Chapter 5.

Conclusion.

5.1. Theory of self fulfilment in theatre.

What has been attempted, in the last four chapters, is to get a clanty about the distinctive features of *Rūta* *Līlā* performances. It has also been attempted to try to catch the whole range of the feeling behind insistence of (for example, Fateh Krishnā's, as mentioned in the introduction) not calling flasi.//a performances as Drama or any such thing. However, use of the axis of self fulfilment, in this attempt, seems to have given nse to a theory of theatre centred around self fulfilment which can accommodate the theories of Western Drama, traditional Sanskrit plays of sex, power and spiritual liberation, and *Rūta* *Līlā*-s of Vrindavan into a single framework. This theory seems to be able to work as a touchstone against which the distinctions of all these different kinds of theatre, along with that of *Līlā*, can come out.

The idea behind bringing out these distinctions has been to try to sensitize the student of Drama to the fact of Drama, 'Nātya' and 'Līlā' being categories rooted in different cultural or worldview settings. One way in which such a sensitization, it has been considered here, can be achieved is to first trace the worldview underpinnings of these categories and the notions related to each of them, and show the results of the application with these underpinnings to the facts being covered under the other categories. That the application of one category born out of a worldview, to the facts covered under the other has always been questioned, is also true. The analysis, here, has been done with a care to verify and validate such an applicability, by going to the universal rock bottoms of meanings of each of these categories. What has come out of this process is not the confirmation of the inapplicability of categories crossculturally, but the necessity of a greater care in such a crosscultural description. The definition of self used
throughout this work is consistently that of the Deers, i.e., the idea of 'who am I?' in relation to oneself, in relation to others, and in relation to nature, and the idea of a human individual, subject and so on (1.1 & 1.3). And the definition of self fulfilment also is just that of the Deers, i.e., the idea of realization of one's notion of 'who am I?' (self knowledge) (1.1). But what conveinced the application of this category to Indian material of Natya and Liśa is the availability of concepts like guna-s (2.4), purusārtha-s (2.5) and ātman (2.5.2), which are centered around concepts like prakṛti - nature, including human nature (2.5.2), purusa = human being (2.4) and ātman = self itself, respectively. Though, it is the word ātman, which is the third person form of the first person pronoun ātman = I, which appears closest to the 'self of the Deers (2.5), which also has a similar grammatical function, even prakṛti, here, human nature, and purusa, human being, also have translatability with the self of the Deers which, as the Deers themselves make it dear, is used in the sense of human individual, subject and so on, also (1.1). Now juxtaposing this notion of self with these related ideas of the guna-s (2.4), the purusārtha-s (2.5) and the ātman of Indian Philosophy (2.5), and putting the theones of Drama, Natya and Liśa together, has been shown to be giving rise to a self fulfilment theory of theatre which can be summarized as follows: Each form of a theatre acquires its character based on the depiction of notions of self and self fulfilment in it. Theatre, in which self which is (perennially) in search of self fulfilment and which lacks self knowledge and (hence) each time fails in self fulfilment is depicted, becomes a (form of) Tragedy,' and all serious Western Drama is a good example of this (1.3). Theatre, in which both kinds of selves with and without self knowledge and consequently succeeding and failing in self fulfilment of these two kinds of selves, respectively, are depicted, with a focus on the success of self fulfilment, becomes a subhānta or happy ending theatre (2.1, 2.4 & 2.5). Traditional Indian theatre, which is given the name Natya, is a good example for this. These subhānta plays again differ from each other depending on the kind of self and self fulfilment depicted in them (3.6). If the protagonist self depicted is a śṛṅgāra seeking self and is depicted to be succeeding in self fulfilment, it becomes Nāṭya for Śṛṅgāra (2.5 & 3.6). As
mentioned in the second chapter (2.5), most of the Sanskrit plays of authors such as Kalidasa and Bhasa are good examples for this. If the self depicted is a \textit{brahmadvaita} seeking self and is depicted to be succeeding in self fulfilment, the play becomes \textit{NS\text{\textregistered}ya} for \textit{Jn\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}na}} (2.5, 3.4 & 3.6). As mentioned in the second chapter (2.5), Sanskrit plays such as \textit{Bhartrhan Nir\text{\textregistered}\text{\textregistered}d\text{\textregistered}am} and \textit{Prab\text{\textregistered}d\text{\textregistered}ha Cand\text{\textregistered}\text{\textregistered}dayam} are good examples for this. Finally, if the self depicted is a \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\textregistered}\text{\textregistered}}} seeking self and is depicted to be succeeding in self fulfilment, the play becomes \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya} for \textit{Bh\text{\textregistered}akti} or \textit{Li\text{\text{\textregistered}i\text{\text{\textregistered}a}} (3.6). \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya} performances of Vrindavan are good examples for this.

Each kind of depiction of self and the theatre based on it have kinds and notions of \textit{rasa} associated with them. If \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}\text{\text{\textregistered}}} is associated with the (forms of) Tragedy (2.6.3), eight \textit{rasa-s} listed by Bharata are associated with \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya} for \textit{Trivarga} (2.6.1), \textit{santa} with \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya} for \textit{Jn\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}na}} (2.6.1 & 3.4), various kinds of \textit{bhakti rasa-s} are associated with \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya} for \textit{Bh\text{\text{\textregistered}akti} or \textit{Li\text{\text{\textregistered}i\text{\text{\textregistered}a}} (3.7). In the course of presenting \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}a} as different from Drama and \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya}, the analysis in this book has come up with certain important observations which missed the attention of the earlier scholars. For example, the list of \textit{rasa-s} as nine became so much routine that, the fact that \textit{santa} among these nine got added into this list only later was not carefully observed by many scholars (2.6.1). Those who took note of this fact, plunged into polemics about whether the inclusion of \textit{santa} into this list was right or wrong (2.6.1). It may be observed that the categorization of \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya} into \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya} for \textit{Trivarga} and \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya} for \textit{Jn\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}na}}, by recognizing the two different worldviews underlying the two, has automatically shown that the eight \textit{rasas} sans \textit{santa} and \textit{santa} belong to these two categories respectively (2.6.1). If the issue of \textit{rasa} is being discussed \textit{keeping} \textit{Natya} for \textit{Trivarga} in mind, it is very much justified to keep out \textit{santa} from among the list of \textit{rasa-s} (2.6.1). But if the issue of \textit{rasa} is being discussed \textit{keeping} \textit{Natya} for \textit{Jn\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}na}} in mind, \textit{santa} essentially gets its place in the list and moreover becomes the principle \textit{rasa} in this \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}}}ya} (2.6.1). In the same vein, it may be seen how recognition of the underlying worldviews of \textit{Natya} for \textit{Trivarga/Jn\text{\text{\textregistered}\text{\text{\textregistered}na}} and \textit{\text{\text{\textregistered}a} has facilitated to view the polemics about the status of \textit{rasa} to \textit{bhakti} in a better perspective (3.7).
For example, taking into account of the underlying worldviews in this work has shown how not giving the status of rasa to 'bhaktt in Nātya for Tnvarga is justified from the perspective of the worldview underlying Natya for Tnvarga (3.7). But, if the issue of rasa is being discussed keeping L.iḍ in mind, bhaktt should not only be given a status of rasa, but should also be recognized as the only rasa, for which all the seven rasa-s other than vyhgara and santa become secondary aspects (37).

In fact, the Deers have already come out with the Drama/Tragedy part of the fullfledged self fulfilment theory being discussed here (1.1 & 1.3). What has been done in this work is to extend the theory to L.iḍ via Natya for Tnvarga and Natya for Jnana. Arthur Miller's consideration that the depiction of failure in self fulfilment is an essential and defining quality of Drama, and his observation that a perennial search for newer and newer laws of determinism with hitherto inexplicable effects is also a characteristic of Drama (1.1) provides an explanation for the motive behind the perennial search for self fulfilment in Drama. The motive behind the depiction of success and failure in self fulfilment in Nātya is shown in this work to be based on the idea of theatre as a presentation of models for emulation (2.4), according to the laws of nature believed to be once for all revealed (in Vedas) (2.3). These laws of nature are shown in this work to be according to their interpretation found in Karma Kanda (2.5.2), Advaita Vedanta (3.4) and Bhakti Vedanta (here, Gaudiya vaisnava school of Bhakti Védānta) (3.5), respectively.

Nature of each form of theatre is determined by the nature of self in it. For example, it has been shown that if the tragic nature of Drama (forms of Tragedy) is rooted in the passionate but failing self in it (1.3), the happy ending nature of Natya for Jāna is rooted in dispassionate and tranquil self (2.5 & 3.4); and finally the playful nature of Natya for Bhakti is rooted in the dispassionate and 'playful' self in it (3.5). One feature which has been in all the forms of Natya, including L.iḍ, is the consideration of theatre as a means of self fulfilment for its participants (2.7.2 &
4.3.2). It is as part of this consideration that Lie is looked at as the playful process for self fulfilment.

Eugene O’Neill justifies the choice of a passionate but failing self throughout different forms of Drama by saying that the most tragic character is the noblest. Only as long as he strives towards the unattainable ‘does man achieve a hope worth living and dying for - and so attain himself (1.3). It has been shown, as mentioned above, in parallel, in different forms of Natyā including Līlā, the consideration of theatre as a presentation of models for emulation (2.4 & 3.5.3) leads to the choice of successful self. Here, it may be noted that, the distinction of Lie has been shown, in this regard, to be the presentation of a multiform variegated system of self knowledges structured in a schematic choice (3.5).

It has been shown, how rasa and Lie are the two vital and key concepts of the theory of Līlā from a Gaudiya Vaishnava perspective (3.10). Showing that these two concepts are, in fact, pivotal and all-pervading within the Gaudiya Vaishnava theology (underlying the Gaudiya Vaishnava poetics of Lie) itself, it has been shown that almost all the distinctive features of Līlā can be explained on the basis of these two categories (Ch.4). From the discussion in the third chapter (3.5.2 & 3.9), it comes out that it is the use of rasa language to talk about the spiritual realm (3.5.2), the content of Līlā-s, which makes rasa attain a distinct significance in the theory of Līlā vis-a-vis the theory of the other two forms of Natyā, that is Natya for Nārāyaṇa and Natya for Jñāna. The consequence of this in Līlā has been shown to be importantly the consideration of possibility of rasa in activities of daily life too (3.9). The concept of Lie as playfulness, which has been one of the most discussed concepts in the past literature, has been shown to have a hitherto unexplained significance in the schematic choice of a variegated system of rasa-s, which has been shown to be another distinct feature of the theory of Līlā-s (3.5.3) The identification of closeness as another meaning of playfulness, other than the meaning of ‘not motivated by gain/purpose/
use’ (3.10), recognized in the past literature, has helped in the recognition of this significance (3.5.3). Recognition of this additional meaning of playfulness’ has opened many more knots like the understanding of affinity for the simple, rural and rustic Brṣjavasi culture in the theory of Līlā-ś, in terms of playfulness’ (4.1).

Two clarifications need to be given here with regard to the concept of laws of nature used in this work. Firstly, though both in Drama (1.3-4) and in Nāṭya for Trtvarga (2.2-5), self is considered to be governed by laws of nature and in both, where ever there is a depiction of violation of laws of nature, self is depicted to be punished for such violation, the laws of nature being discussed in these two cases need not be the same. As already mentioned (1.4), the laws of nature in Drama have been considered to be explored freshly everytime for each form of Drama and the laws of nature, which are believed to be once for all revealed through the Vedas in the case of different forms of Nāṭya including Nāṭya for Trtvarga (2.2-5), need not be the same as any of the laws applicable to any one form of Drama. But what is common between Drama and Nāṭya for Trtvarga is the principle that violation of laws of nature where ever committed leads to punishment of the self (2.2.2).

Secondly, what is intended in this work is only to bring out the fact and to discuss the consequences of the belief in laws of nature in different forms of theatre and not to take the position in favour of the validity of any one of the laws of nature, relevent to any one form of theatre. In a similar vein, it need also to be clarified here, that what is intended through out this work is to bring out the fact and discuss the consequences of various notions such as self without self knowledge’ (1.1), ‘Trtvarga seeking self (2.5) and self as Self (tnguna - free self) (2.5 & 3.5) underlying each form of theatre, butnot the validity of any of these notions.

The discussion in the last chapters not only has run on the basis of, but also has established the
dependence of each of the concepts of the previously discussed ones. It is paśiy linked with the
Chronological and hence polemical order of Karma Konda, Advaita Vēdaṇṭa, and Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Vēdaṇṭa. It is partly linked with the order of familiarity of a student of Drama which is as follows: the
familiarity with the notions of Drama greater than with those of Natya for Trīvarga, greater than with
those of Nāṭya for Jñāna, greater than with those of Liṅg. It may be noted that to make provisions for
the convenience of cross-cultural comparability mentioned above, the notions in the later
discussions have been anticipated in the previous part. For example, it is with this purpose that
the urges of self for "sex," "power," "order," liberation and "conflict-free relations" (1.3) have
been brought out of the theory of Drama, though these are not directly discussed there. This
anticipation can be seen to be justifying itself each time. For example, when the concept of
self in terms of the urges for "sex," "power," "order" and "liberation" is seen in the second
chapter (2.5) to be the pivotal in the theory of Natya, the anticipation of these notions in the first
chapter (1.3) stands justified. This facilitates the discussions of issues such as failures and
successes in self-fulfillment to run on common axes.

It may be noted that in the first chapter, the 'self fulfillment' and the 'fulfillment of urges by
the self have been shown to be two not necessarily the same ideas (1.3), in the second
chapter onwards, since the self is described as having innate urges (2.5 & 3.5.1), these two
ideas become one and the same.

The convenience provided by the recognition of the concepts of puruṣārtha-s in defining the self
(2.5 & 3.5) and the guṇa-s, in discussing the possibility of the self fulfillment (2.4 & 3.5), can be
noted to be a consequence of recognizing the often ignored locale of Nāṭya for Trīvarga, Natya for
Jñāna and Liṅg in the Vedic worldview. Though, the underlying Vedic nature of Natya has been
noted through some scarce passing remarks, the far-reaching implications of such assumptions
were not fully explored by the previous scholarship of Natya (2.1). Such an exploration attempted
here is, on the one hand, an essential requirement for the axis of comparison and on the other, a tremendous advantage in dwelling deep into the intricacies of almost all the crucial problems of Drama-Nātya for Tnvarga-Nātya for Jñāna-Līg polemics. It may also be noted that, the use of Indian mythology as a narrative form presentation of Vedic worldview has been common to all the different forms of Nātya (2.3, 3.5.1 & 4.3.5.2). It may also be noted that, the narration of this mythology by Vyāsā has been from a Vedic worldview and each form of Nātya adapts it to suit to its specific perspective within Vedic worldview (3.6).

5.2. A critique of certain modern uses of terms.

It may also be noted that the identification of the self of tragic hero in a tragedy as predominanting in rājas (2.4), and the aesthetic experience resulting from watching a Tragedy as rāṣṭrānās (2.6.2) and so on, have no value intentions. It may be true that from the point of view of a subscriber to the Vedic worldview, rājas (2.4) has an inferior value connotation than sattva (2.4) and rāṣṭarānās (2.6.3), an inferior value than rāsa (2.6 & 2.7.1). But, it goes without saying that, whatever be the name given by a subscriber of Vedic worldview to it, the passionate personality of a tragic hero is heroic and positive for a subscriber to the theory of Drama such as O’Neill, because as mentioned earlier, such a self “pushes to a greater failure” ... by seeking “the unattainable” (1.4). It may also be said that a hero, who rests on the laurels of his success, from the point of view of philosophy of Drama, at least according to Eugene O’Neill, “pursuing the mere attainable,” is a spiritual middle classer and hence is not worth imitating (worth presenting in a Drama) (1.4). Neither rāṣṭrā is talked about as the intended aesthetic experience of Drama in the theory of Drama nor purgation as that of Nātya in the theory of Nātya. The comment that the aesthetic experience given by Drama is not rāsa, but only rasabhas (illusion of rāsa) (2.6.3), is true for the audience who are subscribers to Vedic worldview. It is as much a negative or neutral statement as the statement of a subscriber to the philosophy of Drama that
there is no Drama’ in the Sanskrit plays belonging to Nāṭya, keeping in mind that there is not enough thrill of conflict in the action or plot of these plays. Probably, depicting a self predominant in rasas can be said to be the sought after norm of Drama. It is more appropriate to talk about Drama in terms of purgation and Natya in terms of rasa only, but again as mentioned above, this whole excercise of crosscultural application of categories is aimed at pointing the incorrectness in the method of application of this kind, done by some scholars (2.6.3).

One good example for such wrong crosscultural descriptions done in the past, is to theorize that Hamlet and other tragedies give santa rasa, and also that giving santa rasa is their defining quality (2.6.3). It has been shown how according to the theory of santa rasa, usages of this kind of the word santa rasa are wrong, and it is in this context that it becomes necessary to clarify that if at all there is any word in rasa poetics that suits to talk about Hamlet and other tragedies, it is rasabhas but not santa rasa (2.6.3). Similarly, it has been shown that to talk about Liśa in terms of Dionysian element is wrong, keeping in view the internal evidences from within the Ras Liś text (4.3.5.2.II). It is in this context that Dionysus has been shown to be comparable to indra of Gṛvādhana Liś in that, both are gods who avenge the disobedience to them (4.3.5.2.III).

It may appear from the point of view of non-singularity of the meaning of a text, that the discussion, here in this work, is an attempt to talk about something like the single meaning of Liś. But, it may be noted that one of the important objectives of the present work has been to show how the same theme or form may look differently to different viewers. For example, talking about Drama through the categories such as rasa, rasabhas (2.6.3), guna-s (2.4) and punusartha-s (2.5) is one such attempt to show what Drama means to the participants of Natya, especially Liś. In the same way, it has been shown how the same themes of Indian mythology may be taken up for Natya for īnvarga (for example, venisamharam as discussed in 2.3), for Natya for īnvarta (as shown earlier in 2.6.2) and for Liś (3.5.1 & 3.6). Similarly, it has been analysed how the same urn
performance may give different meanings to the audience coming from different cultural backgrounds (4.3.5.3). It may also be noted that at least the Gaudiya Vaisnava poetics of Līlā allow the various identifications by the audience, by allowing the possibility of each audience identifying with one of the self knowledges of das type being depicted. Thus, if anyone takes instinctual gratification' as the meaning of Līlā (4.3.5.2.11), it falls under Drama interpretation of Līlā and may be valid within that paradigm (4.3.5.3). But what is intended is to show that that is not the meaning taken by Brajarāsi participants of Līlā at least, as long as they hold philosophies like Gaudiya Vaisnava school.

It may be noted that the position taken in this work is that reading of West born categories into Eastern material is as much wrong or right as the reading of East born categories into Western material. Both these kinds of readings are found in modern writings on Drama, Natya, and Līlā. In fact, the exercise of showing the distinct statuses of the categories such as Drama, Natya and Līlā by tracing their cultural and worldview settings (which as seen above helps in tracing the perspectives behind the various meanings), is an attempt to bring out the tendencies of wrong crosscultural readings exemplified above, which are found in these modern writings.