

On the allegorization of action for health*

ANTHONY CERULLI
Hobart & William Smith Colleges

On the cusp of the 17-18th centuries in Thanjavur, South India, during the reign of the Maratha king Śāhaji (1684-1712), Ānandarāya Makhin produced a seven-act allegorical play called the *Jīvānandanam*, or *The Joy of Life*. In the play's *bhūmikā* we learn that Ānandarāya prepared *The Joy of Life* for live performance at the Bṛhadīśvara Temple Festival in Thanjavur. As a dramatic piece about the relationship between the cultural domains of religion and medicine, *The Joy of Life* is entirely unique in the history of Sanskrit literature. Moreover, innovations in Ānandarāya's play, including the melding of ayurvedic medicine and Hindu religious practice so that care of the body is a necessary precondition for optimal religious practice, position *The Joy of Life* within the dynamic period of Sanskrit literary production between 1550-1750 on the Indian subcontinent, when writers fashioned innovative scientific and literary techniques and produced cross-disciplinary works.¹

The Joy of Life develops simultaneously on two planes: inside and outside of the body of the play's hero, King Life (Jīvarāja). Each character in the play represents an element of the human body, intellect, or emotion while simultaneously playing a part in an imperial Indian court. Throughout the play Ānandarāya concurrently captures both settings—human body and royal court—with the Sanskrit term *puram*. Quite apart from its appeal as a clever, funny, and at

* An earlier version of this paper was read at the Classical Ayurveda Text Study Group's panel "The Transmission of Sanskrit Medical Literature in India", convened by Kenneth Zysk in the framework of the International Asian Dynamics Initiative Conference "Asian Diversity in a Global Context", University of Copenhagen, November 12 to 13, 2010.

1 The two centuries leading up to British colonialism in South Asia was the topic of a multi-scholar, multi-year project led by Sheldon Pollock, "Sanskrit Knowledge Systems on the Eve of Colonialism," which produced numerous outstanding articles on this vibrant period in Sanskrit literary production. For project details and open access to some of the articles, see <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mea/mealac/pollock/sks/index.html>

times bawdy Sanskrit drama, *The Joy of Life* offers a novel and (in the idiom of the modern university) multidisciplinary message: viz., the biophysiology of an individual body affects, communicates with, and is under the influence of the larger cultural physiology of its surroundings and all of the complicated ideologies and institutions that constitute culture. Endemic to the human condition, in other words, there is an ongoing series of collisions between an individual and society. And how people act in the world and negotiate these collisions impacts their physical wellbeing. This is precisely the lesson King Life learns in the play, for the wellbeing of his body and royal court is contingent upon the ways in which he engages and/or disengages from the activities around him. This task is not easy for King Life, for in addition to upholding the complex *dharma* of a king, he is under attack by the vile King Disease (Rājayakṣman) and his infectious cohort.²

In what follows I examine a power struggle that unfolds between King Life's two chief advisors, Vijñānaśarman and Jñānaśarman, and explore the ways in which the positions they encourage elucidate Ānandarāya's vision of a well-balanced and healthy life. On the one hand, Vijñānaśarman advises King Life to hold fast to his domestic duties of statecraft and military defense, while on the other hand Jñānaśarman endorses a life of austere religious commitment and asceticism. The behavioral models of King Life's advisors, I suggest, may be read as two sides of an allegorical trope carefully crafted by the playwright to illustrate a fundamental dichotomy of Indian religious thought, *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti*, or "outward-focused action" and "inward-focused action." This allegorical trope presents Ānandarāya's audience with a poetics of practice about the complexities and responsibilities of human life. In the course of the play, as King Life's advisors debate their positions, and the king engages in both social engagement and ascetic withdrawal, the playwright carefully mounts the argument that a life calibrated by both outward-focused and inward-focused actions leads to bodily wellbeing and, ultimately, the joy of life of the play's title.

In the next section, I briefly look at allegory in Sanskrit literature in order to situate *The Joy of Life* historically in relation to works of literature on which Ānandarāya drew inspiration for his play. I then discuss the concepts of *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* and, presenting examples from Act 6 of *The Joy of Life*, explore how these ideas are allegorized in the characters Vijñānaśarman and

2 For the past two centuries, translators of Sanskrit into English have rendered the term *yakṣman* as "consumption" and, more recently, "tuberculosis." The most adequate rendering of the term into English is simply "disease," in that a *yakṣman* in the Āyurvedic tradition may be of many types and occur in many locations in the body – hence the translation here, King Disease.

Jñānaśarman. I conclude with a brief reflection on the general symbolism of the king as a model for healthcare in a play designed for live performance.

Allegory in Sanskrit literature

In the history of Sanskrit rhetoric and hermeneutics, only recently do we find a term denoting the structural feature of narrative that is equivalent to the western category of allegory.³ For example, in 1962 Saroja Agravāla used the Hindi term *rūpak-nāṭak*, “metaphorical drama” (from the Sanskrit *rūpaka-nāṭaka*) to describe Kṛṣṇamiśra's famous 11th century work, the *Prabodhacandrodaya*. More recently, Matthew Kapstein noted that Gāyatrī Devī Bakhśī coined the Sanskrit term *pratīka-nāṭaka*, “symbolic drama,” to classify Vedāntadeśika's 14th century opus, the *Samkalpasūryodaya*. That said, while the *Prabodhacandrodaya* is the earliest full-length Sanskrit allegorical drama, Kṛṣṇamiśra was not the first writer of Sanskrit to employ so-called allegorical techniques.

Allegorization occurs in Sanskrit literature from very early on. The *Śvetāśvatara* (4.6-7) and *Muṇḍaka* (3.1) *Upaniṣads*, for example, allegorize the story of the two birds in Book 1 of the *Ṛgveda* (1.164.20) to represent the opposing notions of materiality and spirit (or *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*). In the *Kuvalayānandakārikā* (v. 23) Appaya Dīkṣita called this type of one-for-one equation *samāsokti*, “abbreviated speech,” to denote the literary act of describing something present (the birds) while conveying a message about an abstraction or something not present (materiality and spirit).⁴ A “trope of abbreviation,” as Sheldon Pollock has called it, *samāsokti* involves the implicit characterization of something to be signified while explicitly describing only the literal source. It is a brief or isolated tactic in Sanskrit composition, however, not a structural feature with which to describe an entire narrative.⁵

Around the 1-2nd centuries C.E. we find allegorization in the fragments of Aśvaghōṣa's *Buddhacarita* in the three characters Fame (Kīrti), Firmness (Dhṛti), and Wisdom (Buddhi). In the 9th century C.E., Jayanta Bhaṭṭa (au-

3 From the Greek *allēgoria*, meaning “speaking about something else.”

4 Saroja Agravāla, *Prabodhacandrodaya aur uskī Hindī paramparā*. Āgarā Viśvavidyālaya kī Ph.D. (Prayāj: Hindī Sāhitya Sammelan, 1962).

5 Kapstein (trans., *The Rise of Wisdom Moon by Krishna-mishra* [New York: New York University Press and JJC Foundation, 2009], xxxii-xxxiii, lviii fn. 7) cites the following work of a literary critic using the term *pratīkanāṭaka* to mean allegory: *Gāyatrī Devī Bakhśī, Saṃskṛt ke pratīk nāṭak ke rūp mein śrī Vedāntadeśika kṛt Samkalpasūryodaya ek adhyayan* (Jaipur: Samghī Prakāśan, 1993).

thor of the *Nyāyamañjari*) wrote a highly didactic and philosophical play, the *Āgamaḍambara*, which contains substantial allegorical ornamentation. After Kṛṣṇamiśra's *Prabodhacandrodaya*, other Sanskrit allegories appeared, such as Yaśapāla's *Mohaparājaya*, Kaṇapūra's *Caitanyacandrodaya*, and two works attributed to Ānandarāya Makhin, *Jīvānandanam* and *Vidyāpariṇayam*.

Why opt for allegory to convey a philosophical dichotomy like *pravṛtti-nivṛtti*? It is, after all, a somewhat inelegant literary method to wax philosophical. Matthew Kapstein recently argued that allegory “suffers from the constraint of its major premise, for it must tell a story that is in fact a second story, a double task restricting the author’s free creation and often lending to allegorical works a rigid, contrived quality.”⁶ It is true that inherent to the genre there are handicaps, and there are contrivances in Ānandarāya’s work. Yet, where Kapstein sees a constraint on creativity, I read *The Joy of Life* as a highly creative work by a writer who succeeds to an astonishing degree both to entertain his audience and elucidate abstract subjects. Indeed, Ānandarāya appears to be freer creatively in this text, where he interweaves lessons from Āyurveda, Nītiśāstra, and Bhakti literature, than in his other allegory, *Vidyāpariṇayam* (*The Nuptials of Knowledge*), where he is constrained by the tradition of the nondualist school of Advaita Vedānta. Ānandarāya tells not just a first and a second story in *The Joy of Life*. He actually tells three stories at once—one medical, one political, and one religious. He undergirds all three with a poetics of everyday practice: human society, he teaches us, operates best when individuals understand and counterpoise numerous courses of action in their lives.⁷

Pravṛtti–nivṛtti & vijñānaśarman-jñānaśarman

Threaded throughout *The Joy of Life*’s multilayered narrative is the notion of *vṛtti*—“action” (also “moving,” “practice,” “behavior” and “being”). Add the prefixes *pra-* and *ni-* to *vṛtti*, and the course of action implied by the new terms

6 Matthew Kapstein (trans.), *The Rise of Wisdom Moon by Krishna-mishra* (New York: New York University Press and JJC Foundation, 2009), xxxiv.

7 To this end, Ānandarāya’s writing also resembles “simultaneous narration,” *śleṣa*, which, according to Yigal Bronner, “typically involves a metamorphosis of the entire utterance—nouns, verbs, and prepositions—in a way that creates a new sentence with a new vocabulary, a new syntax, and, obviously, a new meaning” (*Extreme Poetry: The South Asian Movement of Simultaneous Narration*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 181.

presents a contrast between the outward expression of action, or a “turning forward” to the world—*pravṛtti*—and a relinquishment of action in the world, or “turning back” onto oneself—*nivṛtti*. I translate these types of action as “outward-focused” (*pravṛtti*) and “inward-focused” (*nivṛtti*). Early in his research on *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti*, Greg Bailey interpreted these two terms as mutually exclusive and opposing ideologies. He initially thought *pravṛtti* pertained to the life-station of the householder, *nivṛtti* to the renouncer.⁸ Over time he reformulated his position, rightly on my view, to suggest that instead of two polar ideologies, *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* in fact represent two ideal types that make sense only in relation to one another, and offer “a total world view consisting of two related, if opposite, perceptions of how the world and the person [operate].”⁹ Which is to say that both concepts pertain to all people irrespective of their life station.

The arc of King Life's life in Ānandarāya's play is a narrative lesson on the need to establish complementarity between *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* in one's lifetime. We observe the king alternate between active upkeep and defense of his fortress-body (*puram*) and withdrawal from these engagements to perform religious austerities in the Lotus City (Puṇḍarīkapuram). The course of action King Life takes is determined by the guidance of his two primary advisors. On the one hand, in the course of the play Ānandarāya tells us that Vijñānaśarman, “Social-knowledge” in my translation, is an advisor on the three aims of life (*traivargika*). The three aims here refer to the first of the three *puruṣārthas* (*kāma*, *artha*, and *dharma*), and they pertain to one's present lifetime, experience, and responsibilities in Hindu society. On the other hand, the playwright explains that Jñānaśarman, rendered here as “Ascetic-knowledge,” is an advisor on matters pertaining to the termination of *saṃsāra* (*apavargika*), or *mokṣa*, release from the cycle of rebirth and redeath. The Sanskrit word *śarman*, meaning “joy, delight, comfort, bliss,” is a common suffix added to names of members of the Brahman class (in the same way, for example, that *varman* is frequently added to the names of Kṣatriyas and *gupta* to Vaiśyas). For the purpose of economy in my translation, I take the term *śarman* in the names of King Life's advisors to be designations of their Brahman class affiliation,

8 Greg Bailey, *Materials for the Study of Ancient Indian Ideologies*; *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* (Torino: *Indologica Taurinensia* 19, 1985), 17-22.

9 Greg Bailey, “The *pravṛtti/nivṛtti* project at La Trobe University with Notes on the Meaning of *vṛt* in the *Bhagavadgītā*” (Torino: *Indologica Taurinensia* 29, 2003), 13. See also Matthew Kapstein's recent discussion of *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti*, which is similar to Bailey's characterization, as “complementary facets of a common ideology” (2009, lix, fn. 13).

and do not translate this term. Other common meanings of *śarman* include “shelter, protection, and refuge,” and some have suggested the term is related to the word *śarīra*, “body.” One could translate the names of King Life’s advisors in a literal, but ultimately unusable way for publication, with these definitions in mind as: Vijñānaśarman – “He for whom refuge is Social-knowledge” or “He for whom there is Comfort in Social-knowledge” – and Jñānaśarman – “He for whom refuge is Ascetic-knowledge” or “He for whom there is comfort in Ascetic-knowledge.” It is useful to know the breadth of the term *śarman* as it applies to these two critical players in *The Joy of Life*. Their differing types of knowledge and expertise provide some context for the important directives they offer the king in the play. Yet, for a complete understanding of the play, at bottom, readers need to know that the two Śarmans advising the king are Brahmins. What is more, to cultivate reader appreciation for the play and the playwright’s literary skill, Ānandarāya’s allegorical design and description of these two central characters through the dialogue of other characters in the play is paramount. Ultimately Ānandarāya designed Social-knowledge and Ascetic-knowledge, and the positions they defend, as allegorical tropes on outward-focused action (*pravṛtti*) and inward-focused action (*nivṛtti*) respectively, with the message that when there is equilibrium between the two types of knowledge, there is balanced action in one’s life directed towards society and oneself. An overarching message to the entire play is that this balance in turn produces somatic wellbeing. Of course, bodily wellbeing is essential to clear thinking and peak performance, and Ānandarāya has a way of addressing that, too. He develops what I have elsewhere described as a uniquely medical “body *dharma*,” which is rooted in the Sanskrit literature of Āyurveda.¹⁰

Act 6: *pravṛtti–nivṛtti* in *The joy of life*

Act 6 of *The Joy of Life* begins with a dialogue between two attendants in King Life’s court, Time (Kāla) and Action (Karma), in which Time recounts a conversation between King Life and Ascetic-knowledge. At this point in the play, King Life is noticeably suffering from the attack of King Disease’s army. In the preceding act, we learned that several soldiers of King Disease,

10 See, for example: Anthony Cerulli, “Religio-Medical Perspectives on the Body, Self, and Embodiment in Āyurveda.” In *Refiguring the Body: Embodiment in South Asian Religions*, Barbara Holdrege and Karen Pechilis (eds.). Albany: State University of New York Press, forthcoming.

such as Leprosy (Kuṣṭha), Diarrhea (Atīsāra), Goiter (Galagaṇḍa), and others, had managed to diminish King Life's vitality while, rather than attending to the affairs of his court, he was residing quietly in the Lotus City doing yoga and meditation. As Social-knowledge exits the stage to check on the condition of his army's defense against King Disease's chief lieutenant, Prince Palid (Pāṇḍu), Ascetic-knowledge sneaks into the king's chambers. King Life had not heard from Ascetic-knowledge in a while and is pleased to see him. The king expresses regret for stopping his spiritual exercises in the Lotus City, which Ascetic-knowledge encouraged, to follow the counsel of Social-knowledge, who had convinced him that his obligation as a king, his *rājadharma*, was to be fully present in his court, especially at a time of war.

Time tells Action that Ascetic-knowledge felt rejected when King Life chose to follow Social-knowledge, so he left the court. Having learnt that the army of Disease was beginning to weaken the king, however, Ascetic-knowledge decided he must convince the king once and for all that thrusting one's body into action in the world—*pravṛtti*—is treacherous business and should be forsaken. Ānandarāya's personification of *nivṛtti* in the character of Ascetic-knowledge and *pravṛtti* in the character of Social-knowledge, and their opposing natures, takes shape in the following exchange between Time and Action:

*TIME: [quoting ASCETIC-KNOWLEDGE speaking to KING LIFE]
Because of the miserable advice of Social-knowledge, you have unduly reached this wretched night. O Lord, desirous to be free of my debt to you, I therefore come now with good advice.*

ACTION: What happened next?

TIME: The king candidly replied, "Friend, Ascetic-knowledge, after a long time you have appeared! Who else but you can make me better?" And he implored, "Speak that usual good advice of yours!"

ACTION: Yes, and then what happened?

TIME: Then, drawing close to the king, Ascetic-knowledge softly explained:

Everyone knows the body is forever transitory. It is the soil that spouts evil. It is a form that consists of visceral fat, marrow,

muscle fat¹¹, bone, flesh, blood, skin, and hair.¹² In it there is excrement and urine in the viscera and cavities. For discriminating folks [the body] is ultimate suffering and should be rejected. Surely, how do those who know what is proper endure here, in this kind of hell?¹³

For Ascetic-knowledge, human life has a singular aim: release from the suffering that comes from embodiment. He proceeds to tell King Life that complete joy (*akhaṇḍānandaṃ*) is found only in *brahman*, “absolute reality,” not in the terrestrial world of humanity. Ascetic-knowledge argues that if King Life follows the guidance of Social-knowledge, he will forever be trapped in a cycle of suffering and incapable of experiencing joy.

Ascetic-knowledge has to cut short his soliloquy when he hears Social-knowledge reentering the king’s chambers. As Ascetic-knowledge sneaks off, Social-knowledge enters the stage. Immediately he can tell the king’s attitude has changed. The king suddenly appears utterly at ease and insouciant about the penetration of Disease into his fortress-body. Social-knowledge rightly sus-

11 For this term, *vasā*, in his commentary Aiyangar cites the *Suśruta Saṃhitā* as its source, although he does not provide a specific reference.

12 This octet is unusual, falling as it does somewhere between the typical seven or ten bodily constituents (*dhātus*): chyle, blood, flesh, fat, bone, marrow, semen (+ 3: hair, skin, sinews).

13 *Jīvānandanam* 6.12-13

Kālah: ...ataḥ kila –
vijñānaśarmahatakasya vṛthā kumantrair
ghorāmimāṃ sumahatīm gatam āpadam tvām /
ākarnya deva hitavāgupadeśaheto-
radyāntikaṃ tava gato ’smyanṛṇo bhubhūṣuḥ // 12 //

Karma: tatastataḥ |

Kālah: tataśca rājā saralaprakṛtitayā sakhe jñānaśarman cireṇa dṛṣṭo ’si |
tvatto ’pi me śreyassampādakaḥ ko ’nyo ’sti |
tat kathaya prastutocitaṃ hitam iti tam anvayūṅkta |

Karma: tatastataḥ |

Kālah: tato jñānaśarmā rājānamupahvare svairamitthaṃ bodhayām āsa –
śaśvannaśvaram eva viśvaviditaṃ pāpaprarohasthalaṃ
medomajjivasāsthimāmsarudhiratvagromarūpaṃ vapuḥ /
etasmīnmalamūtrabhāṇḍakuhare heye manīṣāvatām
duḥkhe nyāyavido vimohamiha ke tanvanti nanvanti // 13 //

pects that his co-advisor, Ascetic-knowledge, has been speaking with the king. Despite his current indifference, out of respect for his advisor, King Life asks Social-knowledge what the frontline of the battle looks like. As soon as he learns the situation is dire, the king's tenor changes:

*TIME: [speaking to ACTION]
Hearing this, the king remembered the words of Ascetic-knowledge. His mind oscillating between the aims of both advisors, the king resolved to act. His mouth trembling, he said:*

In every direction those diseases, sprung from crooked Wind and the others (i.e., the doṣas), are our natural enemies. Oh! How can there be proper refuge and self-sufficiency in this fortress / in this body (pure)?¹⁴

King Life briefly struggles with the opposing directives of his two advisors. Does he retreat to the Lotus City and withdrawal from the world—the path of *nivṛtti*—as Ascetic-knowledge urges? Or does he attend to his physical well-being, to his body and his subjects, and steadfastly engage the often-harmful world around him—the path of *pravṛtti*—as Social-knowledge advises? King Life knows he must act. But he struggles with how to proceed.

Time explains to Action that Social-knowledge tried once more to make the case that King Life should not abandon the helm and run off to the Lotus City. The consequences of doing so at this stage would be fatal. Then, after quietly listening to Time recount the self-reflexive struggle of their king, Action speaks up and asks an important, probing question about how the king is resolving the different courses of action he might take:

ACTION: My lord, to what extent is the opposition of Ascetic-knowledge and Social-knowledge becoming harmonized?

14 *Jīvānandanam* 6.19

Kālaḥ: ityākarnya rājā jñānaśarmavaco 'nusmarannubhayormatayorapi
dolāyamānamānasa
itikartavyatāmavyavasyannitthamākṣepamukhena vyājahāra –
nisargato ye ripavo hi hi rogā vātādibhistajjanakaiḥ samantāt /
adhiṣṭite 'smin kuṭilaiḥ prakṛtyā svāyattatā hanta katham pure naḥ // 19 //

*TIME: My friend, Ascetic-knowledge is focused on release (mokṣa); Social-knowledge is concerned with kāma, artha, and dharma. That is their opposition. Why do you ask?*¹⁵

He asks, we later learn, because he suspected that both advisors want the king to thrive. But as readers (or attendants at the live performance of this play), we know that the social withdrawal and detachment Ascetic-knowledge teaches must be tempered by some outward looking activity. For, in the previous act, Act 5, we saw that all meditation and no leadership makes King Life a sick monarch. Realizing this, King Life again gives the reins of his fortress-body (*puram*) to Social-knowledge, who orders for his army a round of a special mercury-sulphur elixir that was gifted to the king by Śiva earlier in the play. This fearsome brew boosts the immunity of King Life's armed forces, who, now reinvigorated, persevere in the battle against King Disease.

Reading Ānandarāya's play through the lens of the *pravṛtti-nivṛtti* dichotomy, the travails of King Life suggest that a host of factors determine the extent to which a person may give emphasis to one course of action vis-à-vis another in one's lifetime. These include such things as one's *dharma* apropos life station, class, caste, and the like. For Ānandarāya ultimately *bhakti*, too, must factor into the equation.

This message comes across clearly in the last act of the play, Act 7. With overtones of Kṛṣṇa's instruction to Arjuna in the *Bhagavadgītā*, in the play's final act Śiva swiftly sums up the two paths of Social-knowledge and Ascetic-knowledge, underscoring their inherently joint embodiment in humanity, while adding a third path—devotion (to Śiva, i.e., *śivabhakti*):

ŚIVA: Since the path of your dear old friend, good-hearted Ascetic-knowledge, celebrated by sages, is difficult for you to reach, always honor me. For superior combat, however, Social-knowledge is obliged to be truthful; he alone should constantly develop what is best for you in the world. Always think about Social-knowledge as being no different from Ascetic-knowledge.

15 *Jīvānandanam* 6.29

Karma: bhagavan jñānavijñānayorekarūpayor iva satoḥ kuta iyān virodhaḥ?

Kālaḥ: vatsa –

mokṣe dhīrjñānamanyatra vijñānaṃ śilpaśāstrayoḥ /
taylor virodha ity etat kim āścarya|karaṇaṃ tava // 29 //

These two are in your possession, and jointly they bring together enjoyment [in this world] and release [from saṃsāra].¹⁶

Ānandarāya then has Śiva explain that the king's fortress-body must be well maintained first and foremost for the *bhaktimārga* ("path of devotion") to be effective. With this, the poet links a duty to the health of the body with religious practice. Significantly, religious practice ensues from healthcare. Put another way, medical care ensures the ability to perform religious practice (which in this case is yoga and meditation).

Conclusion: the king's life as everyone's life

In conclusion, I would like to add a few words about the symbolism of the king. It is not inconsequential that the *pravṛtti-nivṛtti* dichotomy is superimposed on the life of a king. In premodern India many people relied on kings for protection and sustenance, and if a king went down he took many people with him. He is an important model, to be sure, one that demands attention. But King Life should not only be read as a royal sovereign of subjects and territories in *The Joy of Life*. This play was meant for a live audience of commoners from throughout South India, and the poet would have been attentive to the need to facilitate an identification of the festival audience with the play's hero. With that mind, I suggest we read King Life as a "self-sovereign," a person who is a leader unto himself. The various predicaments in which King Life finds himself in Ānandarāya's play, and especially the struggles he undergoes following the counsel of Vijñānaśarman and Jñānaśarman, collectively address basic questions arising from being human, questions with which most people are confronted at some point in their lives. How, for instance, do one superintend one's physical body while facing personal and social troubles, such as illness, mental unrest, social insecurity, and religious uncertainty? In this way the playwright's basic message of how best to comport oneself in the world—that is, Ānandarāya's poetics of practice—is certain to resonate with a lot of people.

16 *Jīvānandanam* 7.28-29

Parameśvaraḥ:

prācīnaḥ sacivaḥ priyas tava suhr̥dyo jñānaśarmā munistomasyāpi sudurlabhaḥ sa bhavatā mānyaḥ sadāhaṃ yathā / śreyassaṃghaṭanāya hanta bhavataḥ satyaṃ sa evārhati preyas tvaiḥikam ātanotu satataṃ vijñānaśarmāpi te // śaśvad jñānād abhinnaḥ san vijñānam api mānaya / evaṃ sati ghañeyātāṃ bhuktimuktī kare tava.

