CHAPTER – IV
THE COMIC CHARACTERS CREATED BY
OTHER FAMOUS DRAMATISTS IN THE
AFTERMATH OF GIRISH CHANDRA GHOSH

Amritalal, too, like Girish Chandra established himself first as a dramatic performer before writing dramas. Amritalal is one those actors who coming in contact of Girish Chandra accepted discipleship of Girish Chandra.

Inspite of being a devoted follower of Girish Chandra, Amritalal in terms of writing dramas took a different road. Girish Chandra had been overwhelmed with an ecstasy and truth searching and observing eye, but on the other hand, Amritalal used to severely mock the various discrepancies of life and society, yet having no interest for serious and grave matter and that’s why he wrote very minimum number of dramas pertaining to deep and profound ideas.¹

Kshetra Gupta said:

“মোটকথাতে অমৃতলালের মধ্যে যে শিল্পী - তিনি সাহিত্যিক বা অভিনেতা হাই হোন, তাঁর জগরণ হাসের জগতে । এবং সে হাসা ব্যঙ্গ বা রঙ্গ বা কৌতুক বা কোন-অজ্জগুলি কিংবা শন্দক্রীড়া সবকয়েকই হতে পারে।”²

It is comic sentiment which happens to be the source of his creative faculty like Dinabandhu, and this very quality has immortalized his creations.
The comic sentiment of Dinabandhu and Amritalal is not identical. The comic sentiment of Dinabandhu in actuality belongs to the category of humour, and so our inner self gets soaked with laughing flawlessly with him; but on the other hand, the comic sentiment of Amritalal is forceful and pointed, and that what is called satire in English. Most of his farces fall under this genre. Sukumar Sen said:

“অমৃতলালের নাটক রচনা করিয়াছিলেন বটে কিন্তু প্রহসন-নকশার উপরই ঈহার যশের প্রতিষ্ঠা। প্রহসনে অমৃতলাল যেন জ্যোতিরিন্দ্রনাথের সাংক্ষেপে শিয়া। জ্যোতিরিন্দ্রনাথের ‘কিন্নী জলমোগ্য’ এবং ‘এমন কর আর করব না’ প্রহসন দুটির প্রভাব অমৃতলালের একাধিক প্রহসনে লক্ষ্য হয়। জ্যোতিরিন্দ্রনাথ জড়ামির ও ইতরতার আবর্জনা হইতে সমসাময়িক প্রহসনকে উদ্ধার করিয়াছিলেন, অমৃতলালের রচনায় তাহা খানিকটা পুষ্টিলাভ করে।”

But Ajit Kumar Ghosh said comparing the literary works of Jyotirindranath and Amritalal:

“...... জ্যোতিরিন্দ্রনাথ ও অমৃতলালের প্রহসনের মধ্যে লক্ষ্যীয় প্রভেদ বিদায়িত। জ্যোতিরিন্দ্রনাথের প্রহসনের প্রাণ ঘটনার অভ্যুত্থতা চমৎকারভাবে উপর নির্ভর করিয়াছে এবং কোনো সুলেহ তাহার ব্যক্তিত্বের খোঁটা জ্যোতিরিন্দ্রনাথের জালাময় হয় নাই। কিন্তু অমৃতলালের অনেক প্রহসনেই কাহিনীর কোনো জটিল বৈচিত্র্য নাই। দৃশ্যের পরম্পরা যুক্তি করিয়া এবং কয়েকটি পার্থিবত্ত্বে আনিয়া লেখক তাহার উদ্দেশ্য ব্যক্ত করিয়াছেন। এই সব প্রহসনে উদ্দেশ্যই মুখ্য, কাহিনী গৌণ।”
He also added more:

“বাসবিজ্ঞের আতিশয়া অমূল্যালের দেষ হইলেও তাহা অপেক্ষাও বড় দেষ মাঝে মাঝে দেখা গিয়াছে যেখানে গ্রহণকার অতি প্রকাশাধীন প্রত্যাক্ষ করিয়াছেন। অনেক সময়ে তিনি পাত্রপাতীর মূল্য তাই বক্তাদের মধ্য দিয়া সামাজিক লোক ও অস্বীকার বুঝাইবার চেষ্টা করিয়াছেন। হাস্যাত্মক রচনায় এইরূপ জবরদস্তি নিতান্ত দোষাবহ।”

It is understood from the study of the farces of Amritalal that his target of mockery was the society of both man and woman influenced by western waves. He repeatedly displayed in his gamut of farces as how our society adopting western culture and education has been heading towards the path of degeneration losing its own age old ideals and systems. The revival and awakening of Hindu dharma started by Bankim and Vivekananda started in closing part of nineteenth century and hence consequently the attention of the people of country was again directed towards past civilization and culture, and that what is found in the writing of Girish Chandra, Then the human society influenced by western waves was repeatedly condemned. An unshaky faith in eternal dharma and ideals is noticed in the dramas of Girish Chandra. The community of young people fond of imitating westernism has been condemned in all his Pancharaang. It was Amritalal who after Girish Chandra has severely struck the society influenced by occidental trend. Michael Madhusudan and Dinabandhu, too, mocked the English educated and degraded society. Madhusudan’s Akei Ki Bole Sabhyata and Dinabandhu Mitra’s Sadhabar Akadashee are a pointer to this fact.

The faults and harmfulness of ancient systems, Such as kulin system
and polygamy have been shown in the compositions of the dramatists of first age, especially in the works of Ramnarayan Tarkaratna and Dinabandhu Mitra, but so far the dramatists of the age of Girish Chandra are concerned, a tendency of supporting such evil practices instead of castigating them is noticeable. Amritalal in many of his farces condemned this new system but appreciated the ancient one. He in his drama *Babu* wanted to show that widow marriage is a ludicrous matter; and even in his farce *Akakar* he showcased his sense of conservatism. Amritalal forwarding his arguments with extraordinary strangeness expressed his views of upholding that casteism and sense of upper-lower discrimination which weakened the Hindu society. Ajit Kumar Ghosh said about Amritalal:

“যে জাতিভেদ এবং উক্ত-নীচ বৈষম্যবোধ হিন্দুসমাজকে ক্ষয় করিয়া ফেলিতেছে তাহাই লেখক অসুস্থ যুক্তির সহিত রক্ষা করিবার মত প্রকাশ করিয়াছেন। পাপভাণ্ডা শিক্ষা ও ভার আমলের সমাজের যথেষ্টোক্তি করিয়াছে সম্পদে নাই, কিছু প্রাচীন সমাজবাবুরা কোন যে জগতি ও গনদ ছিল না এমন কোনো কথা নহে; সুতরাং সেই সমাজবাবুরার প্রতি যুক্তিীন অৰ্কো সতীর্থ একদিনবাহী ছাড়া আর কিছুই নহে।”

Though Amritalal satirized various shortcomings of society, yet he did not poke his nose so seriously in the world of sexual perversion and obscene affairs. Asit Kumar Bandyopadhyay said:

“সমাজের নানা তুলিত্বেত্তকে তিনি রঞ্জকৌতুকের সাহায্যে না টিকে ও প্রহসন চিন্তিত করেছেন, নীতি ও শিক্ষাপ্রচার প্রাখ্যায় পেয়েছে এবং কিছু রসসাগর হয়েছে তা তীক্ষা করতে হবে। একটি রঞ্জ প্রহসন ছাড়া অন্য কোথাও তিনি রোচির মাত্র ছাড়াননি। ব্যক্তি ও কৌতুকের এত সমারোহ অন্য কোন বাংলা রঞ্জনাট্য লক্ষ্য করা
TajjabByapar is a farce being short in size but with plentiful music, where the main subject matter is related to a sort of situational topsy turviness. When we see that men are doing the work meant basically for women and vice versa, then it becomes difficult for us to check our laughter with great sobriety. The situation has come to such a stand owing to female education, woman liberation that their respective specified work has taken a reverse order. The boys are doing household works, rearing children and rendering service to wife, and on the other hand, girls have been doing professional job, holding meeting, and preforming the duty as a volunteer. It is no doubt that woman liberation has been severely ridiculed in Tajjab Byapar, but the overmuchness of affair has turned it into an instance of wit and humour; and thus which lacks the severity of attack.

If we have a look at history, the Brahma movement by that time, have already awakened and most of the people, therefore, were vocal in demand of woman liberation; but the conservative society was perplexed at it. The Brahma and the Christian missionary played an important role in respect of female education. Jayanta Goswami said:

"তাজমাবাধিকরণের সময় ব্রহ্ম প্রেরনার মাধ্যমে এবং বিভিন্ন জাতিকর্তার মাধ্যমে মহিলার শিক্ষা ও মহিলাদের সমস্ত ক্রমাগত প্রতিরোধের ওপর আত্মবিশ্বাস ও স্বাধীনতার উদ্দেশ্যে মহিলাদের শিক্ষা ও স্বাধীনতার কুফল চিহ্নিত করা হয়েছে।"  

It is not always true that Amritalal Basu had an anti-progressive mindset. Though he mocked female education and woman liberation in Hidimba or Bilashini Karforma, yet he gave much respect and
importance to woman liberation and their personality in his farces namely *Chorer upor Batpad*\(^{14}\) and *Dismiss* \(^{15}\). Actually he could not accept some of the hypocrisies. Hence he did not spare either a hypocritic reformer or a hypocritic Brahmin priest.

The farce *Taijab Byapar* does not contain any well fabricated and systematized story, nor none of the character could attain completeness, rather most of them are caricature type sketch, yet some of the characters have provoked comic sentiment, such as the description of meeting of women quite funny. Moreover, characters like Anangamanjari, Birajmohini, Nanibala Bidyalankar, Giribala Lahiri by expressing their respective view have changed the drama with comic atmosphere.

Nanibala Bidyalankar said in course of pointing out the necessity of moustache of women:

\[
\text{“নন্দিনী। খুন বলে গোফে গ্রীলোকের শোভা হানি করে।} \\
\text{তরীপণ, মনে কর, যখন আমরা মেলিকেল কলেজ যাই, যখন হাইকোটে} \\
\text{ওকালতী করিতে যাই, হাউসে, আফসে, ওদামে যে যে কার্যে যান,} \\
\text{বর্ণন সবকাছে গোফের আবশ্যক।”}^{16}\]

Giribala Lahiri said the means of growing moustache quickly and thus her logic helps us burst out laughing. She proposed to remove ‘ovaria’ by getting it operated upon and the moustache and beard of women would grow quickly. She Said:

\[
\text{“গিরি। খুন আমারের উড়রের মধ্যে ওভেরিয়া (ovaria) নামক} \\
\text{এক যন্ত্র আছে, অপারেশনের (operation) ভারা টাহা রিমুভ} \\
\text{(remove) করা যায়, টাহা হইলে আমারের গোফ ভাড়া উঠিবে} \\
\text{পারে, ও সম্ভান হওয়া বন্ধ হয়, এ কথা বিজ্ঞানসম্মত।”}^{17}\]
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She advanced her views of carrying out this experiment on woman guard and maid servant, and even her Bengali-English mixed language, too, provides us scope to laugh.

Anangamanjari is the editor of Dhaka Budget. Giribala Lahiri that for the purpose of moustache, beard, and for man to be get child should be sent to America at the present time, but Anangamanjari did not endorse such views of Giribala, rather her argument is more ludicrous:

```
“অনঙ্গ । ........ মোটের জনাই আমেরিকার শলা লবর কি অবিশ্বাস, 
.........আমি আপন চইকে দায়চি, ডাকাতে চাঁদাগুলা মোট উঠানবার 
লেগে নাপিতের পুইশা দিয়া থামকা থামকা খাউরি করে, আমরা বদর 
মহিলাগণ যদাপি সেই পথ অবলম্বন করি, তা অইলো অহাসায় 
কইছে খাউড়ি করতে খাউড়ি করতে অবিশাই মোটে লেখা দিতে 
পারে।”
```

The characters made us laugh immensely through the expression of such bizarre views. Actually, Amritalal primarily satirized the hypocrisy that had been going on in the contemporary society in the name of female education through these characters, but in doing so, he exaggerated the characters to an excessive extent. It needs to be said in this respect the male-female discrimination policy has at present come down in a greater degree, and in future, too, it would go down much more. That which was a bizarre thinking at the time, of Amritalal, so, it was a cause of laughter as well as to satirize society. Now a days we may laugh at it abit, but cannot mock it. In the days of yore it was indeed a matter of quaintness. The writer showed the contemporary reality in a reverse order for the sake of mockery and laughter.
Dismiss of Amritalal is very short in size as a farce, and where the flavour of story is latent in the gyration of incidents itself. The plot of the farce is very simple. Krishnanath babu had a groundless doubt in his mind for his second wife Pramada and at last the removal of that doubt amid a comical situation. This is the story of the farce.

The dramatist has a deep motivic mindset behind depicting the character of Krishnanath babu’s wife Pramada in the farce. Though the character is lightly restless, yet his mind is full of romanticism and kindness. She in full make-up wanders in the locality, sings amorous songs and enjoys a lively and light chat with anybody. When Krishnanath babu dislikes her such activities, she said in return:

“প্রমদা।আচ্ছা আজ থেকে আটশোরে কাপড় পরে কেঁদে যাব, বাচা বাচা লোক দেখে হাসিয়ে করবো, আর টকা ভাল না লাগে খেয়াল গাইব।”\(^{19}\)

When this locality-rounding habit of wife seems to be unbearable for her husband, he said angrily:

“কৃষ্ণ। আর সহ্য করা যায় না, আমি আজ থেকে নিজের ধরো।”\(^{20}\)

In reply to this, Pramada informed creating counter pressure:

“প্রমদা। তুমি করো অরুলোক, আমি আমায় এদিন জালমুখি দেখিয়ে ভুলিয়ে রেখেছ?”\(^{21}\)

Such behavior of Pramada is quite funny. Though she appears to be restless and witty, yet she is abit of different type. She does lots of social services, serves an ailing persons, help in putting up hair, stitching kantha and so many other social services. Many of locality deify her like a god; but her husband not understanding the fact
doubts her for nothing. The dramatist through this character supported woman liberation. It is even seen in the end of the farce that she was not on backfoot to frighten her husband disguising Tinkari as a ghost. Actually there lies a deep motivic outlook of Pramada behind all such activities; and that is to control the worldly-minded husband and win over Krishnanath babu’s mind filled with suspicious nature. So, it requires no explanation that the character concerned is the main source of comic sentiment in the story.

The character of Krishnanath babu may be called a typically comic character. There exists a kind of male persons in the society who doubt their wife even for a minor matter, but this groundless doubt should not grow, as in many cases family problems may crop up out of it. Krishnanath babu is such a crotchety man. He left no stone unturned to make his wife a homing woman. Sometimes he met Tarkalankar or his father-in-law to solve the problem; nor did he never hesitate to have tact and ingenuity from Tarkalankar in exchange of money. At last the way in which he was defeated to the tact and tricks of his wife is very ridiculous. Krishnanath babu’s disillusionment with his wife was over in the end of the farce. Releasing Tinkari at the request of Pramada, he said:

“কৃকি । আজ্ঞা প্রমদা, তোমার অনুরোধে আমি একে ছড়ে দিলাম ।
আজ আমি বুঝলাম - ঘোমটা সিলেই সত্তী হয় না, তোমার মত স্ত্রী
যার, তার আর অন্য সুখ চাই না।”

Krishnanath after so long was able to be familiar with the nature of his wife. He could not know the nature of such a goddess-like wife so long. Moreover, he also gave his word of giving a diamond necklace as a compensative gift for his suspicious mind to his wife Pramada.
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Tarakalankar, too, is a Brahmin representing the hypocritical class greedy for money. Though he wanted to show his apathy to money, but actually he is fond of money. So, when Krishnanath sought his help to solve his problem, he took money. Immediate after getting money, he said:

```
তরকা । (ঢাকা লইয়া) কি । আমায় ঢাকা দেওয়া । নবগীরের
নিধিপাধ সমৃদ্ধিতের ছাড় আমি, বিকশিতের সম্পূর্ণ বিদ্যমানতির
পৌত্র, আমায় ঢাকা দেওয়া । আমায় অর্থ পিশাচ মনে করা ?```

Such disguised mentality of a man who is greedy for money being indifferent to money creates sarcastic sentiment. The dramatist heavily mocked the verbiage of the foolish Brahmin. Advising Krishnanath to talk less, he himself talked too much accompanying many learned expressions reasonably and unreasonably. Such behaviour of Tarkalankar made him a comic character.

All the characters like Aghornath Mukhopadhyay, his wife and Kangali belonging to Amritalal’s farce Chorer Upor Batpadi are comic ones. The story of the farce is very simple. It is the matter to be proved as how a characterless man was harassed his own wife a characterless, lascivious and worldly man named Aghor engaged an unemployed boy called Narayan to establish an illicit relationship with a woman, but incidently Narayan unknowingly brought the wife of Aghorbabu under control, and thus fell in love with her.

The conduct and behaviour plus mentality of Aghorbabu have created enough comic sentiment in the farce; and who may be called a typically comic character; as because there are certain people like Aghorbabu who have been always eager to have a touch of female body; rather they are never concerned about any social duties and
responsibilities, nor about any well consolidated trend of thoughts. The dramatist portrayed the real nature and the consequences of this class of people of society in a ludicrous way. The young Narayan who was engaged by Aghorbabu to violate the chastity of a woman himself fell in love with the wife of Aghorbabu and Aghorbabu’s wife also gave him much indulgence. Though everything happened before the eyes of Aghorbabu, yet he could not nab anybody red-handedly; rather he was repeatedly before the presence of mind of his wife; yet he vaunted like a stupid fellow. The act of brag and bluster of a characterless and lascivious man has ludicrously become enjoyable through this character. Aghorbabu could not trace out Narayan hiding first day under a table and second day in cask, yet had he been a bit conscious, the problem could have been mitigated. But dull headed Aghorbabu did not have that capacity. The sentiment of mirth reached its climax from the incident of Aghorbabu’s taking the chest to his father’s-in-law house carrying on his head after a quarrel with his wife. It is that chest where the young Narayan hid himself. If the man for whom Aghorbabu suffered separation from his wife is to be carried on head and his urine is to be lapped in sense of holy water, the mercury of laughter would naturally go up. So, it may be said that though Aghor happens to be an endless source of comic sentiment, yet to the dramatist, the character concerned is a medium to reform society. Aghor could realize in the end of farce that the man whom he engaged in this work has deceived him. At last cry shame on himself, he said:

"আমার ! ........................ আমার মুখোমুখির নাম ডুবলো ! আমি মেমন
দুর্ভাগ্যক্রমে তোমাকের মেয়েদের ওপর নজর লিভেন, গিলী আমার"
Such helpless utterance of a lascivious man brought stream of laughter in the mind of readers.

Aghorbabu’s wife taught him a lesson and it may be said that there lies a kind of poetic justice in her such act of revenge. It is seen in the farce that just seeing Narayan only one time, she called in him by her maid servant. Such kind of activities seems to be contrary to social ethics and full of improprieties. The sudden meeting of two man and woman followed by amorous talk, and the start of drinking brandy are indeed quite ridiculous. Nevertheless, the efforts that are noticed in the wife of Aghor to bring back the characterless husband on the right track are funny indeed. The young Narayan comes to her in the absence of husband Aghor. Mean while, when Aghorbabu come back to his home, the way in which Aghor’s wife managed the situation is ridiculous. We cannot but laugh seeing the way in which she put Aghorbabu to troubles once keeping Narayan under a table and then inside a barrel made of cement. Ultimately falling in great troubles, hiding Narayan inside a chest, she compelled her husband to carry that chest on his head. So, it may be said that the conduct and behaviour of the character, her attitude to Narayan and to her husband created enough comic sentiment in the farce and what simultaneously also made the character a comic one. The dramatist, as if, creating such characters has encouraged the community of women to bring back their characterless and lascivious husbands on right path.
Another comic character in the farce is Narayan himself; who in course of luring away a woman for Aghorbabu himself fell in love with that woman, but incidently she was none other than Aghorbabu’s wife. The mental panic that, he suffers following sudden arrival of Aghorbabu in his house while chatting with his wife is enjoyable. So, in order to save himself, he sometime hid under a table and in a barrel made of cement. We cannot but laugh when frightened Narayan gets extremely embarrassed at the arrival of Aghorbabu during the time of his drinking wine with his wife. He said in a sad tone:

“নারায়ণ। (সহজে) আবার আজ মে, কি হবে? ও গল্প, আমি পেড়ি, রক্ষা কর। নেশা হয়েছে, কি হবে? তুমি না রাখলে কে রাখবে? তুমি আমার সব, তুমি আমার পথে পাওয়া চোদামান।”

Actually the two critical conditions, the erotic feeling of Narayan to have the company of fair sex, and on the other hand, his panic stricken mind due to Aghorbabu generated comic sentiment in the character. In the end of farce, the act of urinating by the frightened Narayan on the body of Aghorbabu at the time of carrying him in a chest and telling Aghorbabu the very same incident glibly, as if brought tidal waves to comic sentiment.

The farce begins with the character Kangali, but though the character gets a little mention in the farce, yet her style of pronouncing ‘ন’ as ‘ল’ makes us laugh:

“কাঙ্গালি। ……… আমি একবার চাররঙ্গায় একটিক্স করে বাঁধাঙ্গালে মোটামুটি লাটক দেখে এসেছি। আঁ ভালো যা হোক, এলোকেষ্টকে কেটে লদনী যা করো, রক্ষা রক্ষপাত।”
Aghorbabu even askewed her for such style of pronunciation:

“তো লোকার কি ‘ন’ বেরুকে না।”\(^{27}\)

The dramatist through this short term character informed us skillfully the act of Aghorbabu being utterly harassed. His song at the very outset of drama is itself a pointer to this direction:

“কাঙালি । ঘাঁচির বিজ্ঞ জেনেছে মেহতা,
 খাকতে জবান, পরাকরার লামটা আনবে না মুখে ।”\(^{28}\)

The farce *Chatujye-Banrujye*\(^{29}\) is a drama fit to be seen in a scene and here a humorously savoury story is described and which has been composed in imitation of two English farces, namely Sir. F. Bernard’s *Cox and Box* and J.M. Morton’s *Box and Cox* belonging to the English literature; and where the stories of both the farce are identical. Mrs. Bouncer rented same house to Box and Cox respectively, and one of the renters stays during day time and the other at night in the house. One day immediate after return of cox to house availing leave, the din and bustle started. Both of them found out that the duo wanted to marry same woman. Afterwards, having some chaos and angry mood, both of them united again. Hence, the story of Chatujye and Banrujye is same like the above stated stories.\(^{30}\)

The farce contains a well organized story, and it is due to merit of description, the story of the farce has turned to be savoury.

There are three characters in the farce, namely Chatujye, Banrujye and Bhabatarini. Their entrance and exit have been maintained in such a way so that the mercury of laughter has its climax in the limit of a single scene. The trio of characters by virtue of the description of the dramatist flowed tidal waves of laughter.
Both Khudiram Banrujye and Puntiram Chatujye stay as renters in the house of Mr. Chakraborty, but they have not any close connection with the owner of the house; and a maid servant named Bhabatarini looks after them. Khudiram Banrujye works in a printing press, while Puntiram Chatujye deals in piece goods at Radhabaazar. Banrujye sleeps whole day, but goes out at night and it is vice versa so far Chatujye is concerned. As a result of it none of them meets each other; yet both of them stay in the same house. Two separate amounts of rents are collected from the same house.

One day Chatujye saw smoke of marijuana in the house. Bhabatarini said intelligently that another person who works in a printing press stays in upper room and who smokes marijuana. Then Chatujye replied:

```
"চটুজো। ভব, আজ তুমি একটি আমার সংখ্যা উঠে দিলে।
ছেলেবেলা থেকে জানা ছিল যে, যেয়া উপরেই উঠে যায়, কিছু এ যৌয়াটি শুনছি কিছু বিচিত্র গতি; আমার ঘরে চোকবার জনা চিরকলের
পরতি উঠে এ নিচের দিকে নেবে আসে।"31
```

The readers feel fun at this reply of Chatujye, but one day accidentally both of them met each other resulting the start of chaos. Stormy arguments started between them. This set of arguments is quite enjoyable:

```
"বাংলুজো। কাগজ? এই দেখ দেখ দেখ দেখ এই এই এই, দেখলি?
চটুজো। চেয়ে চেয়ে দেখিবিং জাপাখানায় ভূত।
বাংলুজো। চুপ রও। রিপুর কর্ম্ম (সুদে) ও র রিপুক -অ-
চটুজো। দুর বেঁড়া। কমা, সোমিকলন, কর জায়গায় ফ, হয়ের
জায়গায় চ।
```
The war of their arguments opened the fountain head of our laughter.

Both of them were involved in war of words following the fact of staying in the same house and again it seemed to them the continuation of such bandying of words is an unwelcome act. We cannot but laugh observing such rapid changes occurred in their respective character:

"বাঁড়িরেন। যুদ্ধবিষয়ে আপনার মত কি?"

চট্টুলে। অতি ছেলেলেক অসভ্যের কাজ।

বাঁড়িরেন। আমারও এ মত, অব বুঝে বুঝে দাদা হয়, তাতে তো আপনি নাই।

চট্টুলে। হার বলে আলাদা কথা।

বাঁড়িরেন। কিছু এ বড় বেলিকেমো। কথাও কিছু নাই, দুখানা কাটার বুঝে ভাবতুকি করি, এই বা কি ছেলেমানুষি?

চট্টুলে। কিছু না, একটু ইয়ারকি মাত্র।"
we burst out laughing from this incident. The Story has become more ludicrous due to description of the dramatist. The dramatist described their demeanour, dialogues, behaviour in such a dexterous way that what made both the characters comic ones.

It is necessary to say in this context that Bhabatarini has been their domestic help and so who knows everything, but she feigns as if she understands nothing. When various doubts crop up in the mind of Chatujye and Banrujye, the way by which she manages the situation by means of her presence of mind is indeed much funny. The farce does not have any sort of mockery, but only laughter and laughter.

Amritalal’s remarkable farce is Bouma and which is mentioned as Samajik Naksa (a social chronicle) by the dramatist himself. This farce may be marked off belonging to the same group of farces like Bibaha Bibhrat and Babu respectively. Here the dramatist satirized the young community armed with neousage and the reformers associated with brahmo samaj. There is no rigid bindings in this story; rather here the dramatist mocked the husband having weightless personality, hypocritical social reformer, a maniac married woman, educated women with a tomboyish mentality.

The characters like Baburam, his wife Kishori, Hirimba, Bamacharan have generated immense comic sentiment in the farce. Ajit Kumar Ghosh said about the farce:

"নবা তরুণ-তরুণী এবং ব্রাহ্মসাধূের প্রতি বাস ‘বৌমা’ প্রহরেনেও আছে, তবে ইহো সরস কৌশুকের গ্রিভতায় বাণীর আধার উপর হইয়া উঠিতে পারে নাই।”

The bizarre thoughts of Baburam, follower of modern doctrine; provoke sentiment of mirth. He has always been anxious and curious
about the distress of the coolie women of Assam, the serious responsibility of arranging for the marriage of one’s daughter amongst the Hindus, feminine, afflictions of widows, charitable society, plague in Bombay (now Mumbai). He has always been haunted with a fancy of becoming a ‘publicman’. He says proudly:

“বাবু। আয়ন্ত যদি একটা নামই না রেখে গেলেন তবে পরিবর্তিতে
এলেম কেন?”

Yet he is completely afraid of doing any work. The mother Annapurna does not like at all this capricious tendency of her son; rather she always advises him to earn money by doing a service but Baburam repeatedly reciting the poem of Rangalal said disgustedly:

“বাবু। উঃ - আবার এই চাকরীর কথা!

‘স্বাধীনতা-ইহীনতায় কে বাঁচিতে চায় রে -
কে বাঁচিতে চায়!’

তুমি নিশ্চয় জেন মা, আমি যদি যারে যারে ভিক্ষা ক’রে খাব, তবু এ জীবন থাকতে কখনই ইংরেজের চাকরী করবা না।..........................

ভারত-মাতা আমায় বদন ব্যাদান ক’রে ভাড়াছেন, যাকে ইংরেজীতে
(call) কল্ল বলে ! I have a call mother, I have a call!-
বুঝলে মা?"**

Amritalal through this character scathingly mocked the people of contemporary society who are given to merriment, bewildered with a false fancy and persons of mere words. Such type of people are of no use to society. Even the family as a whole has to carry the burden of their own life. We burst out laughing hearing the high sounding words of freeing country from their mouth.
Not only that, Baburam being under the control of his wife is a man of weightless personality. The wife Kishore of not getting ‘tea’ in the morning complained to son against mother-in-law. Then we cannot but laugh at the amazing reply of Baburam:

"बाबु। ............ या होक, घुम थेके उठे एकनो चा खाओन, तुम्हि 
दादिये आत कि करे किशोर। हासितामासा करि आर या करि, मार 
बड़ अनायः; मा-मा।"38

The complaint to mother against wife is itself ridiculous:

"बाबु। प्रिये आमार खुब बीराङ्गना, ताई एकनो-एकनो-चा ना खेरे 
दादिये आते, ............।"39

The anxiety that he showed for not serving of ‘tea’ to wife at the time reveals the hollowness of his character; and again when these worthless people themselves pronounce bombastic words in terms of development of country a sense of hatred grows in us along with immense laughter. The dramatist castigated such class of people severely in order to bring their hypocrisy to light.

Baburam’s wife Kishori, who has read novels now ridden by a mania of romance. She does not do any household work. Even she cannot make tea for herself. The habit of her reciting poem all the time has generated comic sentiment in the farce. Her poetic expression of not getting ‘tea’ in the morning is quite ludicrous:

"किशो। ओहो बिजलित मन्दिङ्क आमार, 
शुनायन्त हि हरी चारি दिक।"40

She said hearing that tea has run short in the house:

"किशो। ओहो चा नाइ घरे - 
कि काज संसारे आर।"41
What a disturbance a romance loving woman having interest in the study of novels can cause to the house of a family man is felt from the instance of bouma Kishori. This Character has a similarity with the characteristic nature of Hemangini of Jyotirindranath’s farce Aleek Babu. Kishori or Ulangini like Aleek Babu’s Hemangini reading the novels of Bankim regards herself as a heroine, and she, too, like heroines of novels snapping family relationship has made love her all. When the mother-in-law Annapurna asked her to look after kitchen, she replied referring the context from the novel of Bankim:

“ফিলো । ............ আসুন, আমার সঙ্গে আসুন, আলমারি খুলে সমস্ত বই আপনার সামনে ফেলো নির্দিষ্ট, দেখে বলুন যে, তার মধ্যে যত নারীকা আছে, তারা কে হইলেন গিয়েছিল? তিলোত্তম কখনও ঘরের কাজ করেছিল? মূর্ণসার্থী যখন একজন পরিবার প্রাক্তনের ঘরে বাস করে, তখনও সে প্রেমের ছবি আকা ছাড়া আর কিছু করেনি; মনোরম পুলকে হাস দেখা ভিজিয়া আর কি করেছিল? সূর্যমুদ্রী কখনও রেখেছিল? কুল্ল কখনও ভাত রেখেছিল । শান্তি, অমর, শ্রী, মাথীরকমে, এরা কেউ কখনও বিজ্ঞানী পর্যন্ত পারেনি। । ............”

That is, Kishori can adopt any tricky device for not doing any work.

She has an objection even to her own name, as she does not like the name ‘Kishori’, and changing the name, she has kept the name ‘Ulangini’. The analysis that she has made regarding her own name provokes our laughter:

“ফিলো। ............ উলাসিনী মানে হচ্ছে, উল-ছিল-আসিনী - উলাসিনী । উল কিনা পশম, যা আমরা বুনি, সেই পশমের মত অঙ্গ যার - অর্থাৎ নরম, দেখ দেখি তাই কিনা ?”
The way by which she has expressed her poetic feelings speaking in a versified style in family has become ridiculous to us.

The great chance came for her for romantic acting following the arrest of her husband. When she entered with her companions in an exclusively dramatic style singing the famous song of her native land, such as ‘জল জল চিতা’, then it has become uniquely jocular. The purpose of the dramatist’s mockery lies in the fact that he dislikes the theatricality of love of husband and wife existing in modern mindset; rather he thinks that in the line of eternal tradition the rendering of service and bhakti to husband happen to be duty of a wife. However, both the characters have provided laughter profusely.

Hidimba coloured with masculine nature and even the character Bamadas himself have generated enough comic sentiment in the drama. The newly educated Brahmo Hidimba has kept her husband under control; and on the other hand she has an open love with an effeminate young boy named Sucharu. She shows her strong objection if husband Bamadas pronounces pure Bengali:

“বামা । বিশ্ব নাগের চাপরাশি কি একখানা চিঠি দিয়ে পেল না ?

 হিড়ি । বিশ্ব নাগ কি ? - মিঠার নাগা মুখ দিয়ে বেরোয় না ?”

The style of her pronunciation is indeed ludicrous.

The husband Bamadas is completely dependent on the wife Hidimba in his worldly life. His pair of shoes were torn. So, he helplessly sought money from his wife to purchase shoes and what is really enjoyable:

“বামা । আমি যে বেরুতে পাল্লানি, জুতো কোডাটা একেবারে ছিড়ে গেছে ।
Basing on this character, Amritalal Severely satirized the Brahmo Samaj. A fictitiously violent image of women liberation has been showcased here.

The dramatist has pushed the character Bamadas to a comic level through sarcasm. This weightless character is a class or type one, and who maintains himself at the dictation of his wife and has no views of his own, rather he has no existence of his own without reference to his wife. He himself said:

"বামা । ........................ আমি কি জিলেম আর কি হয়েছি, তখন আমায় কর্জন লোকে জানতে, কিন্তু এখন হিডিঃ হর যামী বল্লে কে না আমায় চিনতে পারে । .............................. পঞ্চাশের পাঁচ তুলো নিলে মেমন শুনার কান মূল্য থাকে না, তেমনি হিডিঃ তুমি যদি অথমকে তাগ কর, তা হলে আমি একটি শুনোর মত পড়ে থাকবে । তুমি ইউনিট (unit), আমি জিজো (zero) !"\(^{47}\)

Amritalal looked askance at such state of henpeckedness.

His farce is *Raja Bahadur*\(^{48}\). The dramatist called it ‘সং-রং’ and in course of giving introduction to the personages, he wrote ‘সঙ্গের তালিকা’.

There runs the story of the farce in this way- a foolish Bangal Zamindar of a village wants to be conferred upon the title *Raja*, but the cunning Kalachand wants to seize this opportunity. He consulting with a Saheb who has fallen into a bad state and addicted to drinking
arranged the means of giving Sanad to that village Zamindar in exchange of huge amount of money. Meanwhile, the arrival of father and wife of Zamindar embarrassed Kalachand resulted in shattering all of his dreams. The story is very short and simple, but it has become humorous by the merit of the writing style of the dramatist. The state of hypocrisy prevailing in the city of Kolkata and public-cheating tricks have been depicted in various ways in the farce.

The characters like Ganikyadhan, Kalachand have created comic sentiment in different ways in the farce.

Ganikyadhan is a notable comic character in the farce and who is a village Zamindar but he has very minimum properties in village. Yet he coming to Kolkata wants to get the title Raja like other traditionally aristocratic Zamindars of Kolkata. So, his hopes and expectations are like the saying that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. This dangerous discrepancy in regard to his trend of thinking plus hopes and expectations has made this character ridiculous. The dull headed Ganikya has no capability of understanding actual motive of foxy Kalachand, greedy for money. His greedy mind is absorbed in the hope of getting title and so whenever the hypocritical Kalachand addresses calling him Maharaj Bahadur his mind feels the thrill of joy. He said with a mind filled with pleasure:

"গালিকা । অঃ ! মাষ্টার মশা, আপনি যে আমার আমারে মহারাজ বাহাদুর ব'লে সত্যিক করছেন, গুছে না চলাচলে কাদি হাতে দান দেহি !" 

When the girls of Hapsiganj demanded money to perform Petni Nach on Christmas Day, he easily agreed to give them rupees two hundred, but with a condition:
Kalachand informed that he would first get the title *Raja* and by degrees he would also get the title *Maharaj Rajabahadur*. The foolish Zamindar also felt delighted even at this and added:

“গালিকা । ..............এতদিনে গালিকাদের জন্ম সফল আইল, রাজা আইল।”

The way in which the was defeated to his wife Manasha in the end of farce is very enjoyable. He no longer was able to have the title *Raja*. The character was cheated by everybody. Moreover, The way in which Panchi Baijee took possession of necklace made of pearl tactfully is also ludicrous. Her manner speaking in Bangal language has also generated enough comic sentiment. Actually the dramatist through this character scathingly mocked the Bengalees of the then society who were greedy for title officially awarded to somebody.

One of the farces of the play wright is *Byapika Bidaya*, written by Amritalal, and the dramatist himself called the farce *Pramod Prahashan*.

This is a romantic love story. The dramatist presented in a humorously satirical way as how a pert and flippant greedy for domination coming to the family of her daughter created extreme disturbance and was also ultimately brought under control. The story contains the touch of modernism of the twentieth century. The farce ended in a laughing mood and pleasant union.
All the major characters of the farce have provoked comic sentiment and the remarkable characters out of them are Mrs. Pakdashi, Ghanashyam, Sanjeeb Choudhury.

The mother of heroine in the farce is Mrs. Pakdashi and who plays a most important role to create critical condition in the story. It is only she who is the main of object of ridicule of the dramatist, who is a fake modernist plus a complex minded and a crooked woman. Her eccentric behaviour has created enough laughter in the farce; and her education is incomplete, so she goes on speaking incorrect English randomly. We cannot but laugh at her English pronunciation, as she pronounces ‘Pronounce’ as ‘Pronoun’, ‘mentality’ as ‘mortality’ ‘female emancipation’ as ‘female emastication’, ‘natural’ as ‘national’. ‘infamous’ as ‘infections’ and ‘Pronunciation’ as ‘Punctuation’. She came to the happy family of daughter Mini and son-in-law Puspabaran suddenly like a guest with heaps of unrest and disturbances and the main purpose was to exercise her own domination creating a conflict between daughter and son-in-law. Such small self-centeredness happens to be the base of her character. Such eccentric mentality and perverted discrepancy are the prime source of comic sentiment of the character. The playwright severely ridiculed female education and woman liberation through this character. Yet the dramatist not making serious of the serious matter of this female character who is crooked, quarrelsome, wicked minded has made it light taking it to a ludicrous level. The dramatist through comic sentiment has made us conscious about people of this class; and thus as a result of it, the character has become humorously a typical comic one.
The character Ghanashyam has created enough comic sentiment in the farce, who initially seems to be a dull and fool to us; but gradually a state of honesty and humanism becomes distinct in the character. His stammering, queer style of speaking English, his leering to the Sahibs clad in khadi, his meaningful comment hearing the words of Mrs. Pakdashi from the place out of sight have generated comic sentiment in the farce. Even his dress is also freakish. The dramatist through him scathingly condemned the contemporary congress leadership and English-knowing countrymen.

Sanjeeb Choudhury, who with a military temperament and having with Afgan experiences of Northwest Frontier Province has appeared as an extremely savoury character. Whenever he appears in the drama, he charms every one with laughter and joviality. In a word Mr. Choudhury may be regard as a central source of merriment of the drama.

*Bibaha Bibhrat*, is a dramatized form of a burning problem of the middle class Bengali Society, and which is the greatest farce of Amritalal. The inhuman demand of dowry of the bridegroom party in the Bengali Society, unreasonably odd and reckless behaviour of English educated men and women, an abortive effort of becoming a Sahib-like giving up one’s own culture-all these contemporary social maladies have been castigated through different characters by means of mockery and ridicule. Most of the characters of the farce are comic ones. The mentality and style of dialogues of the characters create comic sentiment in the characters. The leit motif of the story of the farce is that how L.A passed Nandalal’s father Gopinath Sarkar took a hefty amount of dowry money brutally from Manmathababu,
burdened with the responsibility of a marriageable daughter, and Nandalal went to England without caring Gopinathbabu at all.

Gopinathbabu is the father of Nandalal, a bridegroom, in the farce. This is typically a comic character. Gopinathbabu represents that class of people who from time immemorial have been unjustly demanding dowry money from a father burdened with the responsibility of marrying his daughter. He likes to marry his L.A. passed son in exchange of dowry demand. He adopted a dirty means for the recovery of debts by marrying his son in exchange of high dowry amount. He has been over head and ears in debt indifferent places. He wants to pay the unpaid balance to the shop of daily necessities and balance to mahajan by the dowry money. Even he assured the maid servant that her outstanding dues would be cleared after the marriage of the son. As the effort of repaying debt by marrying son is a despicable matter in the society, so also ridiculous as well. The extremely greedy Gopinathbabu wanted to know from the match-maker whether the girl was very bulky, that is, if so, the breadth of ornaments, too, would increase. In this dirty way he gradually increased the amount of dowry money for the bridal side. But this increase gradually went up to such a point that he said :

“গোপী। তা থাক, তায় আর কাজ নাই, আমি গেলে। লোকের উপর
বেশী পেছন করে চাই না।”

The sudden large heartedness of a greedy man forces readers to laugh. Gopinathbabu facing loss of judgment under the pressure of greed has become very ridiculous. The neighbour Chandrababu suggested him to demand a gold tail seeing Gopinathbabu demanding gold spectacle and watch :
Gopinathbabu thought at his such suggestion:

```
“গোপী। আচ্ছা, তুই মেধা ইচ্ছা উচ্ছস্ত যা, আমার টাকা দে যা।
নন্দ। এক পায়া না।
গোপী। অর্জুন দে - কিছু দে।”
```

This critical condition of a greedy man is very enjoyable. Of course afterwards he came back to his senses for the misdeeds that he himself did. The helpless Gopinathbabu who was totally cornered said:

```
“গোপী। ভিক্ষার বুলি আছে, গলায় দেবার দাতা আছে - সেও ভাল, কিছু কেউ যেন জেলের বিয়ে দিয়ে টাকা রোমারের চেষ্টা না করে - অতি ইতর ! অতি চামল !! অতি কসায়ের কাজ !!!”
```

In this way the playwright severely satirized and ridiculed the greedy, oppressive and callous bridegroom party of the society through the character Gopinathbabu consequently the character has become a typically comic one.

The most comical and sarcastic part of the drama is related to highly educated woman Bilasini Karforma of Bengal and her husband Gourikanta Karforma. The highly educated Bilashini Karforma is the chief of purush daman sabha. She is an earning woman and the
husband Gourikanta reads with her. She also engaged her husband in domestic works, and she established her inhuman domination over her husband; and even does not hesitate to order her husband heartlessly:

“বিলা । তোমার, তুমি বসে ওসব কি ভুলছ যাও, রামাওয়া যাও, কিছু বুঝতে পার না, শুধু ঘটিতের মত দেয়া আছে।”

And again she sometimes says:

“বিলা । পতির প্রধান চূড়ান্ত, যে পতি তোল য়া ভুল করে, সে বোঝাতী, পুরুষ-শক্তি ; তার আমারা যদিও সামাজিক দমন করতে না পারি, তবে আমাদের হাই একত্রেশনের ফল কি?”

The character Hidimba of the drama Bouma has a similarity with Bilasini Karforma of this farce. She is also newly educated and has kept her husband Bamadas amazingly under her control.

On the after hand, her husband Gourikanta, too, is a man of weightless personality—a henpecked personality having profound regards to his wife. He has been restricted within four walls of his house, does household works. He is rebuked by his wife if cutlet is over fried.

So, it may be said that the farce contains a severe attack on female education and women liberation from the end of the dramatist himself. This satire is turned into a comic sentiment by the force of the thinking of the playwright, and who setting the wife in the place of husband and vice versa has depicted on opposite picture of traditional Hindu conjugal custom resulting in social impropriety; and what ultimately leads to cascade of comic sentiment.
The character maid servant has played an important role in the drama and the maid servant in this farce is different from that of *Chorer Upor Batpadi* and *Chatujye O Banrujye*. The present maid servant has, as if, taken the responsibility of reforming the society. She did spare none, say, Gopinathbabu, Bilasini Karforma, Nandalal Singh. She penetrated various discrepancies of society with sharply printed arrows of sarcasm. When Gopinathbabu failed to pay her due, she let him know with a strong voice:

```
“কী ! ........................ গালাগালের চাট্টে আদায় কর্ষ্টে, রাস্তায় বেরাবে না ?
আমি এমন গয়লার মেয়ে না ! দেখি টাকা আদায় হয় কি না ! অন
যেটে না-বি রাখা, কি আমার ভদ্রদের গো !”
```

In this way the dramatist castigated different problems through this character maid servant, and side by side, also created sentiment of mirth.

Writing the farce *Kalki Avatar*, Dwijendralal Roy appeared in the domain of dramatic literature and prior to that Amritalal wrote lots of dramas and farces. So, it is natural that much of the influence of Amritalal has fallen upon Dwijendralal; but subsequently through he wrote some excellent dramas, yet he could not parade any remarkable creativity in the writing of farce. Ajit Kumar Ghosh said in this regard:

```
“তাহার হাসির গণগুলি বিশেষ জনপ্রিয় এবং প্রসিদ্ধ হইয়াছিল, এবং
একটু লক্ষা ফেরালৈহ বুজা যাইবে যে তাহার প্রহসনের কৌতুক ও
হাস্যরসের মূলেও গণগুলি রহিয়াছে। গণগুলি বাস দিলে তাহার
প্রহসন নীরস ও কৌতুকবর্জিত বোধ হইবে। উভয় এবং বিস্ময়কর
চটনা-সমায়েশে যে হাস্যরস উদপত্ত হইয়া উঠে ডিজেরলাল সেই
হাস্যরস সৃষ্ট করিবার অধিকারী ছিলেন না, দীনব্যস্ত এবং অমূতলালের
```
Dwijendralal did not have that much state of keeping aloof from as a farcist should have. He attacked Rabindranath scathingly in *Ananda Biday*. So, it may be said that he did not have any praiseworthy contribution toward writing farce.

His farce *Punarjanma* is exclusively a light creation and which bears the influence of English literature. That’s why he claim the stamp of originality in regard to the story, yet the farce has turned to be very enjoyable in terms of presentation of story and portrayal of characters including even language being very easy. Nevertheless this short sized farce happens to be the greatest writing of Dwijendralal. The dramatist has raised the question of aphorism regarding the farce. He said:

```
“প্রহসনের মর্ম যদি কেহ জানিতে চাহেন, তাহা হইলে তিনি যেন একটু চিন্তা করে দেখেন। ইহাতে নীতিকথার অভাব নাই।”
```

The consequence of a miser, cruel and self-seeking usurer has been in the farce through sentiment of mirth. Yadav Chakraborty lending money on interest does ‘মহাসাগরী নামে রাহাজানি’(highway robbery in the name of money-lending) and he even does not allow his second ‘মুখ্যরী শিক্ষিতা স্ত্রী’ (beautiful educated wife) to satisfy her hungerfully, two
sons are not given education. It so happened that changes incidentally occurred in Yadav Chakraborty.

Jadav Chakraborty believes horoscope. So, he has indubitably believed the prediction of horoscope that he would die from snakebite in his own house at midday on the second of Baishakh. So that his death should not happen from snakebite in his own house, he that day sat silently in neck deep water upto noon in Mallikpukur. The dramatist used this weakness of Jadav very tactfully. When everybody collectively proved him as a false Jadav Chakraborty, even then he could not disbelieve the prediction of horoscope. A conspiracy was hatched out under the leadership of his sister’s husband Aswini to prove Jadav false and that Jadav Chakraborty got impersonated falsely is proved by a circle of conspirators. When the killers getting the assurance of the exemption of interest from Aswini, Jadav could not remain in a composed state of mind the money which is dear to him more than life is going to be under the possession of someother else, Jadav meekly requested Aswini: “আমি মরি লেখাই”. Being harassed and insulted in various ways Jadav was taught a lesson, Hence incidently there occurred changes in Jadav Chakraborty. Jadav said in the closing part of the drama:

``
“মাদব।............এআমারপুনর্জন।আজনূতনবিভাগনিয়ে
আবারবেঁধেউঠেছি।মৃত্যুরপরেযাৰয়াঘটবেআজচঁকেসম্মুখে
তারঅভিনয় লেখলাম।........”
``

The character overwhelms us with pure comic sentiment.

In fact, it is not easy to befool an intelligent person. If we crack a joke with him, he would rather harass us making counter fun with us. So, the person with whom we are to poke fun, we have to find out
such a point of weakness in his character that the specific weakness inspire of being discrepant and laughable in the environment and situation has been present in the character itself. But if he becomes conscious realizing his own deficiency, then no chance is left for us to poke fun at him. If, on the other hand, he does the opposite we would break into tears by laughing continuously. But the dramatist knows where to stop, that’s why he has sustained the style of farce.

The act of having belief in horoscope is a principal weakness present in the character of Jadav Chakraborty; and his wife and sister’s husband have seized the opportunity of this weakness; but they would ridicule him, yet not hatching out any serious conspiracy are understood from their conduct and behavior. When Jadav Chakraborty was sitting in neck deep of water of Mallikpukur to avoid his unavoidable death, then Saudamini had been singing a song:

``বুঝু হে - আর কোনো না রাত।
শুকিয়ে যাছে তোমার বাড়া ভাত।''69

It is actually to crack a joke with Jadav. When Aswini and brothers-in-law were looting everything from the iron chest of niggardly Jadav, we then cannot but laugh looking at the condition of Jadav. Meanwhile, Soudamini entered singing a song:

``ওহে প্রাণনাথ পতি তুমি কোথায় গেলে গো।
এ ভব সংসার মাঝে আমায় একা ফেলে গো।''70

``রেখেছি ইলিশ মৎস্য, খিড়ড়ি ও ঘাস বংস,
একা আমারই খেতে হবে
(ওগো) তুমি নাহি ফেলে গো।''70
Had Jadav been a bit intelligent, he could have understood this trick, but not realizing it, he regarded the false cry as true. Consequently roaring laughter was created beyond the knowledge of Jadav. The speeches of insulted and affended Jadav Chakraborty in the end of drama became short, while Aswini said:

“অশ্লীলই। এখন, যাদব বাবু - কিছু শিক্ষা হোল।”

Then Jadav replied briefly:

“মাদব। অনেক।-এ আমার পূর্ণর্ণন।”

The second farce of Dwijendralal Roy is *Biraha,* which he dedicated to Rabindranath. The farce *Kalki Avatar* contains the intensity of social mockery, but the main sentiment of the farce *Biraha* is not satire, but fun. The main story revolves round Govinda Mukhopadhyay and his ugly wife Nirmala accompanied by sub plot of Ramkanta and Golapi. The dramatist fabricated the story in such a way which resulted in creating an atmosphere of incredibility and from this point there comes the flow of comic sentiment.

The story reads – the plot begins through funny conjugal tussle of middle-aged Govinda Mukhopadhyay and his third ugly wife Nirmala. When the quantity of meals of Govindababu has increased following the pain of separation in the absence of his wife, he gradually began to be bulky. So, he arranged to send the photo by Indubhusan shot by a photographer showing that he did not become lean and thin even in the absence of his wife. On the other, the photo of wife’s friend Golapi in guise of Sarat Haldar with hand on the shoulder of wife Nirmala made Govindababu suspicious. Govindababu wanted to have his purpose fulfilled sending false information to his wife through the servant Ramkanta that he would
marry again. But accidently truth came to light, and thus the dull
headed Govindalal himself became a fool to his sister-in-law Chapala.
In fine, the story ended in a happy union through bursting out of
laughter.

Comic sentiment is generated in the farce through middle-aged
Govindababu and his wife Nirmala. Moreover, Golapi, dull-witted
Ramkanta, Govindababu’s sister-in-law Chapala and husband
Indubhusan and even the photographer contributed much comic
sentiment.

Both Govindababu and his wife Nirmala are the central
characters of the farce. Govindababu is a middle-aged man, who had
already performed his third marriage and he respects his wife very
much. When his friends request him to accompany them he says:

“গোবিন্দ ! আমার পৃষ্ঠকোষের প্রতি কিছু মায়া রাখি। যদি
আজ রাতে যাহি, ত কাল পীঠের চামড়াখানে মেরামত করার
জন্য একটা জুতো সেলাইওয়ালা ডাকতে হবে।”

Comic sentiment reaches its climax, when the helpless middle-aged
man tells his wife at the time of being beaten by his offended wife:

“গোবিন্দ ! .......... খুব মার্কে, দুঃখ মার্কে ; সকালে একবার
মার্কে, আবার বিকেলে একবার মার্কে। আর যদি দরকার হয়
ত রাতে স্ত্রীতে যাবার আগে আর একবার মেরো।”

We become familiar with his savoury state of mind by means of
comparing his wife to ‘সরভাজা’ (fried thin layer on milk). He said:

“গোবিন্দ ! .......... সরভাজা যেমন খেতে, আমার ট্রিটি সেই রকম
দেখতে।”
After the departure of his wife for her father’s house following a quarrel, he becomes turbulent. He wants to show outwardly that he has been in a comfortable state of mind. So, taking a wonderful snapshot that he in a barebody has been eating Sweet rice, sent it to his wife. He consulted with the servant Ramkanta as how to bring back to his house again. The dramatist through the character did not like to teach any social lesson, rather, he fathered the character just to offer pure comic sentiment.

Nirmala is the third ugly wife of Govindababu. She is a vixen (মুখী) and keeps her husband under her dictation. She is expert in showing poses of slaps and blows with first, making stinging insinuation for him being an old man, humorous tauntings to husband for marrying at such an old age. When the servant Ramkanta protested her at the time of thrashing her husband, the clearcut reply of Nirmala was ludicrous:

“নির্মলা । [সাভিত্রিণে] তোমার স্বামীকে মার্নে, আর লোকে সহিতে পারে না ; চোক টাট্টায় । আমারও যেমন কপাল ! নিজের স্বামীকে যখন কুঁড়ী মার্নে পার না !” [ফনোপনস্ত্র] ॥

The character Ramakanta, an admixture of foolishness and cleverness, is also immensely humorous. Music goes on playing in his mind at the very sight of Golapi, and since then he has been love-sick for her. The false information that Govindababu wants to marry again was decided to be sent to Govindababu’s wife by Ramkanta, but for the sake of winning over the love of sweet-heart Golapi, he disclosed all the secret facts; and thus as a result of it, the false information of Govindababu’s remarriage was revealed to his wife. The witty
dialogues of dull headed Ramkanta with Golapi have also made the character jocular.

Apart from that, even the characters like Golapi, Indumati and Chapala have also generated comic sentiment. The placing of hand on the back of Nirmala by Golapi in the guise of a male person, the coming of Chapala to Govindababu in the guise of a male person, instruction to Govindababu to stand in queer poses at the time of taking snapshot by a photographer provided pure laughter in the farce.

Another remarkable farce of Dwijendralal Roy is Prayashchitta, a social satire, was acted in Classic Theatre under the name of Bahut Accha. The artificiality and overmuchness of practices and behaviour of England-returned society, unusual effort on the part of modern Hindus in respect of imparting female education, and the practice of giving biased education to educated women have been mocked here. There has been the influence Amritlal’s farce on the idea and subject matter of the farce. The dramatist at the very outset of the farce satirized ‘বঙ্গীর’ (Hero of Bengal) Presaging achievement, such as the trend ‘নতুন কিছু কর একটা নতুন কিছু কর’ (Do something new), that is, giving up dhoti and chaddar to wear pant and coat, delivering speech in town hall, beating the women or giving undue importance. The farce comprises three stories – the story of modern Hindus accompanied by their wife, the story of Indumati, Sarojini and Binode Behari and the story of Champati Sahib. Most of the characters in the farce in question are comic ones.

England-returned Champati and Indumati are two major characters of the farce. Champati and England-returned barrister, but
his real life does not match with his bookish knowledge; and that’s why he does not get any court case to plead for; yet he is an unparalleled personality in respect of English fashion and his only intention is to earn money by any means. There emerges every problem. He married widow Indumati for the greed of money. Even being a barrister he does not know that if a widow remarries, she has no right over her previous property. It is due to conspiracy of Binod Behari and Sarojini both Champati and Indumati were taught a lesson. Champati said:

```
চম্পাটি। ........................ আমি দেখি করেছি - একবার প্রেমের জন্য, 
একবার টাকার জন্য; দুবারই ঠিকিয়ো। Logically দাঁড়াচ্ছে যে বিয়ে 
করতোই মিসে।''
```

We cannot but laugh seeing the last consequence of Champati; a man of hollow and fake nature. It is seen in the last scene that Champati was turned into a pure Hindu. He holds a hukka in one of his hands. Tarka Panchanan advised him to atone for eating cow-dung, so that he can be free from his earlier sins. He said:

```
চম্পাটি। ........................ দেখি যে বিলিতি চালের দেহে বাঙালীর পক্ষে দেশী 
চালই বহু আচ্ছা। বাঙালীর বাঙালীয়ারাই বহু আচ্ছা।''
```

Despite being a widow, Indumati cannot accept the culture of widow-hood, so seeing Champati; she loves him; and wants to marry him. The dramatist skillfully mocked the funny discrepancies of the character of educated Indumati having propensity to unusual romance. Amritalal Basu, too, portrayed ironical characters regarding female education and women liberation in many of his farces. The queer behaviour and comment of Indumati generated strong comic
sentiment. She expressed emotions of her mind about Champati to Sarojini:

```
"ইন্দুমতী । ........................ চণ্ডেরটি ! চণ্ডেরটি ! চণ্ডেরটি- ? [ মুখ ঢাকিয়া ]
| আহা কি মধ্য নাম । চেছায় উপমুক্ত নামই বটে । ........................ আর
গলায় আওয়াজও ঠিক মেন-একেবারে চটি জুতা । আর নাক !-অং
কি নাক !-চণ্ডেরটি হে তোমার পেয়াক ভালো, নাম ভালো, গলায় সব ভালো-কিছু সবচেয়ে ভালো তোমার এ নাকটা।"
```

The Character Binode Behari is also equally ridiculous; as his means of earning money is very ludicrous. He wants to marry such a woman so that he would be economically solvant and would maintain himself with that money doing nothing; and for which has no state of hesitation. This exceptionally opportunistic idea of Binode Behari is different from the prevailing thoughts and ideas of society. It is this impropriety which has created sense of jesting. He is an opium-smoker and so he likes to induce everyone to smoke opium. His speech in this regard is very funny:

```
"বিনোদ । গুলির লাইট্যা একটা পয়সা চাইতেই থাকি ; পাই না
........................ আমি চাই যে নিজে খাই, পরেরে খাওয়াই আর গুলি খাইয়া
ভোর হইয়া থাকি।"
```

He became owner of the property of his own dada by tactfully marrying his widow boudi Indumati with Champati just for the sake of money. He married Sarojini, but when Sarojini asked him not to smoke opium, his regretful reply is very ludicrous:

```
"বিনোদ । সে কি কথা ? এতা ত গিরিমেন্টের মধ্যে ছিল না । গুলির
লীলে এত করলাম, গুলি ছাড়বু কেমন কেরা ?"
```
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One of the farces of light sentiment of Dwijendralal Roy is Tryahasparsha or Sukhi Paribar, containing buffoonery of low sentiment plus coarseness. One of the maladies of contemporary society is polygamy. Dwijendralal wrote this farce resorting to this craziness for marriage.

The central theme of the farce is Bibaha Bibhrat (marriage problem). The conflict between father Bijay Gopal and the second son Aninda Gopal went up to mutual fighting for the reason of marrying the same bride, and which turns to be quite funny.

King Bijay Gopal is a dull-witted man with perverted taste. His desire for marriage seems to have no end even at the old age. It does not even go against his mentality to have bandy words with his son to marry the bride chosen by his son. Who cannot but laugh seeing such man madly longing for marriage in the society. He considers himself being in his youthful days even at his old age. So, when the queen calls him as an old man, he refuses to accept it, but on the other hand, when he is addressed as a young man, his joy knows no bound. Seeing the king, when Shiuli went away being ashamed, the king said:

```
“রাজা । কেন আমাকে লজ্জা কি ?
রাগী । আমি তাই বলি - যে রাজা বুঝে মানুষ, তাকে আর লজ্জা কি ?
রাজা । না রাগী, সত্যি আমি তেমন বুঝে হইনি।
রাগী । ৯-৯ ত তাই বলে।
রাজা । বলে না কি ? [ সতুইভাবে হাসা ও সজোরে গৌরে তা দিতে লাগিলেন ]
```
We cannot but laugh observing his gestures and postures, mindset and manner of conversation in the farce. His desire to marry once more seems to have no end. After the death of every wife, he marries once again. He has even wished death of his wife to marry a new woman. Giving a bribe amounting rupees one hundred to Dr. Bhudev, Kishore induced the doctor to declare that the queen was dead. As soon as the news reached the king, he was beside himself with joy. A strong desire then grew up in his mind that he would marry again. When the conflict between father and son reached its climax over the bride of marriage, that very moment the servant came and informed that the queen was eating *luchi*. Though the disgust expressing sentences of the old king that, followed from the getting of information of queen’s revival to life at the time of his going to marry is very coarse, yet fun-provoking. Such as:

"রাজা। আমি শুনতে চাই না। ডাকারে বলে গেল মরেছে।-এ সব আমাকে বিয়ে করতে না দেবার জন্য যড়মাং করেছে।।। এই চলাম আমি বিয়ে করতে।।।।"

We also being stricken with the grief that cropped up in the wake of the cancellation of marriage of the man who madly longed for it had to at last laugh very loudly.
The discussion related to erotic sentiment with the ministers of the royal court is very interesting, as he felt proud of having children more than other ministers. So, he let us know proudly:

```
```

Kunja informed that he had four children, but all of them died. Then his advice given to kunja is very ludicrous:

```
```

The dramatist projected the men of the society having craziness for marriage in this humorous style in this farce. Hence consequently the character in terms of dull headedness, conduct and behaviour and in consideration of situation has become comic one.

The character Bhudev left no stone unturned to make us laugh and who was a natural doctor of the royal family. We cannot but laugh observing his strong desire of parading his knowledge and wisdom by uttering the names of tough English books for a reason and not. The whole range of his learning and erudition was pointless, yet his attitude and bearing appeared to be such, as if, everything medical science was at his finger-tips. So, this type of character has to be ludicrous. Even his own comments regarding his medical practice is quite humorous. When Kishore giving an amount of rupees one hundred as bribe want to induce Bhudev to disclose the death news of the queen, he said:
Ananda told to Matiya to sing a song. But Matiya said that he gone hoarse. Dr. Bhudeb retorted:

“ভুনেব। আলো তুমি গাহিতে না পার, ঐ গান, কুমুদগায় নেই।
তুমি না হয় সঙ্গে সঙ্গে নাচ। তোমার গলাই ভেঙেছে, পা ত আর
ভাগেনি দাসা।”

In this way sometimes telling the names of great English books unnecessarily he paraded his purposeless learning; and again now and then through savory style of conversation, the character has provided food of laughter in the farce.
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