving away the Northerners has invited the Deccanis. Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa observes and describes the brahmins of the feast. Ciṅcā now asks the other ladies to serve the food. One of the ladies had a lot of garlic tied up at her lap which now falls down.

Enter Raktamūlikā casting her eyes on Laṅsuna Panta. In his great joy Laṅsuna Panta tries to laugh but getting a spasm falls down in a swoon. Each one suggests and tries some remedy favourite to him, to infuse some energy into Laṅsuna Panta and help him to regain consciousness-the juice of onions, garlic, kaṭṭi juice of Raktamūlikā and tamarind, Miṭṭhākūṭa (tamarind-milk with vendayam etc.). This last one brought by Miṭṭhākūṭa Bhaṭṭa really revives him and Laṅsuna Panta is announced as saved from death. Everybody praises the efficacy of the Miṭṭhākūṭa fluid. But the moment Laṅsuna Panta regains consciousness he stretches out his hand for his favourite bag of garlic as an antidote for his biliousness. His younger brother says that pitta (bile) can be counteracted only by something sweet and suggests the juice of his own Grīñja. The brothers exchange for a while eulogies of Laṅsuna and Grīñja. Liṅgoji and others are glad that the rich, old
son-in-law is revived and Raktamalikâ's marriage as well as property have been secured. Peram Bhaṭṭa, the Purohita for the religious ceremony of Liṅgoji and Ciṅcâ already arranged for, arrives now with the necessary things. He is afraid that the fine smell of onion and garlic and the wafting of the breeze of their peelings would collect too much of a crowd. He arranges things for the ceremony. Ciṅcâ and Liṅgoji sit down for the same and in the same fire where the religious rite is to be done, Liṅgoji inhales the smoke of his own favourite things like tobacco, Bhang etc. Pûṁnapolikâ is shocked at the profanation of the ceremony and snatches from Ciṅcâ's hand her favourite thing Lâksâmanâ which she was eating all the time.

Gṛiṇjanâḍri who has learnt that his marriage has been dropped and his old elder brother had been chosen, announces his resolve to commit suicide. One of the guests Kavakâṅkura prevents him from spoiling the occasion with the rash act. Kvathikâ is also upset that Gṛiṇjanâḍri would remain unmarried and finds fault with Pûṁnapolikâ for going back upon her word.

Mithyâkâṭa now observes that some Northerners were arriving; they do not like any of the dishes mentioned above and are generally highly critical of the local practices of the Deccanis.

Enter Bengali Bhâṭṭâcâryas Jhâlalâ-Jhâṅkâra, Bherî-bhâṅkâra etc with a pupil. The pupil is carrying for the Guru's diet fish which is three days old. They are anxious to find a kitchen to cook the fish. Unfortunately he has to face the Deccani Pandits who enter into the argument with him on the unorthodox character of fish-eating. The Bengali cites some texts in support of their habits. The Deccani decides to punish the Bengali.
DRAMATIS PERSONAE

The Characters in the order of their appearance

Prajapati Deva, a Pandit, master of the ceremony.
Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa, a Pandit.
Ciṅcā, second wife of Liṅgoji (Tamarind)
Tryambaka Bhaṭṭa, Brother-in-law of Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa (Cocoanut)
Kvathikā, Wife of Tryambaka. (Boiled fluid dish)
Pūṇāpolikā, first wife of Liṅgoji. (A kind of sweet cake, Poli)
Lauṇa Panta, elder son of Tryambaka and Kvathikā (Garlic)
Gṛiṇjanāḍri, younger brother of Lauṇa (Onion-small variety)
Palāṇḍumandana, a guest. (Onion-big variety)
Cittapāvana, another guest. Maharashtra Brahmān.
Raktamulikā, daughter of Pūṇāpolikā and Liṅgoji. (a red edible root)
Āraṇāla Bhaṭṭa, a guest. (Gruel)
Mithyākāṭa Bhaṭṭa, a guest. [a Maharashtrian Soup-Curdis mixed with ground rice, pulses, mustard and fenugreek (Vendayam)]
Dāksīṇāyaṇa-1, Deccani Pandit -1
Peram Bhaṭṭa, a Priest, an Andhra
Kalaṅkāṅkura, another Priest. (Mushroom)
Śīṣya, Pupil of above
Dāksīṇāyaṇa-2, Deccani Pandit -2
Puruṣa, Official.
Policemen. (Pathāṭayāḥ)
Other Brahman Pandits & Others.
Līṅgoṭa and Priest Peram Bhaṭṭa at the fire-place to perform the Garbhāḍāna ritual while the Southerners arrive to attend the function.

—Courtesy, Samskrita Ranga
PALÅNDUMANDANA PRAHASANA

OF

HARIJĪVANA MĪRA

Text Critically edited by

Dr. V. Raghavan

with

English Translation and Notes by

Dr. S.S. Janaki
Śiva who is the lord of the universe is glorious in all the worlds! He delights in many tastes and enjoys all kinds of food and drink. He rids (people of) evils in their worldly life and speaks to them about the discharge of duty, gratification of desire and acquiring wealth. He has earned abundant wealth and is the dear lord of Pārvatī. (1)

(At the end of the invocatory verse)

Stage Manager - Do not be prolix. Oh! It is the occasion for the performance of the impregnation-rite (Garbhaṅgtana) for the wife of Liṅgōjī Bhāṭṭa. In this function Palaṇḍu Mañḍana and other (guests) are feeling hungry as there is a discussion.

* The text edition of the play as printed in the Malayamārūta was prepared by Prof. V. Raghavan from its two mss, available at the Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner (No. 3163) and the India Office Library, London (No. 7409), the latter having better readings. Textual variants from these two mss. are given as found in Ṛṣ. (London ms.) and गृ (Bikaner ms.)

1. As is required in the texts on dramaturgy the Nāṇḍī verse highlights the two features in the play by describing Śiva as 'enjoying all types of food and drink' and also 'acquiring abundant wealth'. In the Prahasana also the author satirizes the eating habits of Pandits and their womenfolk in the different parts of India. The chief character Liṅgōjī Bhāṭṭa too, with the consent of his wife Pūpapūpā, receives large sums of money for fixing the marriage of their adolescent daughter Raktamūkī with their own nephew Laṣāna Panta, a sickly elderly fellow.

2. Bhakṣya-bhojyā-bhoktā. Bhakṣya and bhojya could generally mean any thing that is eatable. But in medival and other texts food is said to be of six types. They are — those that are to be sucked (cogyā) like sugar-cane, to be chewed (caroṣa) like flattened rice and chick-peas, to be sipped (lehyā) and drunk (peya); cooked soup and such other things are called 'bhojya' and 'bhakṣya' is sweet made of milk cream, laddu etc. cf. Sabdakalpadrumā.
regarding a marriage alliance. How would (these guests) confer blessings when their wishes are not fulfilled? Moreover, how could they pronounce the Vedic syllables correctly without inward satisfaction, while the North Indians are crafty and skilled in many ways? Hence let the strong feelings of the audience alone be fruitfull (In the air, smelling with delight) Oh, our wishes are about to be fulfilled by the strong smell of onions that suppresses all the others. (To himself.) Let it be so. I shall gather people after calling forth my wife. (Looking all round) Madam, here, here, please!

(Entering)

Actress Wife - My lord, tell me quickly. I am intent on some other work and I am busy.

Stage Manager - Lady, what is the type of work which hurries you like this?

Naṭī - My lord, today Palāṇḍu Maṇḍana and his party have been invited. For receiving them cordially I have smoked the house with incense and in the meanwhile have come over here. You can also go over there to receive them by waving the fringe of your upper cloth.

Sūtraa - Madam, have you spoilt the house by smoking it with dark aloe powder?

Naṭī (smiling) - Sir, don't you know that this is the smell of the big onions?

Sūtraa (smelling all round) - Well, well, Palāṇḍu Maṇḍana and others must be gratified now. Hence come along, we shall honour them cordially. Why cause delay?

1. भी. कतिपि 2. भी. चाहुः
3. भी. च. यक्षः
4. भी. चाहुः
5. भी. पलाण्डुः
6. भी. चाहुः
7. भी. आलोकः
8. भी. पलाण्डुः
9. भी. उपाधारः

3. Here and elsewhere (caturāra, note 9a), the author uses the term 'caturāra' as a synonym of 'catura' or 'caturaka' (clever) and not in its normal meaning of 'square'.

PALĀṇḌUMAṆḌANA
Palandu Maṇḍana and others, seeing the street filled with large quantities of scattered onion-peelings, are wandering about as they like to go to the house rich in big onions. Prajāpati Deva comes (here) to inform the same to Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa.

Sūtra⁹ (listening) - How is it that Palandu Maṇḍana and his party are puzzled? Where do they go? Come on, let us approach them.

(They both exit.)

Prologue

(Then enters Prajāpati Deva⁴.)

Prajāpati Deva - Where has Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa, the son of whore and of a paramour, king of wretched gone? For, Palandu Maṇḍana and his party, being angry, are going elsewhere. Oh! I do remember too well! Perchance Palandu Maṇḍana and other guest-pandits have turned away due to the (presence of) many leading kinsmen for discussing the marriage of the son and daughter of the brothers-in-law Tryambaka Bhaṭṭa and Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa. Let it be. I shall go myself and bring them.

(Behind the curtains, tumultuous noise)

All the lords of the ganyas and sun, the moon, the happy host of celestials, the group (of elements) - water, air, fire, ether and earth; of many precious gems and mantras, as also the brahmins conversant with perfected knowledge—let them confer blessings on you all!

4. It is noteworthy that the master of the Garbhāḍaṇā ceremony, Prajāpati Deva, is himself compared to the lowly mouse in the following off-stage announcement. He is also assigned menial jobs like bringing the priests, sacrificial vessels and leaf plates.
Prajā (listening to attentively) - Oh, the auspicious moment has arrived! Let the feeding of the brahmins and other things be done straightaway!

(Behind the curtains, with Vedic accent)

"There was a Prajāpati, the mouse. He had a pair of teeth. With each of its tooth it digs holes, breaks open the containers and swallows the offerings. The sacrificer (master) hits it when it makes the noise 'cum' 'cum'. The sacrificer is enabled (then) to reach the heavens. One who knows this — !"

Prajā (respectfully hearing) - Oh! the Vedic utterances! Have all the guests arrived? I too shall come here again taking the sacrificial copper vessel and bringing with me Peram Bhaṭṭa and Kalaṅkāṅkurācārya.

(Resuming his chair)

(Then enters accompanied by instrumental music, Cīrīc, holding the hand of Liṅgōji Bhaṭṭa. She has her limbs smeared with turmeric, is adorned with garlands and ornaments and is expertly wearing the pleated fringes tightly and in a special way. She is tastefully chewing the betel leaf and nuts. She has a strikingly auspicious bearing, is well dressed (or sweet-scented) and beaming with love. Enter also Kvathikā holding the hand of Tryambaka.)

Liṅgōji and Tryambaka Bhattas (folding their palms) - Our salutations! Why are the brahmins late in their arrival?

(The two sisters-in-law slyly look at each other.)

---

5. "A defamed person", 'Kalākha' could be also 'Kāvak' or 'Mushroom' which is prohibited to be eaten by brahmins in Manu Smṛti (V.5,19) along with onions and garlic. Herein Manu refers to mushroom as 'Chattikka' also.

5a. Married women in Karnataka and Maharashtra pleat nicely the cloth material in the front and insert it at the side or back of the hip.
Kvathikā (to her brother’s wife Ciṇcā) - Is Raktamūlīkā, the daughter of your co-wife Pūrṇapālikā, keeping well?

Ciṇcā - By your blessings she is all right. Now, is your son (Grīñjanādri) keeping well?

Kvathikā - Aye, day and night, the hearty fellow is thinking about the beauty of your daughter.

Ciṇcā (smiling) - In the same manner Raktamūlīkā also amuses herself by repeatedly recollecting the beauty of the hefty Grīñjanādri.

(They mutually clasp their hands.)

Liṅgoji Bhāṭṭa - Hey, hey, Tryambaka Bhāṭṭa! I am afraid of the statement in the Smṛtis that a man who gives away his adolescent daughter in marriage is not allowed to reach the heavens. I therefore want to arrange very soon for the marriage of my daughter Raktamūlīkā who is like fresh mango blossoms.
Tryambaka - You must have met with your nephew Griñjanaḍri.

Liṅgoji - Hey, Tryambaka, let it be. I shall ask my wife. (Looking at her) Pūrṇapoliṇḍa, here, here, please!

Pūrṇapoliṇḍa - What is it, respectable Liṅga?

Liṅgoji - My dear, the marriage of your daughter Raktamoliṇḍa with your nephew Griñjanaḍri, son of the affluent Tryambaka Bhaṭṭa, is being considered.

Pūrṇapoliṇḍa - Honourable sir, though this is a splendid idea, yet it is difficult because Laśuna Panta may meet with his death soon.

Liṅgoji - My dear, this is quite so. But still Griñjanaḍri is youthful. What is (the use of) that old man (i.e. Laśuna Panta)? Let there be first an oral agreement in connection with this marriage immediately.

Pūrṇapoliṇḍa - What doubt is there about this? (Looking all round) Hey, hey, Kvaṭhiṇa, this Raktamoliṇḍa is under your care.

Kvaṭhiṇa - I am really favoured. Is not Griñjanaḍri your boy?

Tryambaka (listening to, heartily) - Let there be oral agreement between the boy and the girl.

(While Kaḷaṅkonkura is yet to arrive, Laśuna Panta enters.)
Laśuna Panta - Hey, Hey, Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa, the breaker of others’ hopes, what do you gain by depriving me of the heavens? My only prop in life, since the birth of Raktamūlikā, is the desire to get at her hand. Grīhanāḍri is no doubt younger to me, and my own brother. He may entertain hopes about his life. Why are you in a hurry? Would you not be begetting a daughter after today’s Garbhādhāna with Cīcā?

Pūrṇapoliṇī (to herself) - This old man is mischievous towards my daughter. Be it so. I shall think about it.

Kvathikā - (to herself) - Laśuna Panta is old. The marriage is therefore possible only by money-power.

(Taking out golden coins, she displays them.)

Liṅgoji - Let there be matrimonial connection only with Laśuna Panta, owing to the large amount of wealth seen now. Enough of Grīhanāḍri, though youthful.

Cīcā - Hey, hey, you should stipulate exactly the amount!

Kvathikā - Aye, you would get gold equal to the weight of ten Karga. 6

Liṅgoji - The life span of living beings is not fixed. Hence, what is the use of only this amount of gold?

Palaṇḍumaṇḍana

1. Bh. Gaṭṭa; Ka. Paṭṭa (Parna)
2. Bh. L. Vaiṣyā
3. Bh. Karmendra
4. Tathā Gaṭṭaṃ Karmendraṃ Vaṃ. [Tathā Gaṭṭaṃ, Tathā Vaiṣyāṃ Tathā
   Karmendraṃ] Dvārdvi Paṭṭaṃ Vaṃ.

6. Karga is a weight of gold that is equal to 16 maṇḍas or about 180 grain troy. A coin of karga, weight is called ‘Kangana’.
Laśuna Panta (having heard it, happily to himself) - The marriage of a brother of Paśaṇḍu Maṇḍana more than 120 years, with Pindaṃśālīka, was accomplished only with money-power. (Aloud) Oh, Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa, does anyone nourished with garlic, meet with his death at all?

(So saying shows out as much gold as desired.)

Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa - For which purpose could this gold be used? Be it so.

Pūrṇapālīka (looking at the gold) - Ah, ah, son Laśuna Panta, this is quite proper. But then why don’t you offer now, some money be utilised for your crematory rites?

Laśuna Panta (thoughtfully) - If so, how could this land of mine, where garlic and onions are grown, be used? (Pointing out to his field) Woman, if such a thing would perhaps happen, then at this very field (kṣetra), let just a memorial sign (liṅga) be erected. The field is quite fertile. What else?

Pūrṇapālīka (looking at Liṅgoji) - Our purpose is accomplished. Let us have marital connection only with Laśuna Panta.

Liṅgoji Bhaṭṭa - I am also thinking in the same way.

(Then entering by a toss of the curtain)
**PALANIUMANJANA**

**Gṛjanādri** - Ah, a critic of those of helpful nature! Does not the ruler provide free food to widows? He, he, sir, how wonderful! How is it that those wearing a tight lower garment and pleated (upper cloth) on the shoulders, intimidated by men moving about, filling their clothes with remnants of food and eagerly drinking handfuls of water in free water - sheds, forget their regional modes of conduct at the mere sight of money?

**Liṅgojī** (to himself) - Here comes the thorn to stick into my side! Let it be. I shall dupe him. (Aloud) Hey, Hey, the time for performing Garbhadānā has arrived. Therefore let the dinner be quickly served for the invited brahmins!

(off-stage)

Hey, Hey, leader in pronouncing curses, shoot of calumny, mad dog, dog’s tail, the pet for the prostitutes, lover of guru’s wife and one’s own daughter-in-law, skilled lover of maid servants, lord of death, the undoor of friends, lord of broken trust, cheat of the whole world, thorn even to Nārāyaṇa, sharp-faced, chief of rascals, devourer of inedibles, all of you remain right there! Due to limited space inside, comfortable seating arrangement for dinner is to be made only in the street. The renowned Palanṣu Maṇḍana and a few others can go inside.

(Then enter Palanṣu Maṇḍana, Mithyākūṭa and some others)

**Palanṣu Maṇḍana** (looking around) - We never sat along with Cittāpavāna¹ at any dinner before!

---

9. Or intoxicated Śiva-form of Bhairava.
9a. Cēśi-caturāsra.
10. This is a soup prevalent in Karnataka and Maharashtra. It is prepared by putting the powder of a mixture of fried rice, pulses and fenugreek (vendayam in Tamil) in curds or tamarind juice. It is called ‘Mendiyyiṭṭu’ in some parts of Tamil Nadu.
11. ‘Cittāpavāna’ or Cittāvans are a class of Maharashtrian brahmans. According to Prof. N.R. Bhatt the etymology of the word is ‘ciṭāya pāvaniḥ’ (sanctified by holy ashes).
विचारणः - भो भो थः समावरत्मेव विपश्यते किम्, वत् खाद लाणे-रायथणलिंगिन अनेककरणलावविनिर्दितपरावर्तमाणका मनत पु न विष्ठः? किम्?

पलाण्डुमण्डनः (कह्युष्कृत प्रत्ययाने समाविक्षण) असत्! पलाण्डुरायत्वः?

विचारणः - नो चेत् किंस्यदस्यत्?

(पलाण्डुमण्डनः सामवे विद्विति ॥)

गृहजनावः - अथे! किं केवलपण्डनः? गृहजनावः परस्य शणप्रायकोडः भोजप्पोः।

लक्षुपनः - रे रे किमेताया नीसर्ववेगः? ऊपवीनः नाये लक्षुपनः-कन्देसिते व्योरीतिमण्डायाणाः परावर्तमाणाः कुलमध्यः?

पलाण्डुमण्डनः - मो भो असत्! पलाण्डुमण्डनः किमयको न समति किम्? क्षतः--

लक्षुपनः - ॐ (सरोबर) पुल्लुः

म्योरितकां ते (ढ़ी) मनविनां"* 
हन्ति ततः* लसामका कथे स्मात।

गन्धेन यवेन श्रुतिपुराणा-
मवे भवेत सुनिकर विद्यापाल्॥ ३॥

लक्षुपनः - ॐ (सरोबर) पुल्लुः

म्योरितकां ते (ढ़ी) मनविनां* 
हन्ति ततः* लसामका कथे स्मात।

गन्धेन यवेन श्रुतिपुराणा-
मवे भवेत सुनिकर विद्यापाल्॥ ३॥

1. श्री. किर्तिमुः  ². श्री. सत्यनिविद्वेदः
2. छ. धम्मनिः  ³. ब्र. ह्रद  ⁴. ब्र. 'सरोबर' नालिः
5. ल. 'ढ़ी' नालिः; उपनाम उपरि 'सोरीणा' हर्षिव  ⁶. ल. हर;  
*बहुतों वातावरणाविद्वेदः;

PALĀṇḌUMĀNDANA

Cittapāvana - Ha, ha, sirs, did you forget at all what took place yesterday? On the occasion of the worship of Khānderāya,¹¹ did you not swallow the special dishes spiced with varieties of onion?

Palaṇḍu Maṇḍana (smilingly embracing Cittapāvana) - Ha, ha brother, is big onion used here also?

Cittapāvana - If not, what else is used here?

(Palaṇḍu Maṇḍana stands arrogantly.)

Grājanādri - Hey, what is the use of mere big onions? Without the small onions dishes will be tasteless like the grassy food of hoofed animals.

Laśuna Panta - Hey, Hey, what is the use of this insipid discussion? When, like the lord of the medicinal herbs (the moon), the bulbous root of garlic comes up, where is the need for the onion-types that are similar to the fire-flies?

Palaṇḍu Maṇḍana - Ha, ha brother, is not big onion too superior to garlic?

A good collection of the species of onions shines like the multitude of stars. The pearls, diamonds and topaz cannot be compared to a hundredth part of onion. The mere sight of it causes supreme satisfaction. In the field the bulbous onion brightly shines like a moon in the sky at day-time. (3)

Laśuna Panta (angrily) - Really!

A bunch¹² of garlic destroys innumerable disorders due to wind-affliction. What could be compared to garlic? Its mere scent makes the food especially satisfying for the gods and demons (4)

¹¹ a. A form of Śiva worshipped in Western India.
¹² In the context of "garlic" (Laśuna) the author uses "poṭika" in verses 4 and 9 in the sense of a 'collection' or 'pocket' (poṭalā)
Graññādri (setting aside both) -

Listen to me. The small onion is the best among condiments. The lustre of coral is only its handmaiden. Fools do not know its real nature. How can (such fools) be capable of appreciating its subtleties?

(Prajāpati Deva enters again.)

Prajāpati Deva - Hey, hey, why is there delay in the feeding of the brahmmins?

Cīcā - Oh, Prajāpati Deva, the delay is due to the cooked soup and green vegetables being seasoned with onions and garlic.

Prajāpati - So be it. I shall bring leaf-plates. (Shows the action of bringing the leaf-plates.)

(off-stage)

Oh, because of the smell of onions and garlic the whole place has become heaven itself! Re, re, look, look, why do the wretched northerners, covering their noses are running away? Fortunate indeed are the southerners who are excited by dishes of many varieties. Thus they with their very clear enunciation of the Vedic syllables display the pada, krama and jāṭa-types. 14

Liṅgojī Bhaṭṭa - Why are these best of kinsmen, adorning the hall not seated?

(Then enter)

(Perambhaṭṭa and others), with their bodies besmeared with holy ashes. They graciously enjoy holding the leaf-plate, water vessel and other things. Their stomachs are empty. With their reddish brown dress worn by them being patched with hundred scraps, they create a brilliant illusion all around of the thousand - eyed Indra.

---

13. ‘Pāṭīvali’. Could be ‘plantain-leaf’ or more probably ‘dried leaves stitched together’ (Taiyali Ili in Tamil).

14. Three modes of Vedic recitation. In ‘pada-pāṭha’ the individual words in the Sāmkhaṭ text are given separately. Krama and Jāṭa are two ways of preserving the sacred text from alteration. In Krama text every word occurs twice, being connected with the preceding and following words - like ab, ba, and cd. The Jāṭa, as ‘based on Krama’, states each of its combinations three times, the second time in reversal order-like ab, ba, ab.
(Laṣuna Panta while exhibiting his love enthusiastically, coughs heartily and falls down in a swoon due to shortness of breath.)

Palaṇḍu Maṇḍana - Hey, hey, quickly bring the juice of big onions; otherwise, Laṣuna Panta may not be with us for long.

(Gṛñjanāḍri rushes forth with small onion-juice. Āraṇālā Bhaṭṭa brings a pot of gruel.)

Tryambakā - Brother Liṅga Bhaṭṭa, offer him a tonic.

(Liṅga Bhaṭṭa nods his head and looks all round.)

Ciśē - Dear Raktamūlikā, mix the juice of the red raddish with tamarind juice.

(Raktamūlikā does so quickly.)

Mithyākūṭa Bhaṭṭa (bringing Mithyākūṭa fluid) - Hey, you fools, see how I would be instantly working this wonder!

(No saying he offers it quickly into the mouth of Laṣuna Panta)

(from behind the curtains)

Hey, hey, you who regularly arrange for the crematory rites and also who send Laṣuna Panta to the other world! Throw away the funeral pile made of dry onion and garlic peelings! For, the messengers of the lord of death after urinating on the face of Laṣuna Panta, have run away. Therefore, he in undoubtedly alive now!

Liṅga Bhaṭṭa - Truly indeed the medicine is very potent!

(Laṣuna Panta wakes up by then.)
Laśuna Panta - Hey, hey, please bring the bunch of garlic! For I have fainted due to an excess of bile.

Paṇḍu Maṇḍana - Well, well, sir, I too get this quite often.

Grījanādī - I have fallen in with a fool's group. Hey, hey, wretched fools, how could one cure bile complaint without sweet juice? Hence take this juice prepared from small onions.

Laśuna Panta (smiling) -

If garlic is not able to dispel (illness), what could be said of the small onion? If the sun does not become the prime killer of darkness, what could be said of the moon?

O, garlic-bunch, destroyer of all sufferings, the horse trotting in the high road (or leading to the other world), the crusher of grave sins, the wretched killer of fragrant smell, provider of real miracles (or perfect knowledge) in a snap, the bread that delights the hungry, Supreme Goddess, be gracious!

(Pūnapolīka loosening her pleated garment, takes off the garlic-bunch by the left hand and places it in the mouth of Laśuna Panta.)

Grījanādī (smiling) - How obstinate are these silly-minded people?

The small onion is red like the coral, juicy (tasty) like nectar, (causes) love to sprout forth, is capable of giving enjoyment, and at its very sight purity rises (or comes to be). Foolish people do not believe in its powers.
Laśuna Panta (opening his eyes, tasting the garlic while addressing it as “aye Laśunapōṭike etc.” v. 9) - Ha, ha, it is true that in this way only, the gods drink the moon (nectar-rayed) due to its similarity in form (with garlic). And the (crescent) moon itself deserves worship in the world due to its resembling a sliver of garlic. (11)

Liṅgoji Bhāṭṭa - Hey, Pāṛṇapāṇi, this person (Laśuna Panta) is alive owing to the power of your merits. Your daughter is also lucky; for, just now, she has been endowed with enough wealth so that she could be care-free throughout her life, and also her husband’s life.

(Then enters by a toss of the curtain the priest Peram Bhāṭṭa, with fuel, kuṣa grass, sacrificial ladle, ghee and sacrificial vessel.)

Peram Bhāṭṭa - Ha, ha, great confusion seems to prevail among the daughters-in-law! Hence let the smell of garlic and onions be covered up. How is it that the smell has greatly increased due to the strong wind? The sky covered with the skins (of garlic and onion) appears to call out to the uninvited Vedic priests! Let the Garbhādhāna function be started.

(So saying while he covers the sacrificial platform with the peelings of garlic and onion instead of the Kuṣa grass, then—)

Liṅgoji Bhāṭṭa, looking at Cīra, gesticulates, suggestively his carnal desire.)

Cīra (to herself) - Will the impregnation rite happen here itself?

(Looking at her husband she takes out Lakṣṇamāla and acts its eating.)

17. ‘Snuṣa-puruṣām’ - ‘Puruṣa perhaps in the rare sense of “group, collection”.
Dr. Raghavan notes that the correct reading could be “snuṣa-puruṣāyam”, meaning “the kinsmen of the daughter-in-law”. The daughter-in-law could be Cīra whose Garbhādhāna is the main theme of the play, or Raktamūlīkā whose marriage was fixed or both. The London ms. reads “sukhā-puruṣām”.

18. A medicinal herb, considered as a tonic for barren women and for procreating a son (putra - kandā).
Liṅgoḍa Bhaṭṭa (to himself) - Let me acquire virility. For, even a person whose virility is destroyed by the cries of Hanuman, becomes a man by just relishing onions.

(So saying he gesticulates swallowing garlic as if they were the remnants of offerings. He acts consuming bhang (narcotic drug prepared from hemp) under the pretext of respectfully taking the holy ashes. In a concealed manner, offering in the sacred fire tobacco leaves under the pretext of avoiding smoke in the fire, inhales the smoke of tobacco, bhang etc. through the blow-pipe.)

Pūrṇapoliḥa (angrily) - Such a family custom is not witnessed anywhere. The Garbhādhaṇa function was performed for me also. Strange, strange !

(So saying she pulls off Lakṣmaṇa from Cīrca’s hands.)

Gṛṇjanādṛi (looking) - Now, I would have to fall from a mountain or get into the waters (for committing suicide ⁹.)

(So saying he gets up hurriedly in agreement with Pūrṇapoliḥa. With the assistance of Gṛṇjanādṛi she cries out loudly.)

Kalaṅkāṅkura (getting up) - Hey, hey, Gṛṇjanādṛi, why do you spoil this (Garbhādhaṇa) function ?

---

¹. श्र. तमः द्वि लोकांन इत्यर्थं स्वस्ते
². श्र. “असहरू”
³. श्र. लिम्बकिष्टाः
⁴. श्र. महाम्
⁵. श्र. “धृत्र”
⁶. कातिप
⁷. श्र. अनेका अन्तर्निधिः
⁸. अ. उन्नर्णेः
⁹. श्र. “सौर्यम्”

---

19. This reckless decision is because Gṛṇjanādṛi’s marriage with his beloved Raktamālikā is cancelled due to her recent betrothal with Gṛṇjanādṛi’s elder brother Laṣuna Panta.
Kvathikā (rising) - Aye, this is not proper for you, Pūrpapolikā, who are already bound by a pledge (to Lašuna Panta). On the contrary, is Gṛḍhaṇāḍī going to be unmarried (for ever)? 
(In the mutual confusion, due to the loosening of the fringe of the garments of Pūrpapolikā and Kvathikā, onions, small and big, and garlic scatter all round.)

Palāṇḍu Maṇḍana and others (looking at angrily) - Hey, hey, truly ill-bred are these (women) who waste garlic and other roots which are like nectar!

Mithyākīta Bhāṭṭa (observing the deranged pleas of Raktamālikā who is frightened at this peculiar scramble) - Hey, hey, Raktamālikā, you are being watched (by many)! You have been much petted by your father. But here are arriving the malicious northerners who insult the Mithyākīta dish that carries the essentially sustaining taste of all the southerners. Their perception would be quite to the contrary.

(off-stage)

Hey, hey, now the ridiculing of mutual marriage amongst uncle’s daughter and such other topics could be averted. The northerners who are capable of exposing others’ (faults) satirically have just arrived.

(Then enter the Bengali pandits Jhallaṛi Jhāṅkāra and Bheri Bhāṅkāra Bhāṭṭachāryas along with their disciples holding fish in their hands.)

Bhaṭṭācārya (looking all round and smelling) - Śiva, Śiva, alas! All this is the doing of (people) with no children. Ha, alas!
Disciples - Bhaṭṭācārya, direct us quickly to the kitchen because these three days' old fishes might rot at any minute.

Bhaṭṭācārya - Hey, hey, we have fallen into an unorthodox house! How could we arrange for food here among these sterile people?

Southerners - Re, re, we are done to death by the smell of the rotten fish, where could we proceed?

Bhaṭṭācārya - Hey, you who are outside the pale of dharma, you do not know for the most part anything about dharma. The Smṛti says “a man, who eats meat after worshipping gods and ancestors is not defiled”.

Southerners (heartily) - Hey, hey, how can this be because meat-eating is prohibited in the Kali age in the relevant Smṛti portions?

Bhaṭṭācārya (laughing) - It may be by the principle of “satisfying a vicious person”. Firstly there is no basis for your statement. Also where is fish-eating prohibited?

Southerners - If it is so, then where is it prescribed?

Bhaṭṭācārya - Is Kāṭyāyanacārya mistaken saying “Fishes however in two months”? Moreover is 32 (Manu) babbling when he says that “the types of fishes Pārūṇa and Rohita, are the best suited respectively for oblations to gods (kavya) and the ancestors (kavya)?

(Considering that it would not be possible to win over the opponent without false accusation, the southerners send out person among themselves. Until he laid hold of a royal official to bring him over to the place, they establish their proposition by some made-up statements.)

20. Manu Smṛti V. 5.21 ed.

21. 'tugyatā durjana - nyāya. This is a principle followed by authors in some contexts in their śāstraic texts. Herein the author grants in a way the position of even a frivolous or perverse disputant to his satisfaction.
(Then enters the chief royal official, binds Bhātācārya and beats him up.)

Bhātācārya - I do not understand why you are beating me, I am innocent.

Royal Official - Hey, hey, you are such a person who is performing some mystic (tānta) rites to cause death. (Looking at the policemen) Let it be, beat him again many times! (The policemen beat him.)

Bhātācārya (sorrowfully) - Oh, oh, brothers from the south, is this true? Are you not the eye witnesses in this matter?

Southerners - We are the only witnesses. What doubt is there?

Bhātācārya - Then why don’t you just say it out?

Southerners - Is there any authority for our being the witnesses?

Bhātācārya - All of you, being well versed in the Vedic lore, what doubt is there for your being witnesses?

Southerners (turning to the official) - If so, then this Bhātācārya should be done to death as he is a sorcerer!

(So saying they point out to the heaps of the peelings of onions, garlic and others. Finding this to be true the official binds Bhātācārya and his students, and takes them away along with the rubbish heap.)

Southerners (clasping each other’s hand) - How has Jagadīṣa[^23] gained victory over our rivals? Let our friends enjoy such glory!

[^22]: *Mans Smṛti* V.5.16 ab.

[^23]: The Supreme Lord; also the name of the royal official or of the southerner who brings slyly the royal official.
PALANDUMANDANA

The enemy is vanquished, the darkness of obstacles is completely dispelled; knowledge is celebrated: but even now why is the superstition in the prohibited edibles in the Kali age not cleared away?

Bet it so. Let the Garbhādhāna be celebrated again at another auspicious time. We shall go.

Liñoji Bhaṭṭa - Then let us arrange for another auspicious time!

(All saying all get up.)

Nevertheless let this be the final benediction. Sovereignty, conquest (of countries) in all quarters, and overcoming difficulties, are bound to happen, without any doubt, only at an auspicious time.

(All exit.)

The Prahasana called Palāṇḍu Maṇḍana is completed.

24. This is called ‘Bharatavākyā’ in all Sanskrit dramas from Bhīṣa to the present times. The dramaturgical texts do not refer to it. The origin and etymology of the term ‘Bharatavākyā’ are not clear. However, it is the general belief that Bharatavākyā is so called in honour of Bharata, the founder of Sanskrit dramaturgy, and that this final benedictory verse is the statement of a 'bharata' or actor not as playing the role of any character in a play.