

# Heroism or Detachment: Reading Hastimalla's *Añjanāpavanañjaya*

Gregory M. Clines

Recent years have witnessed a true renaissance in scholarship focused on Jain narrative literature.<sup>1</sup> Much of this work, my own included, directly addresses the theme of the current volume: literary transcreation. The corpus of Jain narrative literature is vast, and one of the common threads that runs through the history of Jain narrative composition is the fact that authors have continually rewritten inherited narratives and, in doing so, have intentionally and creatively manipulated the work of their predecessors in terms of genre, style, aesthetics, language, and moral messaging.

In this chapter I want to look at a specific instance of literary transcreation: the thirteenth-century Jain author Hastimalla's seven-act drama entitled *Añjanāpavanañjaya* ('The Drama of Añjanā and Pavanañjaya'). As the title informs us, the play focuses on the marriage and subsequent trials of the *vidyādhara* couple Añjanā and Pavanañjaya. These are the hero Hanumān's parents in the Jain *purāṇic* literary tradition, and the play's basic plot structure is largely inherited from earlier Jain *Rāmāyaṇa* narratives. This chapter examines the transcreative moment of moving from *purāṇa* to drama (*nāṭaka*), and, specifically, I set forth two goals. First, I want to highlight Hastimalla's literary creativity by explicating some of the major changes he makes to his source material. Second, using these changes as a starting point, I want to provide two different readings of the *Añjanāpavanañjaya* as a whole. The first will examine the play as a classical Sanskrit drama that aims to engender in its reader (or viewer) *vīra rasa*, the heroic sentiment in Sanskrit dramatic theory.<sup>2</sup> The second reading, though, is inflected by Jain theology. While I would

---

<sup>1</sup> Previous versions of this chapter were presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion in 2018 and 2019. I am grateful to the questions and feedback received at those presentations. I also extend my gratitude to the two anonymous reviewers of this chapter, whose generous engagement with my materials and arguments invariably benefitted the final product.

<sup>2</sup> Space precludes an extensive discussion of Sanskrit *rasa* theory, its evolution, or the mechanics of *rasa* in pre-modern South Asian drama and poetry. For more on these topics, see Pollock 2016.

not go so far as to say that the *Añjanāpavanañjaya* aims to engender *śānta rasa*—the quiescent sentiment—in its reader, I do argue that there are clues throughout the drama that aim to orient the reader towards a feeling of *vairāgya*, fundamental world-weariness. That is, there is a mode of reading the *Añjanāpavanañjaya* that leaves the reader feeling distrustful of, and unattracted to, the ephemeral world and its fleeting pleasures. My hope is that this investigation of an understudied Jain drama will not only contribute to ongoing discussions about Jain literary creativity and diversity in premodernity, but also help to document Jain contributions to the history of Sanskrit drama.

### *Hastimalla and his Works*

Hastimalla, literally “he who possesses the strength of an elephant,” was a Digambara Jain householder who lived in the latter half of the thirteenth century, most likely in modern-day Karnataka.<sup>3</sup> He is credited with composing a Kannada-language version of the *Ādipurāṇa* and four extant Sanskrit dramas:<sup>4</sup> *Vikrāntakaurava* (“The Drama of the Heroic Kauraveśvara”),<sup>5</sup> *Maithilikalyāṇa* (“The Drama of the Illustrious Maithilī”),<sup>6</sup> *Subhadrānāṭikā* (“The Short Drama of Subhadrā”),<sup>7</sup> and

<sup>3</sup> Hastimalla is almost certainly a *nom de plume*, and we do not know our author’s real name. As summarised by Patwardhan (1950: 7-8), Hastimalla earned this nickname by subduing a raging elephant that had been unleashed upon him by a king interested in testing his spiritual fortitude (*samyaktva*). After calming the elephant, the story goes, the king “honoured and glorified [Hastimalla] in the royal assembly...with a hundred stanzas in recognition of his great achievement” (Patwardhan 1950: 7). The 14<sup>th</sup>-century author Ayyapārya, in his *Jinendrakalyāṇacampū*, builds on this base story, explaining that not only did Hastimalla tame a wild elephant by means of a well-crafted poetic stanza, but that he also revealed a seeming Jain monk at court to be an imposter (*jinamudrādhārin*) (Patwardhan 1950: 8). Further, in the *Pratiṣṭhātīlaka*, Nemicandra describes Hastimalla as “a lion [that kills] the enemies that are his opponents” (*paravādhastināṃ śimhaḥ*) (Patwardhan 1950: 8, f.2). Hastimalla is also referred to, though infrequently, as Madebhamalla, “he who possesses the strength of an elephant in rut.”

<sup>4</sup> At least three additional dramas have been attributed to Hastimalla, though manuscripts of those works are unavailable. Warder (2004: 859) argues that with the exception of the *Udayanarājakāvya*, the other plays listed in manuscript catalogs are likely alternative names for the four dramas mentioned above.

<sup>5</sup> Kauraveśvara here is another name for Jaya, the grandson of Bāhubali. See Warder 2004: 830.

<sup>6</sup> Maithilī is a common name for Sītā.

<sup>7</sup> The Subhadrā of this short drama is the wife of Bharata, the older son of Ādinātha and the first *cakravartin* of the current *avasarpinī*.

*Añjanāpavanañjaya*.<sup>8</sup> A cursory evaluation of these four titles reveals that all of Hastimalla's dramas draw for their plots from the long history of Jain *purāṇic* literature, datable at least back to Vimalasūri and his fifth century CE Prakrit *Paūmacariya* ('The Deeds of Padma').<sup>9</sup> The *Maithilīkalyāṇa* and *Añjanāpavanañjaya* specifically draw from earlier Jain Rāma narratives.<sup>10</sup>

There is little concrete historical information about Hastimalla's life. He lived in South India during the reign of an unnamed Pāṇḍya king,<sup>11</sup> and we know that he was the fifth of six sons of one Govindabhaṭṭa, a convert to Jainism who was born a Vatsa *gotrī* Brahmin. According to the *Vikrāntakaurava* (Act I), all of Hastimalla's brothers were also accomplished poets (*kaviśvarāḥ*), and the *Maithilīkalyāṇa* (Act I) describes the brothers as "ornamented with the jewels of good speech" (*subhāṣitar-atnabhūṣaṇa*) (Patwardhan 1950: 6). Later sources agree that Hastimalla had at least one son, known as Pārśva Paṇḍita. Some sources claim that Pārśva was simply the oldest and most accomplished of several sons (Patwardhan 1950: 8).

### *Hastimalla in Jain Literary Studies*

Hastimalla and his works have received little attention in scholarship on Sanskrit drama or Jain literature. In Hindi-language scholarship, Kanchedilāla Jaina published a monograph on Hastimalla's life and works in 1980 and, more recently, Snehalatā Śuklā published an examination specifically of the *Vikrāntakaurava* in 2010. In English-language scholarship, John Brockington (2016: 9) discusses the *Maithilīkalyāṇa* in passing when discussing later Rāma-based narratives that foreground Sītā, and Mary Brockington (2016: 33) references the *Añjanāpavanañjaya* in her discussion of Añjanā, which is part of a larger

<sup>8</sup> All of Hastimalla's extant dramas have been edited and published. *Vikrāntakaurava* was published in 1915 as part of the Māṇikacanda Digambara Jain Granthamālā, and then again in 1969 by the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office in Varanasi as part of the Haridas Sanskrit Series. *Maithilīkalyāṇa* was published in 1916 in the Māṇikacanda Digambara Jain Granthamālā. Both *Subhadrānāṭikā* and *Añjanāpavanañjaya* were edited and published by M.V. Patwardhan in 1950.

<sup>9</sup> Padma is a common name for Rāma in Jain literature.

<sup>10</sup> For more on Jain *Rāmāyaṇas*, see Clines 2022.

<sup>11</sup> It is possible that this king is Māravarman Kulaśekhara I (r. 1268-1308 CE), though as Sastri (2019 [1955]: 197) points out, "the rule of the Pāṇḍya kingdom was shared among several princes of the royal family, one of them enjoying primacy over the rest." So, while Kulaśekhara might have held primacy over lesser Pāṇḍya princes, it is unclear exactly to whom Hastimalla refers in his works.

analysis of secondary female characters in Jain versions of the Rāma story.

For our purposes, two sources offer the most sustained treatment of Hastimalla and his dramas. The first is M.V. Patwardhan's 1950 edition of the *Añjanāpavanañjaya* and the *Subhadranāṭikā*, in which he also provides an English-language introduction to Hastimalla and his four works. The second is A.K. Warder's lengthy discussion of Hastimalla in volume seven, part two, of his important *Indian Kāvya Literature* series. Warder provides not only introductory biographical information for Hastimalla, but also detailed accounts of all four of his dramas. About *Añjanāpavanañjaya*, he writes that Hastimalla "saw the possibilities of this story for the theatre":

In interpreting the *purāṇa* for the stage he has made Pavanañjaya's friend Prahasita the fool, Miśrakeśī a female tutor and introduced several new characters and many new scenes. He has also modified certain details for aesthetic effect; for example the arranged marriage of Añjanāsundarī becomes self-choice. But most of all Hastimalla has used the resources of *nāṭyaśāstra* to enrich his plot (2004: 860).

It is clear from this quotation that Warder recognises Hastimalla as an innovative author who creatively drew on earlier Jain narrative traditions for the general plots of his dramas.<sup>12</sup> Patwardhan, in his analysis, is complimentary of Hastimalla as a playwright. In discussing the diverse set of Sanskrit and Prakrit meters that Hastimalla employs,<sup>13</sup> for instance, Patwardhan comments that his "ability to handle all these metres in a natural, easy and graceful manner is enough to do credit to any Sanskrit poet. He is quite at home writing metrical passages and his ease and grace are at time reminiscent of similar qualities in Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti and others" (1950: 39). Patwardhan also recognises that the *Añjanāpavanañjaya* is substantively different than its source material. He provides an extensive list—spanning two full pages—of the changes that Hastimalla makes but ends the discussion with a curious note:

<sup>12</sup> Warder is of the opinion that Hastimalla was most familiar with the literary oeuvres of Jinasena II, author of the Sanskrit *Ādipurāṇa*, and his student Guṇabhadra, author of the *Uttarapurāṇa* (2004: 829-830). In regard specifically to the *Añjanāpavanañjaya*, though, Guṇabhadra does not actually provide a detailed account of the story of Hanumān's parents. Both Vimalasūri, in his *Paūmacariya*, and the seventh-century author Raviṣeṇa, in his *Padmapurāṇa*, do provide the story, and it is likely that Hastimalla was aware of these older versions of the Rāma narrative and perhaps had even read Raviṣeṇa's work. Patwardhan is also confident that Vimala and Raviṣeṇa are the sources for Hastimalla's *Añjanāpavanañjaya* (1950: 30-32).

<sup>13</sup> As Patwardhan explains, and largely in keeping with the expectations of premodern South Asian drama, all of the "low" characters in Hastimalla's plays—*vidūṣakas*, servants, and women—speak Śauraseni Prakrit (1950: 40). On this see also Vaidya 1952.

“Except for the points of divergence mentioned above, Hastimalla has closely and faithfully followed the story as given in the Paūmacariya and has cast it into the conventional mould of a Nāṭaka” (1950: 30–32).

What both Warder and Patwardhan allude to is that Hastimalla was motivated to change the story of Añjanā and Pavanañjaya to fit the structural requirements and expectations of Sanskrit drama. Neither scholar, though, spells out exactly what this means, or, rather, what the end goal of the drama is when read through the lens of the classical Sanskrit dramatic theory. In the following pages I offer such an analysis.

### *The Story of Añjanā and Pavanañjaya in Jain Caritas*

To highlight the extent to which Hastimalla creatively changes the story of Hanumān's parents, I will provide in brief what we might call the “classical” account of Añjanā and Pavanañjaya as provided in cantos fifteen through eighteen of Raviṣeṇa's *Padmapurāṇa*. The story begins with Añjanā's father, Mahendra, worrying about finding a suitable husband for his daughter. Different ministers provide different possible grooms for the young woman, but eventually two possible suitors rise to the fore: Vidyutprabha and Pavanañjaya. After a sage informs Mahendra that Vidyutprabha will soon become a renunciate—and thereby leave Añjanā without a husband—Mahendra decides that Pavanañjaya is the best choice. Mahendra meets Pavanañjaya's father, Prahāda, on Mount Kailāśa, and the two kings agree that the wedding should occur at once. Preparations are made, but before the ceremony can take place Pavanañjaya is overcome by the desire to see his bride. Over the three days between his being informed of the wedding arrangements and the actual performance of the ceremony, Pavanañjaya actually goes mad from his uncontrolled passion to see Añjanā. As Raviṣeṇa explains:

Overpowered with desire, Pavanañjaya became anxious to meet Añjanā immediately. He was overwhelmed by the stress of passion so completely; it resembled a warrior being struck by multiple enemy arrows. In the first stage, he was desirous to see Añjanā. In the second, he desired to gaze upon her figure. In the third, his breathing became labored, and in the fourth, he developed a fever like burning sandalwood. In the fifth stage, he intermittently laid his body over a bed of thorny rose bushes. In the sixth, delicious foods seemed to him like poison. In the seventh stage, desirous to speak with her, he babbled uselessly, all the while singing and dancing. In the eighth stage he became intoxicated, sometimes singing and other times dancing. In the ninth stage he began fainting, as if succumbing to a snake bite. In the tenth stage, he reached such a state of total depression that only he could understand it (XV.95–100).

And so, accompanied by his friend Prahāsita, Pavanañjaya sneaks into Añjanā's compound. He scales the palace walls to the seventh story, where Añjanā resides with two attendants. Pavanañjaya overhears one of the handmaidens, Mīśrakeśī, lament about the upcoming marriage, arguing that it would have been better for Añjanā to marry Vidyutprabha, even if he would have eventually left her for monkhood. Upon hearing this, Pavanañjaya becomes enraged and threatens to kill both Añjanā and the handmaiden:

Pavanañjaya, incensed by the fire of anger, immediately began to shake, and a shadow fell over him. Biting his lower lip, he unsheathed his sword, his entire face red and trembling from the sight. He said, "O Prahāsita, certainly [Añjanā] desired this, that the woman would say something so abhorrent! Look! I will cut off both their heads!" (XV.163–166).

Prahāsita ultimately talks Pavanañjaya down from the rash thought of murdering his bride-to-be, but the prince's pride is hurt, and he becomes intent on calling off the wedding. He gives the order for his army to prepare to leave, and the following morning Pavanañjaya abandons his betrothed and the two *vidyādhara* families.

When Mahendra and Prahlāda hear that Pavanañjaya has left, they begin their pursuit. Eventually they catch up with the prince and convince him to go through with the marriage. Añjanā and Pavanañjaya indeed wed, but while Añjanā and the two families rejoice, Pavanañjaya continues to hold a grudge. He leaves Añjanā immediately following the ceremony, uttering not even a single word to her. Soon after the wedding, Prahlāda receives word from Rāvaṇa—at this point in the narrative, the two are allies—that his service is needed in battle against an enemy *vidyādhara* named Varuṇa. Pavanañjaya convinces his father to let him go to battle in his place and soon sets off with a vast army to meet Rāvaṇa. One night during the campaign, though, Pavanañjaya spots a lonely female *cakra* bird pining for her mate. Upon seeing the pitiable sight, Pavanañjaya's animosity towards Añjanā disappears and he desires nothing more than to go and consummate his marriage with his wife. He does just that, returning to Añjanā under cover of darkness. He spends the night with her before returning to his army in the early morning. Añjanā worries that she might become pregnant from her union with her husband and that because no other family members had seen Pavanañjaya return for the night, her in-laws might think that she had been unfaithful. Pavanañjaya gives her a bracelet to prove that he had indeed returned and then departs.

Añjanā, of course, does conceive a child, and when her pregnancy begins to show, her mother-in-law, Ketumatī, accuses her of infidelity.

Añjanā shows her the bracelet, but to no avail. Ketumatī exiles Añjanā from the kingdom and, to make matters worse, she is refused entrance back to her natal home. Añjanā and her *sakhī* (‘companion’) Vasantamālā find themselves wandering through a terrible forest teeming with wild, fearsome beasts. Raviṣeṇa makes numerous references to the fact that Añjanā must walk through the forest, as pregnancy has made it impossible for her to fly through the air. Unaccustomed to walking, Añjanā’s feet soon become bruised and bloody, “as if decorated with red paste” (XVII.104). In a particularly poignant verse (XVII.96), the reader learns that Vasantamālā —though still capable of flying—chooses to walk alongside Añjanā “like a shadow” (*chāyāvṛttim*) supporting her pregnant mistress.

Eventually the two happen upon a Jain ascetic, Amitagati, who has taken up residence in a cave in which Añjanā and Vasantamālā hope to take refuge. There, Amitagati narrates Añjanā’s past lives and, finally Añjanā gives birth to her son. Soon thereafter, Añjanā’s maternal uncle Pratisūrya comes across the two women in the forest, though he does not immediately recognise Añjanā. Upon learning her identity, he takes Añjanā, her son, and Vasantamālā back to his city Hanurūha, after which Hanumān is named.

In the meantime, Pavanañjaya returns from his military campaign with Rāvaṇa and discovers that his mother has wrongly accused Añjanā of infidelity and cast her out. Pavanañjaya sets off to find his wife but is unsuccessful. Mirroring the previous circumstance of Añjanā, Pavanañjaya eventually ends up in a forest, where he vows to end his life if he cannot find his wife. Pratisūrya, though, again comes to the rescue. Prahlāda had previously sent him a message explaining that Pavanañjaya had gone off in search of Añjanā but had never returned. Accompanied by other *vidyādharas*, Pratisūrya searches for Pavanañjaya, finds him in the forest, and brings him to Hanurūha to be happily reunited with his wife.

### *Añjanā and Pavanañjaya in Hastimalla’s Añjanāpavanañjaya*

The bones of Hastimalla’s interpretation of the story of Añjanā and Pavanañjaya align with those of earlier Jain *purāṇas*. The couple is separated because of Rāvaṇa’s war. Pavanañjaya returns from said war for a single night to see Añjanā, and she becomes pregnant. Ketumatī believes Añjanā to have been unfaithful and exiles her to the forest, where Añjanā gives birth to Hanumān. Añjanā is eventually rescued;

Pavanañjaya wanders through the forest looking for his wife; and finally, the couple is reunited.

With that said, Hastimalla also injects substantive aesthetic and plot changes that set his story apart from those of his predecessors. Many of these changes occur towards the beginning of the narrative and in the first two acts of the drama. The first concerns the actual marriage between Añjanā and Pavanañjaya. Whereas in Raviṣeṇa's *Padmapurāṇa* the marriage is arranged, in the drama Añjanā chooses her own husband in a *svayamvara* ceremony. The fact that Añjanā will choose Pavanañjaya is never in doubt.<sup>14</sup> This certainty is possible because in the *Añjanāpavanañjaya*, Añjanā and Pavanañjaya are not total strangers before the ceremony. While they had not actually spoken before, they had briefly seen each other. On a previous occasion, Añjanā had gone off with a few of her *sakhīs* to the Vijayārdha mountain to collect flowers. Pavanañjaya happened upon the mountain at the same time and saw Añjanā as she was entering a shelter of trees. From her shelter, Añjanā too spied Pavanañjaya and, at the sight of him, the flowers she carried inadvertently fell from her hands. In recounting this story the day before the *svayamvara*, Pavanañjaya explains the lasting effect this episode had on him: "Those very flowers that fell softly from the foremost blossoms that are my beloved's hands have become unerring arrows that the God of Love now casts towards me!" (Act I, Hastimalla and Patwardhan 1950: 7). Even before the *svayamvara* begins, then, it is clear that Añjanā and Pavanañjaya are infatuated with each other; indeed, they are in love.

Because of this change, the Pavanañjaya of Hastimalla's drama never succumbs to jealousy and never becomes enraged with Añjanā. Pavanañjaya never attempts to call off his wedding and, thus, Hastimalla removes what is essentially *the* precipitating factor for the prolonged tragedy that marks Raviṣeṇa's version of the narrative.<sup>15</sup> Pavanañjaya does eventually leave Añjanā to join Rāvaṇa in battle, but not because he holds a grudge against his wife. Rather he acts out of a sense of filial duty

<sup>14</sup> In Raviṣeṇa's *Padmapurāṇa* (XV.30), one of Mahendra's attendants presents the option of Añjanā choosing her own husband in a *svayamvara* ceremony, but the suggestion does not gain much traction.

<sup>15</sup> This also relates to Añjanā's identity as a Jain *satī*. As M. Whitney Kelting points out: "The Añjanā story produces a number of...marital problems... (1) rejection by husband; (2) childlessness and miraculous fertility; (3) accusations of shamelessness; and (4) conflicts with one's mother-in-law" (2009: 63-64). Kelting argues that Añjanā's potent wifely virtue, cultivated through fasting, helps her to fix her bad marriage and strained relationship with her in-laws. Some of the issues at hand—Añjanā's assumed shamelessness and conflict with her mother-in-law, for example—are still present in Hastimalla's version of the narrative, but strikingly absent is, of course, her being rejected by Pavanañjaya.

to his father: at the end of the second act, Pavanañjaya has to convince his father, Prahlāda, to allow him to go and join Rāvaṇa in the king's stead.

In fact, not only does Hastimalla remove Pavanañjaya's motivation for abandoning his wife (as Raviṣeṇa would have it), but he replaces it with what can only be described as palpable, over-the-top humour. Indeed, most of the play's first two acts are explicitly funny. Hastimalla creates humour in a number of ways, many of which centre on the sex-obsessed Prahasita, the drama's *vidūṣaka*. The *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Bharata's seminal work on dramaturgy, explains that *hāsya rasa*, the comedic sentiment, arises out of the mimicry (*anukṛti*) of *śṛṅgāra rasa*, the erotic sentiment (*śṛṅgārāt hi bhavet hāsyaḥ*) (VI.40). We encounter this mimicry of eroticism throughout the first two acts of the *Añjanāpavanañjaya*. Take, for example, Prahasita's description of the pleasure forest, where the first two acts of the drama are set. It is replete with sexually suggestive imagery:

O friend, indeed look at all of this! There is the female cuckoo bird, the edge of whose wing is coloured reddish-yellow, as if a multitude of lotus-flower filaments had settled one on top of the other. It is like she is dressed in costume, and having descended from the top of a fragrant mango tree, she sings sweetly! And more, a parrot, along with his mistress, wanders in a row of *bakula* trees, his flight burdened from drinking the sweet nectar of hundreds of opened buds, filled with liqueur-like honey! And the double-jasmine flower, decorated with buzzing bees all about, desirous of the liquor from the young flower buds. And the heavy vines replete with dark leaves that cause the *cakravāka* birds, distrustful of the night, to neglect their union even during the day. [That day] with its showers of sweet water being drunk by beautiful young *cātaka* birds, greedy for the arising of new clouds. And these *bāla* and *tamāla* saplings, to which circles of peacocks are offering a dance, their mouths open, trumpeting.

Flowers oozing with ambrosial nectar, with desirous bees buzzing about. Parrots engorged and drunk—unable to fly—because they have consumed too much intoxicating honey. Birds of different species pining after their lovers or confused about the time of day because of the lushness of the garden. The comedic aspects of this passage lie in its being so overwrought, particularly with its focus on drunkenness, liquor, sap, and water. The passage makes one feel almost literally engorged and sticky; there is simply too much going on to adequately convey the delicateness of eroticism. Indeed, this sense of over-the-top (and ultimately failed) eroticism is driven home when the reader finds out that many of the “erotic” pleasures described in the pleasure forest do not even occur naturally, but are, instead, man-made. In the second act, two garden superintendents are tasked with ornamenting the pleasure forest,

creating, among other things, fake streams and beaches made from the pollen of *ketakī* flowers.

Prahasita also injects the opening acts of the drama with humour by twisting Pavanañjaya's words to be explicitly sexual. For example, when Pavanañjaya exclaims the beauty of a double-jasmine flower twisting around the trunk of a *tamāla* tree, Prahasita responds: "Why do you not speak clearly? Obviously, what you mean to say is that Añjanā herself should surround Pavanañjaya!" What's more, the *vidūṣaka* spends most of his time in the second act attempting to lure one of Añjanā's maidservants, Vasantamālā, into sleeping with him. First, he rolls around on a bed, impersonating an aroused monkey; then he claims that he is afraid to sleep alone, and therefore requires Vasantamālā's company. The maidservant rebuffs Prahasita's advances, taking her own humorous shots at him—as when she compares his rotund stomach to a drum. This exaggerated sexuality and the overall humorous mood to which it contributes establishes the first two acts of the drama as farcical—a far cry from the pitiable mood that dominates Raviṣeṇa's earlier version of the narrative.

This is not to say that all of the humour in the first two acts of the drama revolves around sex. Take, for example, the following conversation between Pavanañjaya and Amātya, a royal messenger who has come to Añjanā's and Pavanañjaya's pleasure-forest. The messenger intends to inform Pavanañjaya that Rāvaṇa has summoned King Prahlāda to serve as an intermediary in his ongoing war with the *vidyādhara* Varuṇa, and that Pavanañjaya must therefore take charge of the kingdom.

Amātya: The prince has heard that on the Trikūṭa Mountain, located in the southern sea, the lord of the Rakṣasas, known by the name Daśagrīva, inhabits the city of Laṅkā.

Pavanañjaya: It is true, I have heard.

Amātya: And between him and Varuṇa, who resides in the city of Pātāla, itself situated in western sea, there is great animosity.

Pavanañjaya: Yes, yes.

Amātya: And then, Daśagrīva released the Daṇḍacakra weapon towards the great king Varuṇa, who was being besieged by Kharadūṣaṇa, among others...

Pavanañjaya: And...

Amātya: And in the ensuing battle, Kharadūṣaṇa and the rest of them were captured by Varuṇa...

Pavanañjaya: And...

Amātya: And thus, Daśāsya is bearing a loss of honor and is thus requesting the Mahārāja to serve as an ambassador to free Kharadūṣaṇa...

Pavanañjaya: And...

Amātya: And, thus, the Mahārāja who has been summoned, having called the prince to protect the city, and having made himself ready for departure, will thus commence with his own mission!

(Act II, Hastimalla and Patwardhan 1950: 33–34)

Pavanañjaya is toying with the messenger here, perturbed that his time with Añjanā has been interrupted and will come to an untimely end because of his father's request. But Pavanañjaya's frequent interruptions of Amātya, which only *encourage* Amātya to continue, are pointedly comedic. Pavanañjaya's exasperation is transferred to Amātya, who himself becomes exasperated with being interrupted from delivering his message.

Hastimalla further proves himself a capable playwright throughout the rest of the drama, deftly incorporating a number of *rasas* into the story. Act III is dominated by *śṛṅgāra rasa* (the erotic sentiment) of both classical types: love-in-separation (*vipralambha*) and love-in-union (*sambhoga*). The act opens—in a reflection of Raviṣeṇa's account—with Pavanañjaya four months into a slow-going war. Taking temporary respite on the bank of lotus pond, he witnesses a female *cakravāka* bird mourning being separated from her mate and, in turn, longs for Añjanā. *Karuṇa* (the pathos-evoking sentiment) dominates much of Act V, set another four months later, where Pavanañjaya learns that his mother ordered the pregnant Añjanā be sent back to her natal home, but that Añjanā refused and chose instead to enter the terrifying Mātāṅgamālinī forest. Pavanañjaya faints upon hearing this news but, after regaining his composure, vows to rescue his wife and enters the forest himself. *Karuṇa* continues in the beginning of Act VI, as Pavanañjaya, at this point seemingly mad, roams the forest asking different plants and animals if they have information on the whereabouts of his beloved.<sup>16</sup> The act ends, though, with *adbhuta* (the wondrous sentiment), as Pavanañjaya is miraculously found in the forest by Pratisūrya, in whose home Añjanā happens to be currently staying. Añjanā and Pavanañjaya are reunited, much to their delight.

Act VII features a veritable panoply of *rasas*. *Adbhuta* continues in the preliminary scene, where preparations are being made for Pavanañjaya's royal consecration. In the main scene, Pavanañjaya, Añjanā, Vasantamālā, and Prahasita all comment on their lucky fate in being reunited. Then the emotional tenor of the act shifts, as Pratisūrya enters and begins to recount Añjanā's and Vasantamālā's time in the Mātāṅgamālinī

<sup>16</sup> Patwardhan points out that this passage is based on act IV of Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaśīya* (1950: 18).

forest. In Pratisūrya's account, Amitagati, a Jain ascetic living in the forest, assuages their fear and suffering for a moment, assuring them that their tribulations will soon come to an end. (We recall that Amitagati plays a similar role in Raviṣeṇa's telling, though, as I will explain later, it is important that Hastimalla introduces Amitagati only at the end of the play.) A sudden attack by a fearsome lion injects Pratisūrya's story with a flash of *bhayānaka rasa* (the terrifying sentiment). Then, as he tells it, the women's frightened cries attract the attention of a Gandharva king named Maṇicūḍa, who valiantly slays the lion—there's our *vīra rasa* (heroic sentiment)—and rescues the women, bringing them back to the safety of his palace. *Adbhuta* again returns to the fore at the conclusion of Pratisūrya's narration, where he again recounts finding Pavanañjaya in the forest and facilitating his reunion with Añjanā.<sup>17</sup> The drama ends with the Gandharva king Maṇicūḍa crowning Pavanañjaya as sovereign of the Vijayārdha mountain.

### *Analyzing and Understanding Añjanāpavanañjaya*

We now turn our attention to thinking about how the reader or viewer of the *Añjanāpavanañjaya* is meant to experience the play as a whole. As we saw earlier, Patwardhan (1950) and Warder (2004) approach Hastimalla's work through the lens of classical Sanskrit drama. As A. Berriedale Keith points out in his *The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development, Theory and Practice*, every play should have a dominant (or *aṅgī*) *rasa*, a single sentiment that the viewer ultimately relishes. Additional *rasas* should be engendered throughout the play, but those should function in service of the eventual dominant sentiment. Further, Keith points out that for the *nāṭaka*,<sup>18</sup> which is the dramatic genre (*rūpaka*) of the *Añjanāpavanañjaya*, only two sentiments are appropriate to function as dominant: *śṛṅgāra* and *vīra*, the erotic and the heroic (2015 [1998]: 325). With respect first to *śṛṅgāra*, it is readily apparent that there is nothing

<sup>17</sup> This aligns with Bharata's maxim in *Nāṭyaśāstra* XX.46: "At the conclusion of all the plays which contain various States and Sentiments, experts should always introduce the Marvellous Sentiment" (Tr. Ghosh 1950: 362).

<sup>18</sup> In *Nāṭyaśāstra* XX.10-12 Bharata provides a definition of *nāṭaka* by explaining what it should contain. The subject matter should be a well-known story, and the hero a "celebrated person of exalted nature." The *nāṭaka* may also focus on "a person descending from a royal seer, divine protection [for him], his many super-human powers, and [his] various exploits," both heroic and amorous. Finally, the *nāṭaka* should have an "appropriate" number of acts (*aṅka*) and introductory scenes (*praveśaka*) (Tr. Ghosh: 356).

particularly erotic about the ending of the *Añjanāpavanañjaya*. Though Añjanā and Pavanañjaya are both present and together in the final act, they are surrounded by friends, family, and the general excitement and freneticism inherent to a coronation. Bharata (*Nāṭyaśāstra* VI.45) says of *sambhoga śrīṅgāra* (the erotic-in-union):

Of these two, the Erotic Sentiment in union arises from Determinants like the pleasures of the season, the enjoyment of garlands unguents, ornaments, (the company of) beloved persons, objects [of the senses], splendid mansions, going to a garden, and enjoying [oneself] there, seeing the [beloved one], hearing [his or her words], playing and dallying [with him or her]. It should be represented on stage by...[the] clever movement of eyes, eyebrows, glances, soft and delicate movement of limbs, and sweet words and similar other things (Tr. Ghosh 1950: 108–109).

None of this seems to apply to the ending of the *Añjanāpavanañjaya*. Indeed, there is very little eroticism in the play after act III.

What about *vīra*? *Nāṭyaśāstra* VI.67–68 explains that *vīra* “arises from energy, perseverance, optimism, absence of surprises, and presence of mind and [such other] conditions [of the spirit]. [It] is to be properly represented on the stage by firmness, patience, heroism, pride, energy, aggressiveness, influence, and censuring words” (Tr. Ghosh 1950: 114). This description better aligns with the conclusion of the *Añjanāpavanañjaya*, where the audience witnesses Pavanañjaya crowned sovereign. And, importantly, he is now *ready* to step into his rightful role as king. Gone is the carefree prince of the first two acts of the play; in fact, the reader comes to understand the humour of the first two acts as a signpost of Pavanañjaya’s immaturity. By the conclusion of the drama, though, Pavanañjaya has matured. He is hardened both in battle and in life. He has persevered through the trials that fate has thrown at him and emerged—wife, son, and extended family by his side—ready to undertake the necessities of sovereign rule. Pavanañjaya faces what is no doubt an uncertain future with a firm resolve and resolute mind. He is the steady hero, *vīra* personified.

We could leave our analysis here: Hastimalla has, in the end, crafted a fine drama, the plot of which draws on the rich history of Jain *purāṇic* literature and which ends on a depiction of stalwart, placid heroism. However, I argue that the attentive reader—particularly the kind of reader who is knowledgeable of and oriented towards a Jain vision of the ephemeral world of samsara, dictated by the impenetrable workings of karma—may be left unsatisfied with this analysis. The drama’s conclusion is too neat, too perfectly wrapped up in a tidy bow. The characters’ flippant discussion of their own ultimate good fortune rings as immature to such a reader, who might well ask: is the next shoe about to drop

for Añjanā and Pavanañjaya? Instead of being imbued with pure *vīra rasa*, then, this reader is left with a sense of *vairāgya*, a knowledge of the futility of continued worldly existence and the endless suffering it entails.

In this light, the reader of the play may question the depiction of Pavanañjaya's heroism. True, Pavanañjaya plays a crucial role in Rāvaṇa's war with Varuṇa, but he is not really the hero of his own story. He valiantly searches the forest for Añjanā and ultimately achieves his goal of being reunited with her—this is the *phalāgama*, a necessary aspect of all classical Sanskrit dramas<sup>19</sup>—but he is not truly responsible for her rescue, and in fact he requires rescuing himself!

Through this lens the reader comes to a different understanding of how humour really operates in the first two acts of the play. Now the humour not only highlights Pavanañjaya's immaturity, but it also works to draw in the reader and set them at ease. When Pavanañjaya must go off to war so soon after his and Añjanā's wedding, the rug is pulled out from the blissful couple—and the audience as well. There is a brief respite in witnessing the couple's fleeting overnight reunion, but this of course sets in motion further, even worse, suffering for both Añjanā and Pavanañjaya. The constant vacillation between the highs of loving (sometimes erotic) bliss and the lows of frightening and dangerous solitariness are exhausting, and the reader reaches the end of the play wondering if Añjanā and Pavanañjaya are, to put it cheekily, really out of the woods. Yes, the couple has persevered through trials and tribulation, but can their current happiness be a lasting one, or is their next precipitous drop in fortune—dictated by inscrutable karma and fate—just around the proverbial corner? For the reader the next logical step in this line of questioning is: is this also true of my own life?

Importantly, the humour of the play's first two acts also adjusts the object of readerly sympathy. In Raviṣeṇa's *Padmapurāṇa*, the reader feels sympathy only for Añjanā: she alone is the unjust recipient of first Pavanañjaya's and then her mother-in-law's anger and mistrust. In Hastimalla's play, though, Pavanañjaya becomes part of the unit of readerly sympathy. He is no longer a cold and distant husband whose marriage is arranged. Rather, he is a love-struck newlywed, torn from his new wife by the demands of filial responsibility and kingly *dharma*. He is also a victim of Ketumatī's rash decision to banish Añjanā from the kingdom, and he suffers just as much pain in being separated from his wife as Añjanā does being separated from him. No doubt contributing to the reader's experience of *vairāgya*, this adjustment brings into bold

<sup>19</sup> For more on this, particularly with respect to Jain-authored dramas, see Restifo 2017.

relief the truth of suffering in samsara. Even in our most joyous times, existence in samsara is marked by the lurking possibility of indiscriminate and unpredictable suffering.

Finally, there are two aspects of *Añjanāpavanañjaya*'s final act, in particular, that I think lend credence to this reading of the play as a whole as pushing the reader to experience *vairāgya*. The first is Hanumān's very presence in the drama's finale. While the play ends during Hanumān's early childhood, anyone familiar with the history of Jain *Rāmāyaṇa* narratives knows that the *vidyādhara*, after helping Rāma defeat Rāvaṇa and save Sītā, eventually takes renunciation as a Jain monk:

Hanumān cast aside his crown, earrings, garlands, ornaments, clothes, and mental distractions. He had broken the fetter of sexual attraction to women, had destroyed the dark masses born from attachment, had cut away the snare of love, and had rejected physical comfort, which he viewed as poison. Holding the lamp of unattachment (*vairāgya*), he cast out the darkness of delusion, seeing the delicate body as nothing more than dust. He plucked the hair from his head with his delicate, lotus-like fingers and, in this way, he was free from all passions, attracted only to the good fortune that is liberation [from samsara]. Embracing great vows and filled with auspicious detachment, Hanumān shone resplendently (*Padmapurāṇa* CXIII.31–35).

While the *Añjanāpavanañjaya* does not cover that part of Hanumān's later life, the text is still inextricably embedded within the larger web of Jain narratives about the life of Rāma's sidekick—the play forms part of the larger “common pool” of Jain *Rāmāyaṇas*.<sup>20</sup> Seeing Hanumān in the final act of the drama, then, triggers the reader (or viewer) to consider Hanumān's eventual fate. The play ends depicting a loving family, but of course the reader knows that that family does not—cannot—last forever, and that Hanumān eventually finds lasting solace only in renunciation.

Second is the fact that Hastimalla chooses to introduce Añjanā's meeting with the ascetic Amitagati only at the very end the play. In Raviṣeṇa's *Padmapurāṇa*, the reader follows Añjanā's trials chronologically as she experiences them: we learn about her fearsome experience in the forest and her meeting with Amitagati *before* she is rescued. Hastimalla changes this timeline; the reader hears about her experience with the ascetic *after* her rescue. This allows Hastimalla to introduce the character of the serene Jain ascetic at the end of the drama, and, in doing so, he juxtaposes the precarious happiness of Añjanā and Pavanañjaya—still enmeshed in the transitory world, vacillating between pleasure and pain—with the more consistent and persistent happiness of the ascetic committed to escaping the suffering of the world of samsara. The

<sup>20</sup> See Ramanujan 1991:46.

ultimate alleviation of Añjanā's suffering was right in front of her, but she failed to recognise it, and, consequently, both she and Pavanañjaya have instead fallen back and recommitted themselves to worldly pursuits. For the attentive and knowledgeable reader, then, Hastimalla skillfully sandwiches Añjanā's and Pavanañjaya's temporary happiness between examples of the more ultimate satisfaction of renunciation: Amitagati's in the present and Hanumān's in the future.

Anne E. Monius has written that all Jain poetic narrative—including, I think it is safe to say, Jain drama—ends in the evocation of *śānta rasa*, the quiescent sentiment epitomised by “the renunciation and liberation of the hero from worldly life, his escape from the eternal miseries of embodied rebirth and redeath” (2015: 162). Monius is certainly correct here in pointing out that Jain narrative has historically focused on pushing its readers towards the path of liberation from *samsara* and providing those readers with motivation for doing so. Renunciation and *mokṣa* seem to be consistently at the forefront of Jain authors' thinking. Building on Monius's claim, I would conclude that while *śānta rasa* itself is not explicitly engendered at the end of the *Añjanāpavanañjaya*, there are clues in the play that point the knowledgeable reader towards the experience *vairāgya* and the ideal of renunciation.

## Conclusion

Hastimalla's act of literary transcreation in composing the *Añjanāpavanañjaya* reveals a creative orientation towards both the lineage of Jain *purāṇic* literature from which he drew and the tradition of Sanskrit dramatic theory of which he was clearly knowledgeable. Hastimalla was willing to make substantive changes to the “classical” story of Añjanā and Pavanañjaya in order for it to better align with what an audience would expect from a Sanskrit drama during this period. At the same time, by composing a drama that could be read as engendering either *vīra rasa* or *vairāgya*, Hastimalla demonstrates a willingness to playfully bend the theoretical “rules” of *nāṭaka*. What's more, Hastimalla does not seem to be the only Jain playwright to be interested in this project. Aleksandra Restifo, for example, has discussed similar “complex interactions between the regulations of Sanskrit poetics and Jain religious imperatives” in her treatment of Śīlaṅkasūri's ninth-century *Vibudhānanda* (2017: 2). In thinking about the larger project of Jain literary transcreation, Jain-authored drama remains an understudied area, and avenues of future research remain abundant.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- Bharata Muni. *The Nāṭyaśāstra: A Treatise on Hindu Dramaturgy and Histrionics Ascribed the Bharata Muni, Vol. 1 (Chapters I–XXVII)*. Translated by Manomohan Ghosh. Calcutta: The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1950.
- Hastimalla. *Śrīhastimallaviracitam Vikrāntakaurava: Sulocanāparanāmakam nāṭakam*. Edited by Manoharalāla Śāstrin. Bombay: Māṇikacandra Digambara Jaina Granthamāla Samiti, 1915.
- Hastimalla. *Śrīhastimallaviracitaṃ Maithilīkalyāṇam nāṭakam*. Edited by Manoharalāla Śāstrin. Bombay: Māṇikacandra Digambara Jaina Granthamāla Samiti, 1916.
- Hastimalla. *The Añjanāpavanañjaya and Subhadrānāṭikā of Hastimalla*. Edited by M.V. Patwardhan. Bombay: Māṇikachandra Digambara Jain Granthamāla Samiti, 1950.
- Hastimalla. *Kavivaraśrīhastimallaviracitam Vikrāntakauravam*. Edited with a Hindi translation by Pannālāla Jain. Vārāṇasī: Caukhambā Saṃskṛta Sīrīja Āfisa, 1969.
- Raviṣeṇācārya. *Padmapurāṇa*. 3 Vols. Edited with a Hindi translation by Pannālāl Jain. New Delhi: Bharatīya Jñānapīṭh, 1958–1959.

### Secondary Sources

- Brockington, John. “Re-creation, refashioning, rejection, response...: how the narrative developed.” *The Other Rāmāyaṇa Women: Regional Rejection and Response*. Eds. John Brockington & Mary Brockington with Mandakranta Bose, 1–17. London & New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Brockington, Mary. “Betrayed by the beloved: lustful wives and devoted mothers in the Jain Rāmāyaṇas.” *The Other Rāmāyaṇa Women: Regional Rejection and Response*. Eds. John Brockington & Mary Brockington with Mandakranta Bose, 31–43. London & New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Clines, Gregory M. *Jain Rāmāyaṇa Narratives: Moral Vision and Literary Innovation*. London & New York: Routledge, 2022.
- Keith, A. Berriedale. *The Sanskrit Drama: in its Origin, Development, Theory and Practice*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, 2015 [1998].
- Kelting, M. Whitney. *Heroic Wives: Rituals, Stories, and the Virtues of Jain Wifehood*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Monius, Anne E. “‘And We Shall Compose a Poem to Establish These Truths’: The Power of Narrative Art in South Asian Literature Cultures.” *Narrative, Philosophy, and Life*. Ed. Allen Speight, 151–65. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2015.

- Patwardhan, M.V. "Introduction." *The Añjanāpavanañjaya and Subhadrānāṭikā of Hastimalla*. By Prof. M.V. Patwardhan, 1–62. Bombay: Māṅikachandra Digambara Jain Granthamālā Samiti, 1950.
- Pollock, Sheldon. *A Rasa Reader: Classical Indian Aesthetics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.
- Ramanujan, A.K. "Three Hundred *Rāmāyaṇas*: Five Examples and Three Thoughts on Translation." *Many Rāmāyaṇas: The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia*. Ed. Paula Richman, 22–49. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991.
- Restifo, Aleksandra. "A Sanskrit Play without a Happy Ending: The *Vibudhānanda* of the Jain monk Śīlaṅkasūrī." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Asian Studies, 2017.
- Sastri, K.A. Nilakanta. *A History of South India: From Prehistoric Times to the Fall of Vijayanagar*. Fourth Edition. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2019 [1955].
- Vaidya, P.L. "On the Use of Prakrit Dialects in Sanskrit Dramas." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 33, 1 (1952) 15–25.
- Warder, A.K. *Indian Kāvya Literature, Volume VII, Part II, The Wheel of Time*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, 2004.