Chapter 3.

Līlā as a theatre of playful self.

3.1. Līlā as Natya for Bhakti.

The last chapter has created a background to understand various kinds of traditional Indian theatre from the point of view of the concept of self and self fulfilment as articulated in the Vedic literature. In this chapter, the discussion shall be extended to the Līlā-s.

Līlā, especially Rās Līlā, the focus of present research, as already mentioned in the introduction, is the name of the theatre performed in Vrindavan. The Rās Līlā-performances have seldom been distinguished from the performances of other forms of traditional Indian theatre either by ancient or modern scholars. Rasak, Natya Rasak and Halīsaka, which are ancient Indian theatrical forms close to Rās Līlā-s and which have been considered to be the older forms of the present day Rās Līlā-s (for example, Hein, 1972 : 276), have been considered to be uparāsaka-s, i.e., minor plays of Natya by Abhinava, Kohala (Appa Rao, 1959 : 534 -5), Dhanika, Sharadatanaya and Vishwanatha (Yamadagni, 1980 : 14). Modern authors like Vasant Yamadagni (1980), Syamnarayan Pandey (1980), Ramnarayan Agrawal (1981), and Prabhudayal Mital (1983), who did a deep and intricate analysis of Rās Līlā-s, also bring the general principles of the Natya Śāstra to be applied to Līlā-s and do not adequately distinguish Līlā-s from the other kinds of Natya. Some of the modern scholars have even read the principles of Drama into the stories of Līlā-s (see, for example, forthcoming 4.3.5.2.II).

The analysis of theatre from the point of view of self and self fulfilment which, as has been seen, is helpful in understanding the distinction between Drama and Natya and also between Natya for Trīvarga and the plays which were discussed under Natya for Moksa within Natya, can be seen to be not only helpful but even compelling to recognize Rās Līlā theatre as a category of its own
within Natya, a category clearly distinct from both NStya for Trīvarga and the category which was referred to as Natya for Mōkṣa (both referred to as Natya at the beginning of this thesis). Such analysis obviously helps in understanding the problem with the reading of principles of Drama into Liī-s also.

On a superficial observation, Ras Liī-s appear to be like any other plays of Natya on account of features such as borrowing of themes from the itihāsa-s and the Purāṇa-s (2.3), being a subhānta (auspicious ending) play, occurrence of rituals as part of performances (2.72), and the use of dance and music (2.6.3). One conspicuous distinction of Liī-s from Natya is the themes being of Bhakti (devotion) in Ras Liī-s. Distinction of Ras Liī-s to this extent has been recognized by almost all the modern authors writing on the Liī-s (for example, Yamadagni, 1980, Pandey, 1980, Agrawal, 1981, and Mital, 1983) But the distinction seems to be much more intricate than mere prevalence of Bhakti. This becomes dear by analysing Ras Liī-s from the point of view of self and self fulfilment, taking the help of the theoretical literature relevant to this issue.

The issue of Bhakti, within the two sections of the Veda-s, namely, the Karma Karda and the Jnāna Karda, mentioned in the last chapter (2.5.2 & 2.8), belongs to the Jnana Karda, which as mentioned in the last chapter, is also known as Vādānta. There are several schools of Vādānta which give central place to Bhakti and these are specially recognized as schools of Bhakti Vādānta. The literature on Bhakti Vedaanta is the relevant place where an explanation of Ras Liī-s in terms of self and self fulfilment can be looked. Here, the analysis of Ras Liī-s is being done with the help of books on Gaudiya Vaishnava school of Bhakti Vādānta which seems to be the most elaborate among those relevant to the issue (like Vālabha, Nimbārka, Rādhā Vallabha and other traditions).
3.2. Self fulfillment in terms of the **Absolute**, the ornaniser of laws of nature.

_Gaudiya Vaisnava_ school, along with the other schools of _Bhakti Vādānta_, shares several assumptions commonly with all the schools of _Vādānta_, though differs along with the other schools of _Bhakti Vedanta_, with the non-_Bhakti_ schools in some details of these assumptions. All these schools of _Vādānta_, as mentioned earlier (2.5.2 & 2.8), propose total liberation from misery and a self fulfillment of self as Self, basing their discussion on the _Upaniṣad-s_, the _Gītā_ and the _Brahma Sūtra-s_ which are Considered as the prasthana traya (the three sources Of _Vedanta_) as mentioned earlier (2.5.2 & 2.8).

As such, one of the concepts common for all the schools of _Vādānta_ is the concept of _atman_, the Self discussed in the last chapter (2.5.2). A word _jīva_ is used in reference to self in contrast with the word _ātman_ used in reference to the self as Self in the literature on _Vedanta_. Consideration of the Self as the ultimate reality of self and consideration of fulfillment of self as Self as the total and complete self fulfillment which can assure the liberation of self from misery, mentioned earlier (2.5.2), is common to all these schools of _Vedanta_.

According to Vedic worldview, which all schools of _vedanta_ share, it is part of nature that a self continues to exist even after its physical death (_Gītā_ II.13). The laws of nature, namely, rewards for compliance with _dharma_ and punishment for non-compliance (22.2) work beyond such a physical death. That is, as long as a self is bound to nature, the three _guna-s_ and their respective qualities (2.5.2), it is bound to receive the rewards and punishment according to the laws of nature even beyond such a physical death, i.e., during the next birth (_Gītā_ XIII.22). A _sattva_ predominated personality because of its conformity with _dharma_, after its death, takes birth again to receive the rewards for its compliance with _dharma_ and the _rajas_ predominated and _tamass_ predominated personalities take birth again to receive the punishment for the
non-compliance (2.4). But a self which transcends the three modes, i.e., attains self fulfilment in the form of self as Self or attains the urge for liberation (from bondage to nature) (2.5.2) does not take birth again (Gita XIV.20 & 11.51). Because self as Self, which as mentioned earlier (2.5.2), is not bound by nature, the three modes and their respective qualities, as such, is not bound to the cycle of birth and death also (Gita XIII.2-3). Thus, self fulfilment in the form of self as Self can also be viewed as liberation from the cycle of birth and death (Gita 11.51).

All the schools of Vādānta commonly explain self and self fulfilment in another way too. This explanation is in terms of the relation of the self with nature through another key concept called the Absolute who is referred to as Bramhan in the Upanisad-s and also as Paramātmā and Bhagavan in the Purāna-s. One of the prominent definitions of Bramhan (Bramhan, bramh - bulge, evolve, manifest) in the Upanisad-s is that it is that which is all pervading (vibhu) (Katha Upanisad I.2.22 & II.1.4), imperishable (aksaram) (Katha Upanisad I.2.16) and unique (advitiyam) (Chandogya Upanisad VI.2.1) source of everything that is. As already mentioned (2.7.2), the Karma Kārda deals with the relation of self with nature as a give and take relation with the gods who administer the nature through the laws of nature. The Jñāna Kārda or Vādānta, in all its schools, conceives of the Absolute as (i) the one who presides over the administration of the gods, i.e., the one who rewards and punishes the serves for their compliance and non-compliance with dharma respectively through the gods (Gita XIII.24); (ii) the one who is the ultimate and actual beneficiary who receives, through gods, the oblations offered in the yajña (2.7.2) (Gita V.29 & IX.24); and (iii) the actual benefactor who gives the fruits of yajña to the individuals through gods (Gita VII.22). This Absolute, like the self as Self (2.5.2), is not bound to nature (Gita XIII.15 & XIII.22), the three modes and hence their respective qualities (2.4). The individuals who are not aware of this Absolute direct their yajña towards the gods (Gita IX.23-24) and think that the gods are giving them the fruits of yajña. Those selves who have this awareness of the Absolute and thus of their ultimate relation with the Absolute, direct their actions such as yajña, towards
the Absolute \((Gita \text{ X.8})\). Such actions make the self \textbf{attain} the Absolute \((Gita \text{ IX.25})\) or \textbf{the features of the Absolute} \((Gita \text{ IV.10 \& III.19})\), i.e., the features of not being bound to the nature, to the modes and their respective qualities \((2.5.2)\). Since, as mentioned earlier \((2.5.2)\), these features are also the features of self as Self, attaining the features of the Absolute is the same as attaining self fulfilment of self as Self which, as mentioned above, leads to a liberation from the cycle of birth and death. This attainment of the nature of the Absolute is quite often \textbf{(metaphorically) referred to as attaining the Absolute}. \textbf{In essence}, the knowledge of self's actual ultimate relation with the Absolute and actions with such awareness lead to self fulfilment in the form of self as Self.

\textbf{It may be seen} that the laws of nature discussed in the last chapter \((2.2.2 \& 2.5.2)\) can be restated in terms of the self's relation with the Absolute as follows. The self which acts with the self knowledge in the form of the knowledge of its actual relation with the Absolute attains self fulfilment in the form of self as Self or liberation from the birth-death cycle, whereas, the self which acts without such a self knowledge gets bound to the three modes and gets rewarded or punished according to compliance or non-compliance with \textit{dharma}.

\textbf{3.3 Various relations of self with the Absolute and the corresponding paths of self fulfilment}

\textbf{It is in explaining} the detailed meaning of the concept of \textbf{attaining the Absolute} or \textbf{attaining the features of the Absolute} by the self that these different schools of vedanta basically differ. Based on the approach to this issue, these schools of V\dd{a}d\r{a}nta may broadly be divided into two \textbf{kinds}, (i) \textit{Advaita V\dd{a}da} \((\text{the philosophy of Non-duaHsm or Monism})\) propounded by Shankaracharya and (ii) \textit{Bhakti V\dd{a}d\r{a}nta}, under which come the different schools like \textit{V\dd{a}is\v{s}\dot{a}dv\dd{a}ta V\dd{a}da} \((\text{the philosophy of Qualified Monism})\) propounded by Ramanujacharya, \textit{Dv\r{a}ta vada} \((the}
philosophy of Dualism) propounded by Madhvacharya, and Acintya Bhādābhāda Vāda (the philosophy of Inconceivable difference and oneness) which is also known as Gaṇḍīya Vaisnava school, propounded by Jīva Gosvāmi.

The relation of self with the Absolute (the ultimate organizer of nature), for the Advaita school, is that self as Self is non-different from the Absolute (Dharmaraja Adhvarindra, 1993: 326, 372 & 380). The non-difference of the self as Self with the Absolute is derived from the general Vedantic principle that the Absolute is unique and hence there can not be a second entity with its features (Chāndogya Upanisad VI.2.1). The main feature of this self as Self non-different from the Absolute is attributelessness (Dharmaraja Adhvarindra, 1993: 372). Thus, for this school, attaining the Absolute by the self is nothing but the self fulfilment of self as Self because self as Self is non-different from the Absolute (Dharmaraja Adhvarindra, 1993: 384). Developing the self knowledge in the form of the knowledge (awareness) of the non-difference with the Absolute through knowing (directly experiencing), is considered to be the process for the attainment of self fulfilment in this school (Dharmaraja Adhvarindra, 1993: 384). This path is called the path of Jñāna (the path of knowledge) and since the self knowledge aimed to be attained through this path is also referred to as Jnana, Jnana' becomes both the path and goal of this school.

The relation of the self with the Absolute (the ultimate organizer of nature) for the Bhakti schools is that self as Self is an associate of the Absolute. Thus, for these schools, the attaining the Absolute by the self is nothing but the attainment of the self fulfilment of self as Self in association with the Absolute. The Absolute, though unique has attributes and a divine form according to them. (Incidentally, most of the Bhakti schools are Vaishnavaite in the sense that they consider the puranic God Viṣṇu-Nārāyana as this divine form). The self as Self, though is similar - in as much as being not bound to nature, guna-s and its qualities (2.4 & 2.5.2) - to the Absolute, is not the same as the Absolute. Thus, attaining the features of the Absolute' means
attaining those features which are common to both the Absolute and the self as Self, and not becoming the Absolute Himself. Working towards the **experiencing** the self knowledge in the form of the closest association of the self as Self with the Absolute, through practicing devotion (associational activities) towards the Absolute, is the process for self fulfilment in these schools. This self fulfilment and the path are both called *Bhakti* (the path of devotion) (see Tapasyananda, 1990, for a brief summary of the lives and philosophies of the propounders of these schools).

However, concepts of *Jñāna* (knowledge) and *Bhakti* (devotion) are among the concepts common for all the schools of *Vedānta* and are discussed in sources like the *Gītā* common to all these schools. But, the schools differ in the interpretation of these concepts and their relative priority as processes of self fulfilment. For example, generally in *Advaita Vedānta*, *Bhakti* is given a lesser position than *Jnana* and often *Bhakti* is considered to be an instrument for *Jnana*. Dharmarajadhvarindra, while explaining the process of *Bhakti* in *Advaita vedanta*, quotes from Amalananda Saraswati who, in his commentary called *kalpataru* on the *Bramha Sūtra-s*, argues that those who can not concentrate on the *attributeless* (*Nirguna*) *Bramhan*, meditate on the divine form of *Bramhan* (*Saguna Bramhan*) which manifests for the sake of the meditation for these meditators. Since the origin of *Saguna* *Bramhan* is *Nirguna* *Bramhan* itself, the ultimate realization of even such a person is in the form of realizing the *non-difference* with the formless *Bramhan* (1993: 399). However, there are many saints and scholars belonging to the *Advaita* school, such as Madhusudana Saraswati who give a significant place to *Bhakti* as a process for self fulfilment. Often, text thirty one from *Viveka Cudamani* (a book attributed to Shankaracharya) which reads as among the instruments of liberation, *Bhakti* is the greatest,’ is cited to show the significance given in *Advaita vedanta* to *Bhakti*. However, the next line of the same verse defines *Bhakti* as ‘sva *svarūpānusandhānam bhaktiṁtyahāyatā*: ‘(working towards) the realization of one’s own actual form as (self as) Self’ *non-different* from the Absolute) is called *Bhakti*.’ (The interpretation of *Jñāna* and
Table 5.

Comparision between different schools of Vedānta.

I. Common aspects.

1. Consider Brahma Sūtra-s, Upaniṣad-s and Bhagavat Gīta as the sources of knowledge.
2. Distinction between self and Self important. True nature of self is considered to be Self.
3. Reality perceived in terms of the Absolute.
4. Self knowledge perceived in terms of self’s relation with the Absolute.
5. Liberation from miseries conceived in terms of liberation from nature, modes and respective qualities.
6. Belief in the cycle of birth and death, cycle caused by bondage to guṇa-s and urges. The self as Self
7. Liberation perceived in terms of self’s relation with Absolute.
8. Incorporation of laws of nature of Karma Kāṇḍa as a special case.

II. Differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advaita Vedānta.</th>
<th>Bhakti Vedānta.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Issue</td>
<td>Self’s relation with the Absolute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-difference</td>
<td>Difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Issue</td>
<td>Nature of the Absolute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formless/Attributeless.</td>
<td>With divine form and attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of non-difference (between self Self and the Absolute).</td>
<td>Attainment of association (of self as Self with the Absolute).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge (jñāna).</td>
<td>Devotion (Bhakti).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the relative significance given to Jnana in the Bhakti schools is beyond the scope of this work).

The consequences of dividing vedanta into these two kinds (see table 5) in poetics have resulted in the interpretation of santa rasa as the ultimate by the Advaitic poetics and proposition of Bhakti as a rasa different from the eight rasa-s of Bharata and santa rasa, in the poetics of till as articulated by Rupa Goswami and Jiva Goswami, the theorists of Gaudya Vaisnava school.

3.4. Santa rasa described in terms of the experience of Self fulfilment

The above analysis of different schools of vedanta helps in analysing the principle mentioned in the last chapter (2.6.1), namely, the kind of rasa given by Natya depends on the kind of self fulfilment depicted in Natya, further. There, it was mentioned that santa rasa is the rasa given by the Natya in which the self fulfilment depicted is the fulfilment of self as Self (just as the eight rasas mentioned by Bharata are the rasa-s given by the Natya in which the self fulfilment depicted is the fulfilment of self as Tmarga seeking) and these plays (giving ianta rasa) were catagorized under Nātya for Mōksa (just as the plays giving eight rasa-s were catagorized under Natya for Tmarga). Incidentally, almost all the plays which are considered to be giving santa rasa, i.e., the plays discussed under Natya for Moksa, depict self fulfilment from an Advaitic perspective, i.e., the fulfilment or endeavour for the fulfilment of self as Self non-different from the Absolute.

As seen earlier in this chapter (3.3), the ultimate goal of the self for Advaita vedanta is the self fulfilment with certain specific features such as self fulfilment in the form of self as Self non-different from the formless Absolute (bramhādvaīta) which is also referred to as the knowledge' (tattva) - 'jnāna.' Thus, the plays which were earlier discussed under Natya for Mōksa are to be more precisely called as Natya for Jnana. (It goes without saying that there can be other kinds of plays which could be discussed under Natya for Moksa, but are to be more
precisely referred on the basis of the specific details of the ultimate goal in the worldview underlying those plays). These plays reveal the laws of nature from an Advaitic perspective, namely, the self which acts with the self knowledge of self as Self non-different from Bramhan ultimately realizes the same and the self which acts without this knowledge gets rewards and punishments for the compliance and non-compliance with dharma.

In this perspective, the fulfillment of the self knowledge of self as Self leads to total liberation from miseries, whereas lack of such self knowledge, though gives rewards for compliance with dharma (along with punishments for non-compliance) does not liberate the self from miseries. It may be noted that this perspective is not in contradiction with the laws of nature of Natya for Trivarga, but, in fact, incorporates those laws into itself as a special case. Moreover, almost all the authors of poetics who justified the possibility of santa rasa also take an Advaitic position with regard to self fulfillment.

Abhinava, the foremost and the most eloquent proponent of śānta rasa, is a follower of a metaphysical school called Kashmir Shaivism. But he shares the view of self being non-different from the Absolute with Advaita Viśdēnta (Vora in Kulkami, 1986: 67). Influence of Advaita Viśdēnta on Abhinavagupta has been well recognized by many modern scholars who quote several passages from Abhinava to substantiate this point. (For example, Arjunwadkar in Kulkami, 1986: 56 and Vora in Kulkami, 1986: 67-68). As one of the evidences for the influences of Advaita Viśdēnta, Vora cites Abhinava’s passages equating rasasvada (the experience of rasa) with bramhāsvāda (the experience of Bramhan) (in Kulkami, 1986: 68).

In fact, Hariharanayaka, the author of Bhartrhan Nirvādam, a santa rasa play with an Advaitic theme, uses the phrase brahmādvaita sukhātmakam i.e., in the form of the happiness of (resulting from experiencing) the non-difference from Bramhan (the Absolute), in reference to the experience of
sānta rasa and adds that like bramhādvaita sukha, the experience of santa rasa is also a permanent experience (as quoted in Bhatta, 1996: 90). This is a significant proposition in the poetics of santa rasa resulting from the influence of Advaita Vedanta on it, because in contrast to the general rasa theory, where the theatrical experience of rasa is fundamentally distinguished from the day to day experience of emotions, here, the rasa is not being differentiated from the spiritual experience of the self’s non-difference from Bramhan in its state as Self which is, in fact, a day to day experience for the selves who have self knowledge of self as Self. It may be noted that the differentiation between day to day life and theatrical experiences in Natya for Trivarga is because of the former being phenomenal and the latter transcendental, and the non-differentiation between the same in Natya for Jnana is because of both being transcendental. In the case of the eight rasa-s that belong to Natya for Trivarga, the day-to-day experience of emotions itself when depicted and thus experienced in a theatre become different from that day-to-day experience. Whereas, in the case of sānta, as seen from the Advaitic point of view, the experience of emotion depicted is the same as the experience in the theatre.

The influence of Advaitic Vedanta resulted in viewing even the eight rasa-s other than santa rasa also measured up against the happiness resulting from the experience of non-difference with the Absolute. Vishwanatha describes the experience of the eight rasa-s as bramhasvāda sahodara - a cognate of the experience of non-difference from Bramhan (1992 : 48). The word sahodara (literally sharing womb, here, congnate) deserves special attention here. On the one hand, it refers to similarity between the experience of eight rasa-s and the experience of bramhasvāda - the relish of the realization of self’s non-difference from Bramhan. But at the same time, the word is a careful choice to distinguish from the words like sukhātmakam used by Hariharanayaka, chosen to highlight the differences between bramhasvāda and the experience of eight rasa-s. These differences, as may be noted from the discussions in the last sections (2.6 & 3.3) are (i) if the experience of the eight rasa-s is characterized by a predominance of sattva and a subduing of
rajas and tamas (2.7.3), the experience of Bramhan, which is otherwise known as Jnana, is characterized by total transcendence of the three modes (2.5.2) and (ii) if the experience of eight rasa-s is characterized by a predominance of happiness (2.6.3 & 2.3), the experience of Bramhan is a total happiness free from miseries (2.4).

Another point of difference is in the temporary nature of the experience of the eight rasa-s noted by Mammata (1995 : 99 - 100) and the permanent nature of the experience of Bramhan described by Advaita Vedanta (Shankaracharya, 1995 : 131, 80). These differences can be applied to distinguish between the experience of sānta rasa given by Natya for Jnāna from the experience of eight rasa-s given by Natya for Tnvarga also. To put it otherwise, it can be stated that the above analysis of Vādānta into Advaitic and Bhakti Vādānta schools helps in identifying the distinction of Natya for Jnana (in comparison to the Natya for Tnvarga), more precisely, as its depiction of self fulfilment of self as Self non-different from the Absolute.

3.5 Self fulfilment in rasa language: Līlā-s as schematic, variegated and wide Choice Of rasa-s.

3.5.1. Līlā-s as the theatrical depictions of `playful' Self.

It is such an analysis of vedanta into schools which helps in realizing the plays of Uli as a category different from the Drama, Natya for Tnvarga and even Natya for Jnana, and helps in locating its place as belonging to the Bhakti Vādānta schools. As mentioned earlier (3.1), the Līlā-s, the subject matter of the present work, are being analysed from the point of view of Gaudiya Vaisnava school, one of the schools of Bhakti Vedanta.

Though the word Uli is used to refer to several different kinds of devotional theatre prevalent in North India, here the word is being used to refer to the devotional theatre of Vrindavan. The
Liśś of Vrindavan, though include several different types of Liśś like Rāmāyana Liśś, Mahābhārata Liśś (named after the source of the plots), and Bhakti Liśś (the Liśś based on the lives of the saints of Vrindavan and the devotees such as Dhuva and Prahalāda discussed in the Purāna-s), the focus of the present work are Rāś Liśś, which are the theatrical enactments of the stories of Kṛṣṇa and His devotees, chosen mainly from the tenth Book of the Bhāgavata Purana and from various other sources like the Brahma Vaivarta Purana, writings of medieval devotional poets associated with Vrindavan such as Surdas, Paramanandadas, Hita Harivams and Swam Haridas.

Gaudiya Vaśnavism school is based on the teachings of Chaitanya, the sixteenth century saint mentioned earlier (Intro), who is famous for spreading devotion through his sankirtan (congregational chanting of the holy names) movement. The biographies available on him describe the depths of ecstasy into which he would plunge at the mere mention of the name of Kṛṣṇa. He exerted his influence over thousands of people of his time (which continues even today) with his extreme devotion to Kṛṣṇa. (plates 1-3). His contemporaries longed for and treasured his association and participated joyously in his devotional movement through song and dance.

Caitanya Caritāmṛta, the most well know biography on Chaitanya explains his devotion as follows:

"When the Lord [Chaitanya here] saw the bluish neck of the peacock, His remembrance of Kṛṣṇa immediately awakened, and He fell to the ground in ecstatic love" (Madhya Liśś XVII.218). He went to Kesītīrtha [which is even now identified in Vrindavan as a spot on the banks of the Yamuna], and when He saw the place where the rasa dance [The dance which Kṛṣṇa is supposed to have performed with cowherd damsels, i.e., gopi-s as an incarnation, going to be discussed in 4.3.4 & 4.3.5.2.2]. Chaitanya is reported to have identified the place where Kṛṣṇa performed
1-3. Paintings depicting Chaitanya's ecstasies (Introduction, 3.5.1 & 3.9).

1. Chaitanya (in yellow robes and with aura around the head) leading an ecstatic street sankirtan (congregational chanting of the holy names). The other saints with aura are his intimate associates Nityananda, Advaita, Gadadhara and Svāsa. Note residents of the street coming to join the team (left).

2. Chaitanya used to trek into streets in his ecstatic sankirtan mood and his associates used to follow him lost in ecstasy.
3 Chaitanya (in the center) used to dance in ecstasy and faint whenever he went for the *darsan* (audience) of the dieties of *Jagannatha* (the figure on the top) at *Puri, Odisha*, while his associates accompanied him.

Source: International Society for *Krsna* Consciousness, Vrindavan.
this dance in Vrindavan] had taken place, He immediately lost consciousness due to ecstatic love. When the Lord regained His senses, He began to roll on the ground. He would sometimes laugh, cry, dance and fall down. He would also chant very loudly" (Madhya Liṅga XVIII. 72-73).

Else where it says,

"The Lord's body was restless, and tears, trembling and jubilation were manifest. He said very loudly, "Chant Kesna Chant Kesna" (Madhya Liṅga XVII.205).

Discussing Chaitanya's emotions, David Kinsley says,

"His behaviour indicates he hovered somewhere between the ordinary world and the transcendental world of Kesna...To use a familiar phrase, Caitanya behaved as though he were in but not of the world, ....The slightest stimulus could trigger within him a flood of emotions and release him from the confines of his immediate surroundings, or transform his immediate surroundings into transcendental realities. On the transcendental plane his devotional sentiments were consummated. When he entered that "other" realm his devotion found complete fulfilment. His intense devotion that came to be paradigmatic for the cult is directly associated with his ability to enter this transcendental plane almost at will ...." (1979:209-11).

It is this Chaitanya's spiritual experience and its articulation that has been elaborated in the form of Gaudīya Vaisnava school by Rupa Goswami (hereafter Rupa) in his Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu and Ujjvala Nilamani and Jiva Goswami (hereafter Jiva) in his Sat Sandartha. Jiva, who explained the philosophy Of Gaudīya Vaisnava school in his Sat Sandartha, considers the prasthana traya, i.e., the upanisad-s, the Bramha Sūtra-s and the Gita as the source of his discussion, like the other schools
of Vedanta (2.5 & 2.8) do, but following Chaitanya, he holds the Bhagavata Purana (one of the eighteen Puranas attributed to Vyasa) (2.2.2) as the essence of the Vedas and thus as the natural commentary on the Bramha Sūtra-s (Tattva Sandartha, section 19). Based on this consideration, he and the other proponents of Gaudiya Vaisnava school constantly refer to the Bhagavata Purana for authority. This methodology of the scholars of Gaudiya Vaisnava school creates an interesting situation because while discussing the poetics of the Bhagavata Purana, the book that is being analyzed itself becomes the source of authority for the validity of the analysis. Jiva, however, adapts the method of constantly establishing the agreement between the Bhagavata Purana and the prasthana traya, to avoid any impression of circularity in his method. This agreement is conceived by viewing the Bhagavata Purana as a narrative form elaboration of discursive form of the Aphorisms of the Bramha Sūtra-s, just as the Puranas and the Itihāsa-s are considered as the narrative form elaboration of the Vedas in general (2.2.2 & 2.3).

In other words, the narrative form elaboration found in the Bhagavata Purana is considered to be pertaining only to the Vedanta, i.e., Jnana Karda section of Vedas. Of course, this view of the Bhagavata Purana by the Gaudiya Vaisnava school includes the consideration of the Bhagavata Purana to be an elaboration of Bhakti point of View of Vedanta, especially, the Gaudiya Vaisnava point of view. Thus, Liśa-s from such a point of view, can be viewed as theatrical form presentation of Vedanta, especially, Bhakti schools of Vedanta, and Obviously, for Gaudiya Vaisnava school, Of the Gaudiya Vaisnava school of Vedanta, just as Natya for Trīarga is a theatrical presentation of the Karma Karda point of view of Vedanta and Natya for Jnana, that of the Advalta school of Vedanta (2.4.2, 2.6.1 & 2.8).

Though either Rupa or Jiva did not directly discuss the poetics of Liśa performances of Vrindavan, their analysis of the Bhagavata Purana in the form of poetics of the Bhagavata Purana. The Bhagavata Purana being the major source of Liśa-s, this analysis can be useful as the
poetics of Lilā-s. In fact, Rupa and Jiva themselves suggest such a treatment when (i) Rupa, in his Nātaka Candrika, adheres to Bharata’s analysis of the elements of plot as they are, only examples being given from his own play Lālita Madhava (containing the story of Kṛṣṇa); and (ii) in Priti Sandartha (section 111), Jiva applies the principles of his analysis of the Bhagavata Purāṇa to the poetics of dṛṣṭyākavya (visible poem, i.e., theatre). The validity of this treatment is further proved in the forthcoming sections of this work. With this understanding the phrase poetics of Lilā will be used in the forthcoming discussion to refer to the poetics of the Bhagavata Purāṇa.

The Genesis of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava school is traced to a conversation between Chaitanya and Sanatana Goswami (hereafter Sanatana), a disciple of Chaitanya. This conversation is described in Caitanya Cantanrta by Krishnadas Kaviraja. In this work, Sanatana, on meeting Chaitanya, asks Who am I? Why do I experience the threefold miseries? (Madhya Lilā XX.102). In his reply to Sanatana, using the word ‘Kṛṣṇa’ of the Bhagavata Purāṇa (see 3.5.3) in reference to the Absolute, Chaitanya says, (i) the self’s actual/original identity is being Kṛṣṇa’s eternal servant - jīvātmā kṛṣṇā nityādas (Madhya Lilā XX.108); and (ii) forgetting (this relationship with) Kṛṣṇa is the cause of miseries (Madhya Lilā XX.117).

It may be interesting to note that the above conversation begins exactly with the same question - Who am I?,’ mentioned by the Deers (1.1) as a question raised by the self throughout the history of Drama. It may also be remembered that according to the Deers, self knowledge is the answer to this question and self fulfilment is experiencing that answer in reality. Thus, the above conversation may be seen to be presenting knowledge of being an eternal servant of Kṛṣṇa - the Absolute, as self knowledge and the failure in the fulfilment of this knowledge as the cause of miseries.

It may also be remembered that the number three used in connection with the miseries in
the above conversation is coincidentally the same as the number used in connection with misfortunes by Schopenhauer (1.3). It was shown in the first chapter (1.3) that the conflict presented in Drama also can be identified to be of three in number. As far as the above conversation is concerned, the use of the phrase threefold miseries' is part of the general usage of the phrase 'tāpanāyā,' three burnings, i.e., three miseries (for example, see the Bhagavata Purana l.1.1 and Caitanya Caritāmṛta, Madhya Līlā XXII.13) to refer to ādhyātmika kēśa-s, ādhibhautika kēśa-s, and ādhyādāvika kēśa-s. Whether these threefold miseries are related or similar to the threefold conflicts and/or threefold misfortunes discussed in the first chapter (1.3), or not, is beyond the scope of the present discussion. But what is common between the conflicts, misfortunes and miseries is their being related to failure in self-fulfilment and to the search for self-knowledge either as causes or consequences.

Apparently, Chaitanya's answer seems to be just the same as the general theory of Bhakti Vedaṇḍa mentioned earlier (3.3). But further elaboration of each of the words in this answer like das, Kṛṣṇa, and niṣya, bring out the distinction of Chaitanya's school, with regard to the self and its fulfilment, in comparison to the other schools of Bhakti Vedaṇḍa. The word das refers, according to this elaboration, to a specific kind of relation of self with the Absolute. One of the major and conspicuous distinctions of Gauḍīya vaiṣṇava theory in comparison to the other schools of Bhakti Vedaṇḍa is with regard to this relation.

Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava school conceives a simultaneous difference and non-difference of the self as Self from the Absolute. This conception is based on the consideration of selves as Selves as parts of the Absolute. Thus, self as Self is non-different from the Absolute, because it is a part of the same whole called the Absolute. But, it is also different from the Absolute, because its self knowledge is that of self as Self different from the Absolute. In this sense, the selves as Selves are considered to be 'separated parts (viññāṇa amṛta-s) of the Absolute (Paramātma Sandarbha,
section 8). Intellectually, this simultaneous difference and non-difference of the selves as Selves from Kṛṣṇa is inconceivable. At best, it can be explained through an analogy. Jiva, in his commentary on Paramāṭha Sandarbhā called sarva samvādini (1984 : 29), quotes the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad (II.1.20), which gives the following analogy to illustrate the relation between the Absolute and the selves as Selves. This Upanisad compares the selves as Selves with the sparks of a fire. The sparks of fire belong to fire (here the Absolute) and are yet different from fire. In this sense, they are one and different from the source, i.e., fire. Similarly, the selves as Selves too are simultaneously one and different from Kṛṣṇa. This intellectually inconceivable relationship of simultaneous oneness and difference between the selves as Selves and Kṛṣṇa is called by Jiva, in his sarva samvādini, as acintya bhedabheda (1984 : 293 & 298). Thus, it may be noted that the das relation between the self as Self and Bnagavan, mentioned earlier, read with this description of the relation between the two, leads to the idea that das relation is, in fact, a (separated) part whole relation. (The other Bhakti schools have their respective notions of relations between the self and the Absolute, discussion of which is beyond the scope of this thesis).

Another significant distinction of Gaudiya Vaisnava school in comparison to the other schools of Bhakti Vedanta, with regard to the relation between the self and the Absolute, is based on its recognition of the formless aspect of the Absolute as simultaneously existing along with the divine form aspect of the Absolute. The schools of Bhakti Vēdānta such as Dvaita and Viśistadvaita, summarily reject the validity of the formless aspect of the Absolute and consider the Absolute as possessing a divine form and a divine form alone. Gaudiya Vaisnava understanding, in this regard, differs even from the Advaita Vēdānta perspective, because Advaita vedanta recognizes only the formless aspect of the Absolute as its ultimate existence. Contrarily, giving the same name Braham, given by Advaita Vedanta, to the formless aspect of the Absolute (Bhagavat Sandarbha, sections 2, 3, 81 & 89), and referring to the formful or the divine form understanding of the Absolute as Bnagavan (Bhagavat Sandarbha, section 2, 3, 81 & 89), the Gaudiya Vaisnava school
considers the Absolute as simultaneously existing as *Bramhan* and *Bhagavan* also. In fact, the Absolute is considered to be simultaneously, along with these two forms, existing in a third form, namely, *Paramatma* which is the name given to the aspect of the Absolute as the organizer of (laws of nature of) the universe (*Paramatma Sandarbha*, section 1).

The mode/state transcendental to the three modes namely, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, described as the mode/state of self as Self in the last chapter (2.5.2) and that of the Absolute in this chapter (3.3), is referred to as *iuddha sattva* or *všuddha sattva* (pure *sattva*) in Gaudiya Vaisnava school (*Bhagavat Sandarbha*, section 75), borrowing the word *ṣuddha sattva* from sources like Padma Purana (*Bhagavat Sandarbha*, sections 72 & 78) and this is considered to be the feature common to *Bramhan*, *Paramatma* and *Bhagavan* aspects of the Absolute. This mode is called pure mode of *sattva*, because unlike the *sattva*, discussed earlier as one of the mode in the personality of the self, this *sattva* is free from *rajas* and *tamas*. In other words, the *(v)ṣuddha sattva* which is the nature of *Bramhan*, *Paramatma* and *Bhagavan* aspects of the Absolute, is different from and transcendental to the three modes *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* (*Paramatma Sandarbha*, section 98).

Since *Advaita Vedānta* focuses on the formless aspect and the *Gaudīya Vaisnava* school on the *Bhagavan* aspect, the discussion here, on the interaction between *Advaita Vedānta* and *Gaudīya Vaisnava* school, is centered around these two aspects.

The *(v)ṣuddha sattva* state exists without attributes or activities in the *Bramhan* aspect whereas, in the *Bhagavan* aspect, it exists as aggregate of all possible auspicious attributes (*Bhagavat Sandarbha*, section 2) and in a form of love which is different from the *kāma puruṣārtha* mentioned earlier (2.5), and which is sublimely above and different from the earthly desires. This transcendental loveful nature of *Bhagavan* is what is described as Mis `playfulness,' in the sense that *Bhagavan* is devoid of any purpose or motive (*Bhagavat Sandarbha*, section 47) other than the
expression of transcendental love. The selves as Selves related to Bhagavan are considered to be sharing this transcendental love in the form of 'playful' activities (Paramatma Sandartha, section 47 and Bhagavat Sandarbha, section 79) with Him which means that these activities are performed by the selves as Selves without any expectation or purpose of fulfilling mundane desires or the otherworldly desires (Priti Sandarbha, section 23). It may be noted that the conception of Bhagavan implies and is implied by a self knowledge in the form of self as Self in a transcendental loving relation with the divine form, just as the conception of Bramhan aspect of the Absolute, as conceived in Advaita Vedanta, implies and is implied by a self knowledge in the form of self as Self non-different from Bramhan. The word das used in Caitanya’s answer to Sanatoria, in fact, refers to this self knowledge in the form of self as Self in transcendental loving relation with Bhagavan.

Though Gaudiya Vaisnava school seems to be sharing certain commonness with Advaita Vedanta in recognizing the formless Bramhan aspect, its place among the Bhakti schools of Vedanta lies in its consideration of the Bhagavan (the divine form) aspect as primary and the Bramhan and Bhagavan as two different manifestations of it (Bhagavat Sandarbha, sections 2, 82 & 89). In other words, if as mentioned earlier (3.3), in Advaita Vedanta, the divine form of the Absolute (given the name Bhagavan in Gaudiya Vaisnava school) is seen as a manifestation of formless aspect of the Absolute (given the name Bramhan in both Gaudiya Vaisnava school and in Advaita Vedanta), manifest in this form for the meditators who can not meditate on the formless Bramhan, which is the ultimate Reality, in Gaudiya Vaisnava school, Bhagavan is viewed from a different perspective and is considered to be the ultimate Reality, the source of Bramhan and hence primary.

Based on this primacy, Gaudiya Vaisnava school considers that those who consider the Bramhan aspect of the Absolute as the ultimate and consider the divine form aspect as a manifestation of the Bramhan aspect- obviously referring to the Advaita Vedantins, naming them as the followers Of Jnana (Bhakti Sandarbha, section 215), are, in fact, talking about Bhagavan only, but perceive only His formless manifestation. As a consequence of this view about the Advaita
Vedantic perspective of the Absolute, *Gaudiya Vaisnava* school considers that the self with the self knowledge based on *Advaita Vedanta* does not, in fact, attain non-difference from *Bramhan* aspect of the *Bhagavan*, but attains only the formlessness (*Bhakti Sandarbha*, section 215), which is a feature of *Bhagavan* in His manifestation as *Bramhan*, since self as *Self* is, in fact, only a separated part of that formless *Bramhan* (just as it is only a separated part of *Bhagavan* aspect also). Because of this attainment of formlessness, such selves do not attain the sharing of transcendental loving relation with the *Bhagavan* aspect of *Bhagavan*.

Thus, another difference between *Gaudiya Vaisnava* school and most of the other schools of *Bhakti Vedanta* can be seen to be lying in the recognition and non-recognition, respectively, of the validity of a formless aspect of *Bhagavan*.

Though transcendental loving relation is common in both the *Gaudiya vaisnava* school and other *Bhakti* schools, in the interpretation of *das*, *Gaudiya Vaisnava* school gives an extraordinarily great significance to the concept of transcendental love, gives it the name *priti* and considers it to be a fifth *purusartha*, different from the four *purusarthas* *dharma*, *artha*, *kama* and *moksa* mentioned earlier (*Priti Sandarbha*, section 1). It may be noted that this consideration provides scope for self fulfilment of the self knowledge (in the form of transcendental loving associate of *Bhagavan*) being the same as the fulfilment for the urge (of *priti*), in the same way as in the case of the concepts of *Natya tor Tnvarga* and *Natya for Jñāna* (2.5). Here, it should be noted that while most of the other schools of *Bhakti Vēdānta* treat the attainment of the ultimate self fulfilment in the form of self as *Self* in a transcendental loving relation with the Absolute, which exists only in a divine form, as the meaning of *moksa purusartha*, *Gaudiya vaisnava* school uses the word in a general sense of the urge for liberation from *miseries*, from the cycle of birth and death, from the three modes and its qualities, which is the cause and effect of self fulfilment in the form of self as *Self* (in any one of the forms conceived by the different schools of *Vēdānta*) and thus includes the
ultimate urge of an Advaita practitioner under this (Priti Sandarbha, sections 1 & 3).

The urge for priti is distinguished from the urge for moksa by Gaudiya Vaisnava school, on account of the emphasis on the ultimate attainment of the transcendental love, to the extent of not caring for the attainment or no attainment of liberation from miseries, from modes, from their qualities, from the cycle of birth and death and so on. Of course, in fact, Gaudiya vaisnava school recognizes that the attainment of transcendental love automatically implies liberation of this kind, since priti is made up of (vāśuddha sattva (supra). As already mentioned (3.3), this self fulfilment and the path of performing activities leading towards such self fulfilment is called Bhakti and the selves following such a path and those who attain such a self fulfilment are called bhakta-s in Gaudiya vaisnava school, just like in any Bhakti schools of Vedanta. In other words, the das relation mentioned by Chaitanya in his answer to Sanatana, is called Bhakti and the selves having or striving towards this relation are called bhakta-s.

The content of Līlā-s is the depiction of bhakta-s and their Bhakti, chosen from various sources like the Bhagavata Purāṇa, other Puranas and ātithāsā-s, and other sources such as the poetic works of the devotional saints mentioned above (supra). Followers of Gaudiya Vaisnava school look at such depictions as narrative form presentations of the Gaudiya Vaisnava school of Vedanta.

In these sources of Līlā-s, all the stories are depicted to be happenings on earth. The happenings are usually in the form of the activities of bhakta-s in association with the Absolute who is depicted in these stories to have been 'born' on earth in human and non-human earthly being forms. For example, in the story of Prahśīda-Narasimha, described in the Bhagavata Pumna (Book VII) and other Purāṇa-s, Prahśīda is the bhakta and the Absolute is depicted to be 'born' breaking out of a pillar in the form of a man-lion called Narasimha. In Ramayana, there are several bhakta characters like Hanumān and Laksmana, and the Absolute is depicted to be born in the form of a prince, the eldest
Son of king Dasaratha of Ayodhya. In Bhāgavata Purana (Book X), there are numerous bhakta characters including the entire population of the cowherd hamlet called Vrndāvana, where the Absolute was found ‘born’ in (in fact, ‘born’ at a different place and brought to) the house of the head of the hamlet called Nanda. It is in this birth that the Absolute is called Kṛṣṇa, and here He is depicted to have spent His childhood as a cowherd boy, going after the cows to graze them, and playing with His mother Yaśodā, father Nanda, cowherd boyfriends (gopa-s) and girlfriends (gopi-s), doing mischief, killing demons and so on.

The Other schools of Bhakti Vedanta like Dvaita and Vāestādvaita give the name Narayana/Viṣṇu to the Absolute taking ‘birth’ on earth, as exemplified above. They consider that He resides in an upper world called vaikuntha and these schools of Bhakti Vedanta consider His taking ‘birth’ on earth as His avatar (avatara = to descend; avatara = descending), i.e., descendance on earth. (see Corcoran, 1995 : 30-52, for a discussion on the views of various Śampradāya-s of Vrindavan on the understanding of Kṛṣṇa as an avatar of Viṣṇu or Narayana). These schools consider that by performing their associational activities with a transcendental loving relation with the Absolute in his respective avatāra forms, the bhakta-s get liberated and attain (company or feature Of) Narayana/Viṣṇu in Vaikuntha.

Gaudīya Vaiṣṇava school, like the other schools of Bhakti Vedanta considers the ‘upper’ world where the Absolute resides as Vaikuntha only, but considers that the Absolute manifests in unlimitedly multitudinous forms in a corresponding unlimited multitudinous forms/planes of Vaikuntha. The forms (like Narasimha, Rama and Kṛṣṇa) are considered to be existing (as Narasimha, Rama and Kṛṣṇa) eternally only in different forms/planes of Vaikuntha corresponding to their respective forms ‘before taking birth’ on earth (Caitanya Caritamrta, Madhya Līlā XX.264 and Kṛṣṇa Sandartha, sections 26 & 29).
This idea that the Absolute exists in various forms such as Rama, Narasimha and Krsna in the various forms of Vaikuntha, leads Gaudiya Vaisnava school not only to reject the idea that all these forms are the phenomenal manifestations of a single form called Narayana (Krsna Sandarbha, section 29 & 153), i.e., the avatāras of Narayana, but also makes it propose a different idea of avatara itself. Avatara of the forms of Bhagavan (such as Rama), according to Gaudiya Vaisnava school, is the "descending down" of the same form of the Absolute (such as Rama) from His abode Vaikuntha, into the phenomenal realm (Catārya Caritamrta, Madhya Liṣṭa XX.264, Kṛsna Sandarbha, sections 28 & 153, and Lāghu Bhagavatāṁrtta I.2.1 and the commentary of Baladeva Vidyabhusana on this verse).

But this taking 'birth on earth' or avatara (descending down) is explained by Gaudiya Vaisnava school in a different way than the other schools of Bhakti Vedaṭa. Here comes a significant notion of Gaudiya vaisnava school called sakti (energy) of Bhagavan which is used to explain the connection between the 'upper' world vaikuntha and the phenomenal world. What is called as the upper world is considered to be the antaranga sakti ('internal energy') of Bhagavan (Paramatma Sandarbha, section 47) and is characterized by (vi)ṣuddha sattva (Bhagavat Sandarbha, section 72), a state beyond the three modes, and the phenomenal realm including the earth is considered to be His bahiranga sakti ('external energy') (Paramatma Sandarbha, section 99) and as mentioned earlier (2.5.2), is considered to be characterized by the three modes. According to this concept, the concept of Vaikuntha as an 'upper' world need not necessarily be taken as being spatially upper. The all pervading nature of the Absolute, mentioned earlier, is explained by conceiving an all pervading nature of Vaikuntha in Gaudiya Vaisnava school (Catārya Caritamrta, Mi Liṣṭa I.5.15 and Bhagavat Sandarbha, section 72). Thus, for Gaudiya Vaisnava school, Vaikuntha is here also just as it is everywhere. In other words, both the internal energy which is beyond the three modes and the external energy which is characterized by the three modes exist spatially at the same place. Or, to be more precise, the same spatial location in its state as
characterized by the three modes is considered to be the external energy and in its state as characterized by ($\psi$)sudha sattva (the state beyond the three modes) is considered to be the internal energy of Bhagavan. It should be noted that these two realms (vaikuntha and the phenomenal realm), which are the internal and the external energies of Bhagavan, are corresponding to and hence as real as the two states characterized by ($\psi$)sudha sattva and the three modes respectively. As mentioned throughout the past discussion, these features of the Absolute are corresponding to and hence imply and are implied by two kinds of self knowledge, namely, self as Self beyond the three modes and self characterized by the three modes. In other words, self knowledge in the form of self as Self beyond the three modes leads to the experience of the internal energy of Bhagavan or Vaikuntha and the self knowledge in the form of self characterized by three modes leads to the experience of the phenomenal world. Thus, all selves in their self as Self beyond the three modes identity are always in a transcendental associated relation with Bhagavan (of course in His internal energy, i.e., Vaikuntha). This fact of a transcendental associational relation (of self as Self) being an eternal reality, is interpreted to be what is being referred to as mtya in the answer by Chaitanya to Sanatana. Gaudiya vaisnava school considers that rt is the state of being beyond the three modes of nature, which is considered to be the feature of Vaikuntha, as mentioned earlier, which is being perceived or metaphorically described as 'upper.' Thus, the 'descending down' of different forms of Bhagavan from the 'upper world' to the 'lower world' is interpreted as the manifestation of these forms of Bhagavan in His internal energy, into His external energy. This manifesting is explained just as a 'play' (pastime) of Bhagavan in the sense that it is part of the 'playful' nature characteristic of Bhagavan to manifest in this way.

Just as the forms of the Absolute like Narasimha, Rama and Krsna are considered to be existing in the same form even in Vaikuntha, and are considered to be manifest in the phenomenal world and are perceived to be descending down or taking birth on earth, even the respective
bhakta-s of these forms are also considered to be existing in the same form and to be performing the same associational activities even in the internal energy (Kr̄ṣṇa Sandarbha, sections 136 & 15) and these forms and their activities are considered to be manifest in the phenomenal world and are perceived to be born on earth' and happening on earth' as part of the avatara (descending down') of the Bhagavan. These associational activities involving the Bhagavān and His bhakta-s are called Līi-ś (plays'), and in their manifestations in the internal energy, they are given the name aprakata Līi-ś, meaning unmanifest Līi-ś, since for the self with self knowledge in the form of self characterized by the three modes, the internal energy and hence the Līi-ś as part of it, can not be 'seen' (Kr̄ṣṇa Sandarbha, section 153); they in their manifestation in their phenomenal world are given the name pmkata Līi-ś (Kr̄ṣṇa Sandarbha, section 153), since they can be seen' by even these selves.

But there is an apparent difference between the apmkata Līi-ś and pmkata Līi-ś. Apmkata Līi-ś, when manifest in the prakata form, not only manifest as they are but also manifest in the form of an additional kind tifūu-%, in which the manifestation of Bhagavan kills demons. Articulating this consideration, Bhaktivinode Thakur classifies prakata Līi-ś into two kinds, namely, nitya (eternal) Līi-ś and naimittika (purposive) Līi-ś. He places demon killing Līi-ś under naimittika Līi-ś and considers the other Līi-ś as the direct manifestation of the Līi-ś of aprakata Līi, which exist only in the nitya form (1985: 405). The demon killing activities of the prakata Līi can be seen to be the manifestation of the principle that self knowledge of the self devoid of its actual identity suffers from miseries. Probably, because of the absence of the selves with self knowledge devoid of the actual identity in the apmkata Līi-ś, demons are said to be absent in apmkata Līi-ś.

Thus, though the recognition of the divine form (Bhagavan form) of the Absolute as primary stands as a common factor between Gauḍiya Vaishnava school and the other schools of Bhakti Vādañ̄ta mentioned above, this conception of Bhagavan and His abode Vaikuntha in terms of (i)
multiple forms; (ii) internal and external energies; and (iii) manifest and unmanifest activities (plays') marks another major point of distinction between them, with regard to the understanding about the das relation mentioned above, in the answer of Chaitanya to Sanatana. If the above mentioned schools of Bhakti Vādānta, like veśistadvaita consider the various kinds of das relations found between different bhakta-s like Prahlāda, Hanumān, gopa-s and gopi-s and the respective forms of Bhagavan like Narasimha, Rama and Kṛsna as various kinds of devotional relations of the selves as Selves with Nārāyaṇa/Veni residing in Vaikuntha, Gauḍīya Vaisnava school understands these various kinds of devotional relations as the manifest forms of the unmanifest transcendental assoaational relations manifest in the external energy from the various forms/planes of internal energy where these selves as Selves, forms of Bhagavān and their assoaational relations exist in the same form as they are manifest

It is with this perspective that the various stories performed in Līlā-s from various sources like the Mahabharata, the Ramayana and the Bhagavata Purana are viewed by the followers Of Gauḍīya Vaisnava school. In Drama and Natya for Trvarga, the content (in other words, the object of imitation) is the mundane activities of human beings on earth. In Greek Tragedy and Natya for Trtvarga these activities on earth are viewed as governed by the laws of nature according to which the gods in the upper worlds administer human activities (1.2.1 & 2.2.1). (As shown in 1.2.3, 1.2.4 and 1.2.5 respectively, in later Drama these laws were interpreted through other kinds of determinism such as the hereditary, the psychological, and the historical and the social). The perception towards what is enacted on the stage in Līlā performances has a significant distinction in this regard. As mentioned above, the content of Līlā performances are stories in which the activities of the Absolute and His devotees on earth are described and these stories, according to Gauḍīya Vaisnava school, are only manifestations of the activities of the Absolute and the selves as Selves in the antarangā sakti (Vaikuntha) into the bahiranga sakti (phenomenal world). In other words, what is being enacted in us performances is the upper world as manifest on earth. It is
in this sense that Gaudiya Vaisnava school looks at Liša as theatrical representation of Gaudiya Vaisnava worldview.

3.5.2. Bhakti rasa, the experience of Self fulfilment.

What is interesting for a student of theatre in the Gaudiya Vaisnava outlook towards Liša is, apart from treating Liša performances as the theatrical (playform) representation of the earthly manifestation of the `playful' activities of self as Self and Bhagavan in the `upper world' (3.5.1), these activities in the `upper world' themselves are talked in a theatrical (play) language in this philosophy. It may be noted that if theoreticians of śānta rasa used the language of vedanta to talk about a theatrical experience, in calling Santa rasa experience bramhādva‎ta sukhālmaka and the experience of eight rasa-s as bramhānanda sahodara (3.4), Gaudiya Vaisnava school does the other way round of this, by using the language of theatrical aesthetics to talk about the ideas of vedanta, i.e., the transcendental loving associational activities (‘plays’) involving self as Self and Bhagavan. This can be seen in Gaudiya Vaisnava school’s use Of words like rasa, vibhava, sthayi bhava, vyabhācāribhāva (2.6.1), in reference to Bhagavan, selves as Selves, the objects and experiences considered to be constituting the upper world’ (Vaikuntha).

The Gaudiya Vaisnava description of Vedanta in this language is that the selves as Selves experience various rasa-s as a result of their transcendental loving relation with Bhagavan. Since this transcendental loving relation is termed as Bhakti, as mentioned earlier (3.5.1), these rasa-s are called Bhakti rasa-s. For the Bhakti rasa experience Of the selves as Selves, Bhagavan is alambana vibhava (locative object). In other words, experience of Bhakti rasa of the selves as Selves implies and is implied by a self fulfilment of das self knowledge. Even Bhagavan experiences Bhakti rasa, because of His transcendental loving associational activities with the selves as Selves. But His Bhakti rasa experience is multiform. For each of His Bhakti rasa experience, a self of Self becomes
Here, the Bhakti rasa experience of neither Bhagavan nor the selves as Selves is that of an audience. This is something like the experience of eros, by both the participants of a loving pair, in the company of each other in day to day life. The eros experiencing partner is experiencing it because of the other partner. It is in this sense that the other part becomes kāraṇa (cause) of the eros experience of the experiencing partner. The resulting physical responses in the experiencing partner are called kārya-s (effects). It may be remembered that (aiambana) vibhāva and anubhāva-s are the theatrical parallels for the concepts of cause and effect as real life entities. Thus, the vocabulary of aiambana vibhāva being used for the cause' of Bhakti rasa experience, in the Gaudiya Vaisnava language mode) of Vaiṣṇava, is similar to what is happening in poetics. Both in the theatrical language and Gaudiya Vaisnava rasa language model Of Vaikuntha, aiambana vibhava is different from the kāraṇa of day to day life, because of its being transcendental (aiināka). Since the Priti (transcendental love) experience, which is being called the Bhakti rasa experience of Bhagavan and the selves as Selves, though transcendental to eros (3.5.1), has an eros like situation, on account of being an experience shared by both the partners, both the partners in Priti (transcendental loving) experience are also being termed as mutually aiambana vibhāva-s.

It was mentioned earlier that Gaudiya Vaisnava school considers self knowledge, in the form of self as Self, to be varied in correspondence with and in an implies - implied by relation with the various forms Of Bhagavan like Narasimha, Rama and Kṛsna. The above mentioned mutual aiambana vibhava situation and mutual Bhakti rasa experience for Bhagavan and selves as Selves applies to all these kinds of self knowledge, in fact, Gaudiya Vaisnava school analyzes the self knowledge further and considers that each of the self knowledges involving a form of Bhagavan like Narasimha, Rama and Kṛsna, is again of various kinds. This is because of the variety in the self knowledge in the form of self as Self characterized by the transcendental loving relation of self as Self with each of these forms of Bhagavan. This relation is one of the various kinds of relations, like servants relation with a master, mother's relation with son and a friend's relation with a friend. Each of these kinds
of self knowledge implies a kind of Priti in the form of servantly, motherly and friendly, experienced by self as Self. Reciprocally, it also implies kinds of Priti like masterly, sonly and friendly, experienced by the respective forms of Bhagavan. Parallel to the concept sthayi bhāva (consistent emotion) of rasa found in the poetics of Natya (2.6.1), the same word sthayi bhāva is used in the Gauḍiya Vaiṣṇava rasa language of Vaiṣṇava also, to refer to the consistent emotion which is experienced in the form of Bhakti rasa. If the sthayi bhava in Natya for Tvaṛga is 'sthayi (stable/consistent) on account of its being relished consistently through out a particular scene, Situation or theatrical performance, the sthāyi bhava in the Bhakti rasa experience of Gauḍiya Vaiṣṇava rasa language of Vedanta is ‘sthāyi’ because it is eternal (3.5.1). This sthayi bhava is given the name rati here (Bhakti Rasamrta Sindhu II.5.2). The word rati has a convenience for several purposes here. Firstly, it sounds like the word rati (= eros), the sthayi bhava of srngara rasa. But, rati which is the sthāyi bhava of srngara is eros. The similarities and dissimilarities of Priti experience with eros have been discussed above (3.5.1). Secondly, rati is considered to be commonly existing in all the eight rasa experiences in the poetics of Natya, in the sense that all the eight rasa experiences are eight different kinds of relishes (rati < mm • relish). In this sense also, the word rati applies to the rasa in the ‘upper world’ because it is also a kind of ‘relish.’ Thirdly, the word rati is a term of Vaiṣṇava also, where it is used to refer to the spiritual relish of the self resulting from the fulfilment of self as Self.

Now, the existence of Priti in various forms like servantly, motherly and friendly, mentioned above, implies the existence of the sthāyi bhava also in correspondingly varied forms. Gauḍiya Vaiṣṇava school recognizes five of such forms of sthāyi bhava, implied by five kinds of Priti or transcendental loving relation between the self as Self and Bhagavan. Rupa (Bhakti Rasamrta Sindhu II.5) and Jiva (Priti Sandarba, section 84) discuss the five kinds of sthāyi bhāva with examples. But they give different names for these sthāyi bhāva-s. Rupa gives them the names suddha, priti, sakhyा, vatsaiya and pnya, whereas, Jiva gives them the names jnana bhakti, bhakti, vatsaiya, matri and kanta bhava.
(Prīti Sandarbha, section 84). The names of these bhava-s as used in Caitanya Caritāmṛta (Madhya Lalī XIX.183-4), namely, santa, dasya, sakhya, vātsalya and madhura, have got established in the convention of Gaudiya vaisnava literature and discourse. This work uses the same henceforth.

The mood of Sanaka and Sarandara (see Appendix 10), who conceive of Bhagavan as being made of Bramhan (Bramhaghana), is called śānta bhava (neutral mood). Their bhava is neutral because, owing to their conception of Bhagavan as nothing but Bramhan, unlike the devotees with the other four bhava-s, they do not maintain any specific relationship, such as that of a servant, a friend, a parent and a beloved, with Bhagavan. Śānta bhava, the emotion of a santa bhakta discussed here, needs to be distinguish from the bhava of śānta rasa, the emotion of a self with Advaitic self fulfillment (3.4).

According to Gaudiya Vaisnava school, a self with Advaitic self fulfillment is conceived to be having Jñāna (the 'knowledge' of non-difference with Bramhan) and since such a self is conceived to be viewing Bramhan to be the ultimate reality, it can be expected to be having no rati for Bhagavan (the divine form of the Absolute). On the other hand, the śānta bhakta has rati for Bhagavan. But unlike the other kinds of bhakta-s, who have a feeling of 'mineness' for Bhagavan (Prīti Sandarbha, section 84), this bhakta, as mentioned above, is devoid of such a feeling since he considers Bhagavan to be Bramhaghana (made of Bramhan) (Prīti Sandarbha, section 84). His expression of transcendental love for Bhagavan is in the form of activities like singing the glories of Bhagavan (Prīti Sandarbha, section 84), but not in the form of participating in the associational activities, in which, the other kinds of bhakta-s, possessing mineness, participate. This kind of Priti is called santa Priti (neutral transcendental love) and that is why, this bhakta is called santa bhakta (a neutral devotee). It may be noted that in the case of a self with Advaitic self fulfillment conceived by the Advaita Vedānta, Priti does not exist at all according to Gaudiya Vaisnava school, because such a self is conceived to be not having rati (relish) for Bhagavan (the divine form of the Absolute).

- described in Bhagavata Purana (X.50.16) as charioteer of Kṛṣṇa in Dvāraka (see Appendix 4),
the citizens of Dvāraka and others, who consider the Absolute as their worshippable master and
themselves as His servants, with a feeling of awe and reverence for Him, are said to be
possessing dasya bhava. It may be noted, here, that the dasya (servantly) relation is different from
or at the most only a kind of das relation mentioned earlier (3.5.1). Considering dasya (servantly)
relation to be only one kind of das relation, itself stands as an evidence that the word das (though,
literally, means a servant) is being used here in a broad sense to include all the different kinds of
transcendental loving relations like dasya and those going to be mentioned hence forth. The
associates of Bhagavān Such as Yudānta, Arjuna (both Kṛṣṇa’s Cousins. See Append 4) and Śrīdāma
(the cowherd friend of Kṛṣṇa), who consider Him as their friend, are said to be expressing sakhyā
bhava. The bhava of Nanda and Yāśodā, who take Kṛṣṇa to be their child, is called vatsāya bhava. The
feeling of transcendental love felt by the gopi-s (cowherd damsels), who have conjugal
relationship with Kṛṣṇa, is termed as madhura bhava. (The discussion here covers only the broad
categories of bhava-s of Bhakti. But, in fact, further sub-categories within each of these categories
are analyzed by Jiva in section eighty four of his Pṛti Sandarbhā).

In fact, there is evidence to understand that Gauḍīya vāsna school does not recognize these five
kinds of bhava as Absolute and mutually exclusive categories, but views them as tendencies
ranging between certain positions to which, these categories may be seen as indicators. For
example, Jiva analyzes the bhava of Yudānta, which is usually described as sakhyā, and says that,
in fact, this character though predominantly possesses sakhyā, he has a mixture of vātsāya and
āśraya (which is a kind of dasya) in him (Pṛti Sandarbhā, section 84). From this point of view, the list
of the five bhava-s, namely, sānta, dasya, sakhyā, vātsāya and madhura, in that order, can be seen to
be forming a scale of Pṛw for Bhagavān, with Santa falling towards the minimum extreme and madhura
falling towards the maximum On this scale, the bhava of each of the bhakta characters need not
necessarily fall at the central positions of sānta, dasya and so on, but, in fact, fall within a range
between any two of these points, with an inclination towards one of the either sides. From this
point of view, now it may be seen that, in fact, santa Bhakti is the tendency of different kinds of bhakta-s towards the santa side, with characters like Sanaka and Sanandana falling mostly to the santa extreme and other characters like Bhisma (Priti Sandarbha, section 84), having only a tendency towards the santa side, apart from their own predominant bhava of Bhakti (Priti).

On the whole, it may be noted that the (separated) part-whole relation, conceived by Gaudiya Vaisnava school, between the self as Self and Bhagavan in an Upanisad language, as mentioned earlier (3.5.1), is being explained here, in terms of the above mentioned five kinds of relations in a narrative language.

Continuing the rasa language technique of explanation, Gaudiya Vaisnava school considers Bhakti rasa also to be of five kinds, corresponding to these five kinds of strīyābhāva-s. Rupa calls them (i) Santa, (ii) priti (or sometimes dasya), (iii) prayās (or sometimes sakhyā), (iv) vatsaiya and (V) madhura (Bhakti Rasamrta Sindhu ll.5.115). Jiva calls the same rasa-s as (a) Santa, (b) dasya, (c) maitri, (d) vatsaiya and (e) ujvāla (Priti Sandarbha, section 157). Here, Rupa (ll. 1-5) and Jiva (sections 203-369) explain the above five rasa-s with examples. Caitanya Caritamrta gives the names Santa, dasya, sakhyā, vatsaiya and madhura to the rasa-s with the bhāva-s for which, as mentioned above, it uses the same names. These names are again established in the convention of Gaudiya Vaisnava literature and discourse, and hence, this work uses the same names henceforth. The vibhāva-s, arūbhāva-s and vyabhicārī bhāva-s and so on, corresponding to these five rasa-s, are discussed by Rupa (Bhakti Rasamrta Sindhu ll.1-5) and Jiva (Priti Sandarbha, sections 203-369) with examples.

It may be noted that as a logical extension of the distinction (supra) between the santa bhava of Gaudiya Vaisnava school and the bhava of Santa rasa discussed in the Advaita poetics (3.4), the Santa Bhakti rasa, being mentioned here, needs to be distinguished from the Santa rasa of Advaita Viśīnta poetics.
The variety in the experience of rasa (Bhakti rasa) is not limited to the variety based on the multiform relations mentioned above. Gaudiya vaisnava school considers that the self knowledge, in the form of self as Self in a transcendental loving relation with Bhagavan, is manifest in the form of a variety of activities involving the self as Self and Bhagavan. Each of these activities is characterized by a certain emotions, just as in the case of the activities of selves in day to day life. Just as the Nāṭya Śāstra recognizes eight of all such possible emotions capable of being sthayi, consistently relished, Gaudiya Vaisnava school also recognizes the same eight emotions to be capable of being sthayi even in the plays’ (activities/events) of Vaikuntha (the realm of self as Self) and the manifestation of these plays on earth (3.5.1), also. Correspondingly, the relish of rasa in eight corresponding forms is also recognized to be part of these plays’ (Bhakti Rasāṃta Sindhu II.5.114)(see table 6).

Thus, rt can be seen that apart from the five kinds of rasa (Bhakti rasa), categorized on the basis of the kind of relation involved, Gaudiya vaisnava school categorizes also seven kinds of rasa (Bhakti rasa) based on the kind of consistent emotion involved. But these two categorizations of rasa are not mutually exclusive. Gaudiya Vaisnava scholars have called the first five kinds, based on relation, as mukhya bhāda-s (primary kinds) and the remaining seven as gauṣa bhāda-s (secondary kinds) (Bhakti Rasāṃta Sindhu II.5.113-117 and Priti Sandarbha, section 158), explaining this by proposing that each of the first kind runs through or exists in all the seven secondary types (Priti Sandarbha, section 158). This consideration of all the non-erṣa seven rasa-s to be nothing but different kinds of Bhakti rasa, in Gaudiya Vaisnava school, is the model of several rasa samākarana vada-s, theories of rasa equation, in which One Of the rasa-s like karuna, santa, śṛṅgāra, adbhuta is considered to be only, or actual, rasa and all rasa-s other than that are considered to be only manifestations or kinds of it (see Appa Rao, 1959 : 215-6 and Rama Krishna Murthy, 1981 : 187-94). Jiva explains the primary nature of the five kinds of Bhakti rasa and the secondary nature of the seven kinds in another way also. According to him, the five kinds of
Bhakti rasa based on relation are primary because each of them is capable of being a consistent rasa throughout the `play` (episode) and each of the seven kinds of rasa-s (based on the emotions) occur only in the specific events of that `play` (episode) (Priti sandarbha, section 158). This explanation is in the model of angi (central) - anga (component) rasa method of analyzing a KavyalNâtya (poem/play) (see Appa Rao, 1959 : 216). Thus, it may be seen that in the Gaudiya Vaisnava theory of primary and secondary kinds of rasa, two models, one, of the rasa samikarana theories, and the other of angi-anga, method are getting merged into one. One major distinction between those theories and methods and the Gaudiya Vaisnava theory, to be remembered, is that all the rasa-s being discussed in the Gaudiya vaisnava theory belong to a self as Self level/plane/situation, whereas, the poetic theories mentioned above (2.6.1), except those related to santa rasa, belong to the self as Self level/plane/situation itself. In a sense, the Gaudiya Vaisnava model leaves the kinds of rasa-s (Bhakti rasa-s) to remain to be eight only just as the Bharata’s Nâtya Sâstra does. Even the names of the rasa-s of Bharata remain to be the same except srngara, with rati as sthayi bhava, in Bharata, being replaced by Bhakti, with Bhagavat rati as the sthayi bhava.

Since the primary kinds of Bhakti are only five different kinds of this Bhakti (replacing Bharata’s srngara), the number remains to be eight only (see tables 6 & 7).

Rupa in his Bhakti Rasâmrta Sindhu (4.1.7) and Jiva in his Priti Sandarbha (sections 157-171) discuss the seven secondary rasa-s with examples. The astonishment experienced by the associates of Krsna when He performs some extraordinary activities such as lifting the Gôvardhara mountain (Bhagavata Purâna X.25)(see also 4.3.5.2.11) is called adbhuta rasa (the rasa of wonder). When Krsna performs pranks (see 4.3.5.1), it gives rise to the experience of merriment in His associates and this experience is called hasya rasa (the rasa of humour). Vira rasa, the rasa of enthusiasm is of four types. When Yudhistira worships Krsna by a performance of yajña (which, as mentioned in the previous chapter, is considered as the dharma, i.e., duty based on order, of an individual) (Bhagavata Pumna X.72)(see appendix 7) he experiences the emotion of enthusiasm for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sthayibhava</th>
<th>Bharata school</th>
<th>Gaudiya Vaisnava school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhaya</td>
<td>krodha</td>
<td>bibhatsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raudra</td>
<td>hasa</td>
<td>bhaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karuna</td>
<td>hasa</td>
<td>raudra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krodha</td>
<td>soka</td>
<td>vishnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utsoha</td>
<td>vismaya</td>
<td>tad pritimaya ushna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soka</td>
<td>hasa</td>
<td>tad pritimaya ushna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vismaya</td>
<td>krodha</td>
<td>tad pritimaya ushna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krodha</td>
<td>bhaya</td>
<td>tad pritimaya ushna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhaya</td>
<td>tad pritimaya</td>
<td>tad pritimaya ushna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tad pritimaya ushna</td>
<td>rasa.</td>
<td>tad pritimaya ushna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rasa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Sthayibhava and their respective rasas in Bharata and Gaudiya Vaisnava school.
### Table 7

Scheme of *rasa*-s in Bharata and Gaudīya Vaisnava tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bharata's scheme of <em>rasa</em>-s</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gaudīya Vaisnava scheme of <em>rasa</em>-s</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>śṛṅgāra</strong></td>
<td><strong>madhura</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>vīra</strong></td>
<td><strong>vīra</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>karuna</strong></td>
<td><strong>karuna</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>adbhuta</strong></td>
<td><strong>adbhuta</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hasya</strong></td>
<td><strong>hāsya</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>raudra</strong></td>
<td><strong>raudra</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bhayanaka</strong></td>
<td><strong>bhayanaka</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bibhatsa</strong></td>
<td><strong>bibhatsa</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: Each self as Self experiences *rasa*-s as shown in one of the columns with the first one.
duty/order which is called dharma vira rasa (the rasa of enthusiasm for duty/order). The experience of compassion found in the devotees such as Rantideva, who responds with compassion to repeated requests for food from different guests by parting with his entire meal part by part (Bhagavata Purana IX.21)(see Appendix 11) is called daya vira rasa (daya = Compassion. The rasa of enthusiasm for compassion). On the celebration of the birth of Krsna, His father Nanda gives away the best of his cows in charity to the brāhmaṇa-s (Bhagavata Purana X.5). This act of charity gives him the experience of dana vira rasa (dana = charity. The rasa of enthusiasm for charity). When Bhima heeds the counsel of Krsna and kills the demon Jarāsandha (Bhagavata Purana X.72)(see appendix 7), he experiences yuddha vira rasa (yuddha = fight. The rasa of enthusiasm for fight). The fury experiences by the gopa-s when Akūra takes Krsna away to Mathura (Bhagavata Purana X.39)(see appendix 4) is called raudra rasa (the rasa of anger). When Yasūda hears of the entry of a horse shaped demon into Gōkula, she becomes scared for Krsna’s safety. This experience of fear by Yasūda is called bhayanaka rasa (the rasa of terror). The feeling of disgust experienced by the devotees at the very thought of sense gratification is called bibhatsa rasa (the rasa of morbidity) (Bhakti Rasāmrta Sādhu IV.7.3). The grief experienced by the devotees when they see Krsna in the Clutches Of the great poisonous snake Kaliya (Bhagavata Purana X.16)(see appendix 6) is karuna rasa (The rasa of pathos). (The categories of seven secondary rasa-s, discussed here, are not exhaustive. Rupa and Jiva discuss many more further categorizations with examples).

However, Rupa was not the first to introduce the concept of Bhakti rasa. Hardy notes that

"the rasa theory is for the first time definitely employed with reference to the gopi songs of the BhP in a work by the Maharastrian writer Vopadeva [c.1265] entitled Muktāphala and in its commentary Kavayaḍīpikā by the author’s patron Hemādri. The idea expressed here is briefly as follows. The classical nine rasas (including sānta) become transformed into (nine varieties of) bhakti-rasa when they are suggested by Krsnāle poetry; the underlying idea being that any form of mental
experience [here secular rasa] becomes bhakti when directed towards Krsna.

Collecting many passages from the BhP [including our gopi songs], the work illustrates how all the rasas are exemplified in the *pumna* (1983: 561). [BhP • Bhagavata Purana]

It may also be seen that Jiva quotes 'the author' of a work named *Bhagavannāma Kaumudi* and Sridhara Swami, the famous commentator of *Bhagavata Purana* from the perspective of Advaita Vedānta, as having discussed *Bhakti rasa* in their works (Priti sandarbha, section 111). However, based on the discussion in the poetics of *Natya* on *Bhakti rasa* by authors of poetics such as Abhinava (in Bharata, 1994: 336), it may be concluded that the concept of *Bhakti rasa* is much older. But, it can be observed that the most elaborate development of *Bhakti* poetics is done by Rupa and Jiva in their works and for them *Bhakti rasa* is the key concept to understand the theology of Gaudiya Vaisnava School itself, unlike for most of the Older exponents of *Bhakti rasa*.

In using the word *Bhakti rasa* to refer to the experience of Bhagavan and His associates in Vaikuntha, Jiva (Priti Sandarbha, 110) took a cue also from the *Bhagavata Purana* itself, the prime source of Gaudiya Vaisnava school (as a description of the manifestation of the activities of Krsna and other forms of Bhagavan on earth) (3.5.1). In the prefatory part of this work, Vyasa, the author, describes the book as a fruit slipped from the wish fulfilling tree called the Vedas, 'and invites all the 'tasteful people' (rasika-s) to taste this parrot tested (tasty) fruit, using the word rasa in the sense of relish of the fruit (*Bhagavata Purana* I.1.3). In fact, *juice* - of a fruit or a leaf is the etymological meaning of the word *rasa*, which Vyasa, the poet, is skillfully exploiting, to bring home the relishability of his poetic work, the *Bhagavata Pumna*. Another cue for Jiva (Priti Sandarbha, section 110) in the usage of the word rasa for the 'plays' (sports) of Bhagavan is the statement *rasa vaisaha rasam hi eva ayam labdhvā anandi bhavati* (the Absolute is rasa - The self becomes blissful only when he experiences 'rasa') from *Tattiriya Upaniṣad* (2.7.1), where the word is used with reference
to the Absolute Himself. But, the fact that Gaudiya Vaisnava school draws this metaphor mainly from the poetics of Natya is evident from the use of words like aiambana vibhava, used in relation to Natya rasa, even in this Context of Bhakti rasa Of the Vaikuntha.

The words aiambana vibhava and others, used in the case of a drsyā Kāvya (visible poem or theatre) were interpreted for a sravya Kāvya (the audible poem) from Anandavardhana onwards (Masson and Patwardhan, 1970: 4). In this sense of the experience of sravya Kāvya, this word is applicable to the Bhagavata Purana too. Jiva looks at the above mentioned verse from the Bhagavata Purana from this point of view of poetics and assumes that Vyasa is referring to Bhakti rasa, here (Pṛīti Sandarbha, section 110). And since for Jiva, the activities of Kṛṣṇa and His forms described in the Bhagavata Purana are nothing but the manifestation of Kṛṣṇa and His associates in Vaikuntha, which is transcendental to the phenomenal realm, for him, this concept of Bhakti rasa is applicable to the activities of Vaikuntha also.

As a consequence of this equation of 'rasa with Bhagavan Himself, the conception of Bhakti rasa as the experience of different selves as Selves leads to the conception of Bhagavan as 'rasa,' existing in all the possible forms of Bhakti rasa experienced by the selves as Selves. Rūpa in fact, uses the words akhila rasamṛtā mūrti (the form of the nectar of all the different 'rasa'-s) to describe Bhagavan (Bhakti Rasamṛta Sindhu I.1.1). It may be noted that it is the above mentioned lines from Tāttvānīya Upaniṣad, which come handy for Rūpa to make this description as akhila rasamṛtā murti, because Bhakti rasa as the experience of iVā (self) leads to the multiform nature of Bhakti rasa based on the multiform nature of jīva-s.

3.5.3. A scheme of preference for varieties of self fulfilment.

With the above mentioned multiform understanding of self knowledge, Gaudiya Vaisnava
school looks at all the different stories of Vaisnavaite Bhakti as containing different kinds of selves with different kinds of self knowledge in the form of self as Self with a particular kind of transcendental loving relation with a particular form of Bhagavan and thus experiencing a particular kind of primary Bhakti rasa and its seven secondary forms. Gaudiya Vaisnava school professes that human individuals can also experience each of these kinds of Bhakti rasa by gaining the fulfillment of the self knowledge of the respective kinds. The way to achieve this fulfillment is to like, love, praise, admire, emulate and ultimately identify with one particular kind of self knowledge, among all the infinite possibilities (categorized into five kinds), examples for which are available in the stories of Vaishnavaite devotion described in the various sources.

At this point Gaudiya Vaisnava school cautiously specifies that the principle of emulation in the stories chosen for Līlā is different from the principle of emulation in the stories chosen for Natya for Trivarga and Natya for Jñāna. Rupa in Ujjvala Nilamani professes that if ramadivat vartiavyam na kvacit ravanadivat (one should emulate characters like Rama and not characters like Rāvana) is the principle of emulation for poetry concerned with dharma, anna, kama and moksa (Ujjvala Nilamani III.15), the principle for Bhakti Sāstra-s (devotional literature) is varttavyam samchadhābhar bhaktavat na tu krsnavat (one should emulate the devotees and not Kṛsna) (Ujjvala Nilamani III.14). The spirit of the principle seems to be the Gaudiya Vaisnava Vedantic principle (as part of Bhakti Vedanta) that any human self can only have a self knowledge in the form of a devotee of Kṛṣṇa but not as Kṛṣṇa Himself (3.5.1). It may be noted that no where in the Gaudiya Vaisnava school’s model of self knowledge, being discussed in this book or, in fact, anywhere else, the self is defined as the Absolute itself or Kṛṣṇa Himself. All the models of self knowledge have an individual identity distinct from the Absolute as a bottom line.

Here comes another major distinction of Gaudiya vaisnava school in comparison to other schools of
Bhakti Vādānta mentioned above. Gaudīya Vaiṣnava school considers particular kinds of self knowledge more choosable than others based on a degree of choosability among (i) kinds of transcendental loving relations between self as Self and Bhagavan and (ii) features of different forms of Bhagavan. The kinds of relation are the same, santa, dasya, sakhya, vātsalya and madhura mentioned above (3.5.2). The features are awe inspiring nature (aśvāya) and choseness inspiring nature (mādhurya). Both among the kinds of relations (Bhakti Rasamrta Sindhu II.5.115) and the features of Bhagavan (Priti Sandarbha, section 97), the latter are considered to be more choosable than the former. Combining these two schemes of choice results in the consideration of the madhura (conjugal) relation with the madhurya (closeness inspiring) feature of Bhagavan as the most choosable.

The hierarchy begins with the consideration of Bhakti rasa itself as more choosable than the experience of Advaitic self realization. Articulating this position of Gaudīya vaisnava school, Rupa says that millions of years of samadhi (meditation) in bramhananda (bliss of formless Bramhan) can not be equated to the experience of even a miniscule from the ocean of Bhakti (devotion for Bhagavan) (Bhakti Rasamrta Sindhu I.1.38). The reason for this consideration is the Gaudīya Vaisnava school's consideration that such a self fulfillment is devoid of Priti (3.5.2).

 Caitanya Cantāmṛta explains the greater and greater choosability of the later and later self knowledges by explaining the greater choosability of the later and later of the five kinds of rasa-s. Santa (neutral love) has relinquishing passions (trṣṇatya) and conviction in Kṛṣṇa (Kṛṣṇa nṛṣṭa) (Madhya Liṅga XIX.215). But, it may be noted that there is no 'mine' feeling (mamata) for Kṛṣṇa in it (Madhya Liṅga XIX.218). Dasya (servantly love) has, apart from the above two qualities of santa, an additional quality of sṛṣṭi-service to (Madhya Liṅga XIX.221) Bhagavan. The knowledge of Bhagavan of the Self with dasya is characterized by a feeling of total awe (puma aṁśavya jnana) (Madhya Liṅga XIX.219) for Bhagavan. Because of this perception of Bhagavan as the Lord, this kind of self is
predominated by charisma (sambhrama) and reverence (gaumava) (Madhya US XIX.220) for Bhagavan. (Thus mine’ feeling begins with dasya in the form of the feeling of ‘my master’). Sakhya (friendly love) has the same qualities of śānta and dasya. But the difference lies in the interpersonal trust (viūvā) replacing charisma and reverence of dasya (Madhya Lilā XIX.222). The self having this relation has more mine’ feeling towards Bhagavan and treats Him as its equal (Madhya Us XIX225). The behaviour of this kind of a self is in the form of sporting and fighting with Kṛṣṇa, serving Kṛṣṇa and taking service from Kṛṣṇa (Madhya LilāXIX.223). Vātsalya (parental love) has the qualities of śānta, dasya and sakhya, but the difference lies in the service taking the form of control (pālaka) (Madhya Lilā XIX.226). The self with this feeling considers itself as the controller (pālaka) and Kṛṣṇa as the controlled (pāya) (Madhya LilāXIX.228). If friendly love is characterized by lack of inhibition (asaṅkōcā) and lack of reverence (agaumva), parental love is marked by beating (tadana) and chastising (bhaṅtsa) (Madhya Lilā XIX.227) Thus, this attitude is characterized by more ‘mine’ feeling in the form of ‘my child.’ In madhum (conjugal love), apart from conviction (nastha), intensity of service (sēvātya), lack of inhibition (asaṅkōcā), cuddling (lāiana), greater mine feeling (mamatādhyā), there is service done through offering one’s own body (nījāgya dyē sēvana) (Madhya Lilā XIX 231-2).

Jiva explains the same scheme of choice on the basis of Prīti (transcendental love). For Jiva, mamātya (‘mine’ feeling) is a measure of Prīti (Prīti Sandarbhā, section 84). In other words, greater and greater mine’ feeling indicates or implies greater and greater transcendental love.

It may be noted that the relations presented as more and more choosable in the above scheme are characterized by closer and closer relations. For example, the awe in dasya is almost the opposite of closeness. A friend is definitely closer than a servant. But parents are still closer on account of their control over their ward. The closeness is the most intense in the case of conjugal relation because of the sharing of the most confidential aspects also. This analysis of the
scheme of choice among the relations from a closeness point of view has one advantage. The word *madhurya*, which, as shown above, indicates closeness inspiring nature, is derived from the word *madhum*. The word *madhura* though technically is being used to refer specifically to conjugal relation, the conclusion drawn above that, according to the *Gaudiya Vaisnava* scheme of choice, it is the closest relation, when read with the meaning of *madhurya* as closeness inspiring nature suggests that in the *Gaudiya vaisnava* jargon, the word *madhura* is closely linked with closeness. It is true that the word *madhura*, in fact, means 'sweet.' But the analyses done here indicates that *sweetness*, a metaphor of taste, here, is being used to refer to closeness. In other words, in the *Gaudiya Vaisnava* scheme of choice, closer relations are considered to be sweeter relations and *madhura* relation is probably so called because it is the closest and hence the sweetest relation.

Jiva, in his *Priti Sandarsha* (section 97), explains the choice of features of *Bhagavan* in order to explain the choice of the greater choosability of the self knowledges based on choice of these features. Based on the two features of *Bhagavan*, namely, *aisvarya* and *madhurya*, *Bhagavan-ness* of the forms of *Bhagavan* is classified into two kinds, namely, *parama aisvarya rupa* (*Bhagavan-ness* in the form of utmost awe-inspiring quality) and *parama madhurya rupa* (*Bhagavan-ness* in the form of utmost closeness-inspiring quality). It may be noted that the *Brahman* form of *Bhagavan* has neither of these features.

Among the different divine forms of *Bhagavan*, forms like *Narayana* are examples for the forms predominating in awe-inspiring quality. Among forms predominating in the closeness-inspiring quality, the form of *Kr̄ṣṇa* in *Vrndavana*, the flute yielding cowherd boy, playing (sports/pastimes) with *gōpā-s* (cowherd boys) and *gōpi-s* (cowherd girls) in the hamlet called *Vr̄ndāvana*, is considered to be the 'sweetest' (the most closeness-inspiring), since it is in this form that the selves as Selves are seen engaged in a transcendental love of the closest type with *Bhagavan* (*Priti Sandarsha*, section 98). It may be noted that within the *Bhagavata Purana*, where the form of *Bhagavan*
is described, Krsna is shown to have left Vrndāvana to Mathura and later to Dvārakā, and to have participated in several royal, political activities (Book X.41.90). The forms in Mathura and Dvārakā are considered to be relatively more awe-inspiring than the cowherd boy form of Vrndāvana. The Gaudiya Vaisnava school considers that the Krsna's flute wielding form, being the sweetest (closest or the most playful) form of Bhagavan, as the actual form of Bhagavān of which all of the other forms (including the forms in Mathura and Dvārakā, which manifest awe inspiring nature apart from closeness-inspiring nature) are only different manifestations. This consideration is articulated by Rupa by saying that this form is the svayamrupa ('His own form') of Bhagavan (Laghu Bhāgavatārta I.2). Jiva (Krsna Sandarbha, section 28) substantiates this perspective by citing a sentence from one of the verses of the Bhagavata Purana (I.3.28). Here, the Bhagavata Purana gives the names of the various forms of Bhagavan and says that if all these forms are His fractions, the form of Krsna is Bhagavan Himself (svayam Bhagavan). In other words, if the other forms have only a few of all the unlimited potential possible features of the Absolute, Krsna has all of them While some of the other schools of Bhakti Vedanta consider Narayana of Vaikuntha mentioned above as having the completeness of all these potential features of the Absolute and interpret Krsna's 'being Himself as possessing all that completeness, Gaudiya Vaisnava school considers Krsna as the form having the completeness of all the features, and interprets Krsna's 'being Himself in this sense, and includes Narayana among the other forms having only a fraction of these total number of features.' Rupa explains this consideration in his Bhakti Rasāmrtā Sāndhu. Continuing the theatrical language to talk about vaikuntha, Rupa says that Krsna has all the features like dhira udatta (composed and magnanimous), dhira śānta (composed and calm), dhira lañita (composed and refined) and dhira udh dhata (composed and vehement) (Bhakti Rasamrtā Sāndhu II.225 - 240) (2.3) and infinite features parallel to features like mahākūtiñata mentioned in the poetics of Natya (for Trivarga) (2.4). Mentioning sixty four of these infinite features, he says that Narayana has all these features except four of them. These four features are (i) niñā madturya (sweetness of 'plays'); (ii) prema mādhurya (sweetness of transcendental love); (iii) venmadturya (sweetness of flute)
and (iv) rupa madhurya (sweetness of figure). It may be observed that madhurya (sweetness = closeness inspiring nature) is common among the four features given by Rupa. This is a sample of Rupa’s model of the consideration of the form of Krsna as primary and of the fractionality of the other forms of the Absolute. Based on this consideration of the primacy of the form of Krsna and of the fractionality of the features in the other forms, Gaudiya Vaishnava school views all these forms as the parts of Krsna. But if the jiva-s, as mentioned earlier (3.5.1), are called the separated parts (vibhinnamsa) of the Absolute, the various different forms of Bhagavan are called His own or unseparated parts (svamsa-s. sva = own or unseparated, amsa = parts) (Paramatma Sandarbha, section 8) and based on the above mentioned primacy of Krsna form, they are described to be the unseparated parts of ‘Krsna.’ This consideration of primacy for the Krsna form is the reason for the use of the word Krsna in the answer of Chaitanya to Sanatana. In other words, whatever be the form of Bhagavan (of ‘Krsna’) which is included in the self knowledge of a self, Gaudiya Vaishnava school considers that self to be, in fact, associated with, i.e., das of Krsna. Thus, it may be noted that the das relation between the self as Self and Bhagavan mentioned earlier (3.5.1), read with this description of the relation between the two leads to the idea that the das relation is, in fact, a (separated) part whole relation with Krsna.

It may be remembered that Gaudiya Vaishnava school considers Vaikuntha to be existing in different forms corresponding to the different forms of Bhagavan. The Vaikuntha corresponding to the Krsna form (the flute wielding cowherd boy form of Bhagavan), where He is conceived to be performing His activities of transcendental love, is called Goioka (realm of cows) (Krsna Sandarbha, section 116). Goioka is considered to be the most choosable form of Vaikuntha where the activities (plays’) of transcendental love of Krsna are the sweetest (the most ‘playful’) (Caitanya Caritamrta, Madhya Liili XXI.44).

The selves as Selves, who are depicted in the Vaishnava Bhakti stories and whom a Gaudiya vaishnava
practitioner emulates for his attaining Bhakti rasa, are considered to be of two kinds also; (i) those who relish awe-inspiring aspect of Bhagavan (aisvarya) more than the closeness inspiring one (madhurya). These are called parama aisvarya anubhava pradhana (parama = supreme, anubhava = experience, pradhana = predominant in); and (ii) those who relish closeness inspiring aspect of Bhagavan more that the awe inspiring one. These are called parama madhurya anubhava pradhana (Priti Sandarbha, section 97). Gaudiya Vaishnava school considers that all the five kinds of relations, namely, neutral, servantly friendly, parently and conjugal, are possible for both the selves as Selves, mentioned above. Correspondingly, the five kinds of sthâyi bhava-s and five kinds of rasa-s are also possible for both kinds of selves as Selves. The scheme of preference among the relations (see supra) and the corresponding sthâyi bhava-s and rasa-s (see supra) holds good for each of these two kinds of selves as Selves. Combining this with the scheme of preference for the forms of Bhagavan (supra) leads to the principle of utmost choosability of the self knowledge in the form of self as Self with a madhura (conjugal) relation with a form which is predominant in closeness (‘palyfulness’) inspiring quality (madhurya), which is one of the prime principles of Gaudiya Vaishnava school (see table 8).

Quoting an incident from the Bhagavata Purâna (X.45) Jiva says, when Kṛṣṇa killed Kamsa and released His parents Devakî and Vasudeva from prison (see Appendix 4), they perceived Kṛṣṇa (and His brother Balarama, who is considered to be one of His forms) as the Supreme Lord(s), though He (They) was (were) their son(s). Hence they did not embrace Kṛṣṇa, but remained in a reverential mood. Later, when Kṛṣṇa addressed them with transcendental love as mother and father, it was then that they took Kṛṣṇa in their laps and embraced Him Their voices were choked with emotion and their eyes filled were with tears (Priti Sandarbha, section 97).

According to Jiva, here, the parents of Kṛṣṇa experience both aisvarya and mādhyāya features of Bhagavān. In the beginning, they experience awe (aisvarya) for Kṛṣṇa as they consider Him as the
## Table 8.

Scheme of choosability of varieties of selves.
Greater choosability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parama Madhurya Rupa.</th>
<th>Parama Aaisvarya Rupa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madhura</td>
<td>The self as Self in Madhura relation with Parama Madhurya Rupa.</td>
<td>The self as Self in Madhura relation with Parama Aaisvarya Rupa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasya</td>
<td>The self as Self in Dasya relation with Parama Madhurya Rupa.</td>
<td>The self as Self in Dasya relation with Parama Aaisvarya Rupa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of self.
Supreme Lord. But later this awe was substituted by their parental affection for Him, hence they experience Closeness and Sweetness (mādhurya). This is the model of a parama aśvarya anubhava pradhāna self as Self according to Jiva.

Jiva argues that, unlike the selves as Selves, who experience the awe inspiring aspect of Kṛsna (in Dvāraka) more, the inhabitants of Vṛndāvana do not get bewildered when Kṛṣṇa ‘reveals’ His awe inspiring nature, for example, by lifting Gāvadāna hill with His hand (Bhagavata Parana X.250. Also see 4.3.5.2. III). Their desire to see Him as a normal sweet child becomes more intense whenever they witness His awe inspiring nature. In other words, the desire for mādhurya increases whenever Kṛṣṇa ‘reveals’ His aśvarya. This is due to their attachment for the mādhurya aspect of Kṛṣṇa (Priti Sandarbha, section 100) This is the model of parama mādhurya anubhava pradhāna according to Jiva.

This model is more choosable, among the two illustrated here, for emulation according to Jiva.

Illustrating the different kinds of relations and corresponding sthāyībhāva-s within parama anubhava pradhāna model, Jiva cites three examples from the Bhagavata Purana for three such selves as Selves. The cowherd boys, who fight with Kṛṣṇa playfully, steal butter together with Him in other people’s homes, relish His mādhurya (sweetness/closeness) aspect in sakhya (friendly) bhāva; mother Yasodā, who binds Kṛṣṇa with rope, in order to punish for His mischievous acts, relishes mādhurya (sweetness/closeness) in vātsaya (parently) bhāva; and similarly, the gopi-s, who perform amorous pastimes with Kṛṣṇa, such as, playing tricks and dancing with Him, relish mādhurya (sweetness/closeness) in madhura (conjugal) bhāva (Priti Sandarbha, section 100). (Jiva, however, does not give any example for dasya bhava here. This is, probably, because the awe-inspiring nature of the Absolute required for the relish of dasya bhāva in the self, is considered to be totally absent in Kṛṣṇa in Vṛndavana).

This relishing of mādhurya in madhura bhava is the most choosable experience for emulation.
according to Jiva (Priti Sandarbha, section 102). This most choosability of the gopi model, for emulation, is mentioned by Jiva, in comparision to other madhura relation holding selves as Selves also. Contrasting the gopi-s with the wives of Kršna of Dvämkha (and using the words from the poetics for the categories of heroines, namely, svakiya, wifely heroine, and parakiya, non-wifely heroine), Jiva says that the love of gōpi-s, who hold a parakiya (non-wifely) relation with Kršna of Vṛndāvana (either as unmarried girls or wives of other cowherds), is more choosable for emulation than that of the wives of Kršna in Dvämkha, who hold a svakiya (wifely) relation with Him (Priti Sandarbha, section 278). Rupa explains the greater choosability of the non-wifely love of gōpi-s on the basis of their absence of this-worldly or other-worldly expectations of a wifely condition (for example, expectations of worldly benefits like security, patronage and children, and the otherworldly benefits like virtue acquired through an unstinted commitment for husband, which are glorified in the Vedic worldview) in them (Ujjvala Nilamani 111.11). It may be noted that even the greatest choosability of the parakiya relation is also based on the criterion of playfulness' in the sense of being devoid of earthly or otherworldly desires, i.e., the greatest degree of playfulness' in this sense is being considered to be available only in the parakiya madhura relation with the parana mādhurya rupa of Kršna. It may be observed that the word parakiya here, like the other words drawn by Gaudiya Vaisnava school from the poetics of NātyaKāvyā, is only a metaphor to refer to a specific theological concept. This becomes clear when Jiva says that those who are being referred to as parakiya-s are, in fact, parama sviya-s (most actual His owns') in reality, i.e., in aprakata Liā (Priti Sandarbha, Section 278). The paradox in calling parakiya-s as parama sviya-s Can be resolved only by realizing that both these words are metaphors referring to the same theological notion. Jiva overtly explains this by saying that the parama sviya-s of aprakata Us when manifest in prakata Liā (in the 'language' of aprakata Us can manifest only as parakiya-s (Priti Sandarbha, section 278). The word parama sviya-s (most actual His 'owns') has reference to the theological fact of the selves as Selves being Bhagavan's own separated parts and the word parakiya is a narrative description of these selves as Selves, described to be in non-wifely
It is obvious that Jiva provides this clarification to avoid taking of the non-wifely relation, described in a narrative form as an ‘immoral’ activity without realizing the theological import in it (see 4.3.5.2.11).

The ladder of superiority among the selves as Selves in transcendental loving relation with Bhagavan reaches its pinnacle in Radha, the closest to Krsna among the gopi-s and the central character of Ras Liś-s. Radha is described to be an eternal unseparable consort of Krsna. If Bhagavan is the divine form of the Absolute experiencing rasa out of infinite transcendental loving relations with selves as Selves, Radha is the pleasure potency (nādinī śakti) of Him. She is unseparable from Him in that sense. Explaining this concept of Radha, O.B.L. Kapoor says,

“Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the ultimate source of the infinite partial manifestations of the divine personality, and Radha is the ultimate source of the endless divine energies of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. . . . . . . she is the predominated moiety, while Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the predominating moiety of the absolute. . . . . . . The function of Rādhā as the divine consort of Kṛṣṇa is to please him by fulfilling all his desires and administering to all his needs... This purpose is eternally fulfilled by her in the company of her innumerable partial manifestations in the form of Gopi-s or the milk-maids of Vraja, who also join in the spiritual pastimes of Kṛṣṇa... The service rendered to Kṛṣṇa by the Gopi-s are the associated aspects of the service of Rādhā. The association of numberless consorts in the amorous pastimes ... of Kṛṣṇa is necessary to enhance the bliss enjoyed by him...; hence, the emanation of numberless divine consorts from Radha” (1976: 98).

Thus, being the source of the pleasure experienced by all the selves as Selves who experience Bhakti rasa as they perform associational activities with Kṛṣṇa, the experience of Bhakti rasa of Radha is both infinitely highest, as well as unique. Rādhā’s self knowledge is similar
to that of other gopi-s in a direct parakiya (non-wifely conjugal) relation with farm in Vrndavana to the extent of being such a conjugal relation, but is distinct in being infinite, highest and nothing but the pleasure potency of Krsna itself.

One of the propositions in Gaudiya vaisnava school which looks very strange for a student of this school is the greater choosability of the model of attendents or the handmaidens of Radha called sakhî-s and manjari-s, than of the model of Radha itself, for emulation. In other words, the best possible is not the best choosable for emulation. This principle may look strange to many Indian readers on account of the familiarity of the more widely prevalent convention of identifying the self with Radha and the Absolute with Krsna among the general Indian public. But according to Gaudiya Vaisnava school, emulating Radha may result in acquiring the relish of a direct non-wifely conjugal relation with Krsna like the gopi-s mentioned above, but not the distinguishing features of Radha, since Radha, by definition, is a unique self as Self. Even the direct non-wifely conjugal relation, which is considered to be possessed by some other gopi-s and considered to be attained by emulating Radha or any of these gopi-s, is considered to be less choosable than the indirect relationship, i.e., relationship with Krsna through Radha, possessed by sakhî-s and manjari-s (in Rupa Goswami, 1981: 177).

Haberman says that the choosability of the sakhî-s and manjari-s can best be understood in the context of the ashraya theory, which I think is so central to these texts - the asraya is the 'container' of the emotions, so to speak. Emotional experience is dependent upon the quality of the container. Radha, by definition, is the deepest container. Her container is defined as being infinitely deep. If one has an independent relationship with Krsna, then one's emotional relationship will ultimately depend on the quality of one's own vessel. But if one is a manjari, that is in communion with Radha, one shares her emotional experience.
Since her emotional experience is infinite, in this way one can tap into that infinite experience" (1992: 323).

Thus, it can be seen that Gaudiya Vaisnava school, apart from considering the das relation of the self as Self with the Bhagavan to be multiform, propounds a scheme of preference among these various das relations, presenting the model of self as Self in an indirect relation with the utmost closeness inspiring form of Bhagavan (as the attendant of another self as Self, namely, Radha, in a direct relation with Him) as the most choosable among all such relations and consequently the Bhakti rasa resulting from such a self knowledge as the most choosable for relish.

All the above elaboration found in (different sources of) Gaudiya Vaisnava literature for the central statement of Gaudiya Vaisnava school found in Chaitanya’s answer to Sanatana, i.e., “jīvēra svārūpa haya krṣnēra nitya das” (the self’s actual/original identity is being Kṛṣṇa’s eternal servant) (3.5.1), may be seen to be highlighting the Gaudiya Vaisnava school’s distinct view (in comparison to the Other Bhakti Vedanta schools)(see table 9) Of concepts Of (i) the primacy Of Kṛṣṇa form Of Bhagavan; (ii) the das relation to be a multiform relation with a corresponding multiform experience of rasa; (iii) this relation and the self knowledge of that relation to be eternal (nitya), with the manifestations of this relation and the self knowledge on earth being described in the Puranas; and (iv) the self knowledge in the form of self as Self related to Kṛṣṇa with the above features being actual identity (svārūpa) of a self. This answer of Chaitanya to Sanatana is not only a diagnosis but also a (suggestion of) prescription to emulate the manifestations of this kind of self knowledge using the descriptions of these manifestations in the Puranas and other sources. Here, a systematic scheme of preference among the different kinds of self knowledge is presented by Gaudiya vaisnava school, in which the self as Self with a non-wifely conjugal relation with the closeness inspiring form of Bhagavan is considered to be the most preferable for emulation (see table 8). But, as mentioned above, the emulation of a self as Self in an
Table 9.
Comparision between different schools of *Bhakti Védānta*.

I. Common features.

1. Relation between self and the Absolute perceived as *Dās* relation.
2. *Bhagavān* form or divine form of the Absolute recognized.
3. Self is not non-different from the Absolute.
4. *Bhakti* is the means and the goal.

II. Differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools such as <em>Dvaita</em> and <em>Viśisṭādvaita</em></th>
<th><em>Gauḍīya Vaisnava</em> school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Issue</strong> : Primary form of <em>Bhagavān</em> and His above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nārāyaṇa</em> and <em>Vaikuṇṭha</em></td>
<td><em>Kṛṣṇa</em> of <em>Vṛndāvan</em> and <em>Gōḍa</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Issue</strong> : Relation between primary and the other forms of <em>Bhagavān</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only <em>Nārāyaṇa</em> in the upper world and all others in lower</td>
<td>All forms in 'upper' (internal) world and 'lower' (external)world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Issue</strong> : The perception of spiritual and phenomenal realms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper - Lower.</td>
<td>Internal - External.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Issue</strong> : The perception of <em>Avatāra</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Descending.'</td>
<td>'Manifesting.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Issue</strong> : Formlessness of the Absolute.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all recognized.</td>
<td>Recognized but least preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Issue</strong> : Simultaneity of difference and non-difference between self and Absolute.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question does not arise because non-difference not recognized.</td>
<td>Accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not found.</td>
<td>Found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Issue</strong> : Perception of devotion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All kinds of 'Dās' relation recognized but no scheme of choice.</td>
<td>There is scheme of choice with a preference for 'closeness' and 'playfulness' (of cowherds).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attendently relation with Radhā is considered to be more choosable than the emulation of a self as Self in a direct non-wifely conjugal relation with Kṛṣṇa.

Līlā performances are considered one of the means to present the above mentioned multiform self knowledges as described in the Puranas and the other sources to be emulated by the audience according to the scheme of preference mentioned above (see 4.3.5.2).

3.6. The issue of same sources for Bhakti and Karma plays.

But choosing itihāsas and Puranas as a source of stories to present the Bhakti Vaiṣṇavism plays may look to be a problem because many stories in itihāsas and Puranas, as discussed earlier (2.3), overtly appear to be instructing Trāvārga. As mentioned earlier (3.5.1), some of these stories are used to present Bhakti Vedanta also. The problem is the same as in the case of using the stories of Purāṇas to present Natya for Jñāna (2.6.2). It has been discussed in the earlier chapter how the instruction of Natya for Trāvārga and Natya for Jñāna appear to be contradicting each other and how the problem can be solved from the point of view of Vedanta which accommodates Karma Kārdaya within itself (2.6.2 & 2.8). It may be noted that this analysis helps to visualize how the same story from Puranas and itihāsas can be presented from the point of view of both Natya for Trāvārga and Natya for Jñāna (2.6.2).

The problem which persists in the case of the relation between Karma Kārdaya and Bhakti Vedanta also is similar to this. Apparently Karma Kārdaya and Bhakti Vedanta seem to be contradicting each other, because Karma Kārdaya instructs the path for the successful fulfilment of urges of artha and kama, whereas, Bhakti Vedanta defines Bhakti itself in terms of the transcendence of urges (3.5.1). But Jiva explains how in reality this contradiction does not exist in the earlier chapter, it was mentioned that Vaiṣṇavism resolves the problem of contradiction between karma and inana by
theorizing that Vedas instruct Karma Kanda for those individuals who by their personality are attached to sensual desires. Jiva takes a similar position and compares the individuals interested in the results, such as heaven, from performing Karma Kānda activities, such as yajña, to children, who are attracted to sugar sweets and so on. It was also mentioned in the earlier chapter that according to Vādānta one of the reasons for Vedas to instruct Tāvarga is to create a sattva predominated personality, in which there is a scope for the rejecting artha and kama. Jiva goes further and says that the instruction of Karma Kanda is, in fact, aimed at leading the self towards the rejection of artha and kama and ultimately towards serving Bhagavan. He compares this instruction to the administration of medicine by luring a child with sugar sweets and so on. He says that, luring a child with sugar, sweets and so on to make him accept the medicine, is not just aimed at administering the medicine but is done for the ultimate goal of curing the child from the disease. Similarly, the showing of results such as heaven to make an individual perform Karma Kanda activities such as yajña also, is not merely aimed at providing heaven and so on, but is ultimately aimed to help the individuals to realize the need to give up (desire from the pleasure of) Karma Kanda activities.

Anticipating a counter question of why the giving up of Karma Kanda activity was not instructed in the beginning itself (directly itself), Jiva says that (just as a child does not directly realize the need for getting cure for the disease) the human individual in the beginning may not have a serious conviction for serving (performing transcendental loving associational activities with) the Bhagavan, or in other words, transcending the urges leading to miseries in favour of serving the Bhagavān. Hence the need for luring with heaven, happiness and so on. This lack of conviction is because of lack of disinterest in the urges. Such an individual must follow the part instructed in the Karma Kanda section of the Vedas to fulfill the urges of artha and kama.

If the individual gives up the activities instructed in Karma Kārta without developing disinterest
in this-worldly and other-worldly pleasures, such an individual is bound to be guilty of inaction and as a result is bound to face the punishment for the violation of laws of nature as instructed in *Karma Karda*. If the activities prescribed in *Karma Kārda* are performed without a desire for the pleasures there of and are performed only to please *Bhagavān*, the said punishment can be averted though the pleasures of such activities are not received. Such performance of activities (intended) to please the *Bhagavan* give the benefit of transcendence of (urgeful performance of) activities and results in the transcendence of the desire for *this-worldly* and *other-worldly* benefits.

Jiva, quoting from *Brhad Aranyaka Upanishad* (IV.4.22), argues that performing *Karma Kārda* activities gradually leads to the gradual evolution of the personality of the individual so as to be able to transcend worldly desire and helps him to become eligible to acquire experience/knowledge of the nature of *Brahman* (Absolute) (*Bhakti Sandarbha*, section 62). The above mentioned lines of *Brhadāranyaka Upanishad*, in fact, are the basis for the theory of partial self fulfilment leading gradually to total self fulfilment mentioned in the last chapter (2.8). Jiva adds the *Bhakti* interpretation to these lines and says that *Karma Karda* gradually leads to (*Bhakti* *Vedānta*).

In fact, Jiva goes to the extent of arguing that once a person acquires the capability of giving up *Karma KSnda* activities through strong conviction in the practice of *Bhakti*, it becomes his *duty* to give up such activities. Such a giving up does not lead to punishment (which is mentioned as a consequence of violation of *Karma Kanda* laws) since he is now governed by the laws of *Bhakti* where performing activities of *Bhakti* remains to be the only duty (*Bhakti Sandarbha* section 23)(4.3.5.2.lll).

The *Puranas* contains the narrative form presentation of all these principles of relation between *Karma Karda* and *Bhakti Vedanta* also along with the principles of *Karma Karda* (2.2.2),
and the relation between \textit{karma} and \textit{Jnana Karpa-s} (2.8), which are mentioned earlier. If the \textit{Purana-s} like the \textit{Bhagavata Purana} contain stories of giving up of \textit{Karma Karpa} activities in favour of \textit{Bhakti} on the one hand and pure performance of activities of \textit{Bhakti} on the other, \textit{Itihasa-s} like \textit{Mahabharata} present stories of performance of \textit{Karma Karpa} activities aimed at pleasing \textit{Bhagavan} along with the stories discussed in the earlier chapter. In \textit{Lilas}, these stories of \textit{Itihasa-s} and \textit{Puranas} also are presented with a focus on the \textit{Bhakti} aspect of them.

From the above analysis of \textit{Gaupiya vaisnava} poetics, it can be seen that according to the poetics of \textit{Lilas}, the stories chosen from the \textit{Itihasa-s} and the \textit{Puranas}, especially those from the \textit{Bhagavata Purana} and the \textit{Bramha Vaivarta Purana}, and from the lives of saints, as the themes of \textit{Lilas} plays are significant not because they are the stories of selves attaining \textit{artha} and \textit{kama} within the norms of \textit{dharma}, not even because they are the stories of the selves who seek \textit{Jnana} (self knowledge in the form of self as Self non-different from \textit{Bramhan}) but because they are the stories of the Absolute and His incarnation on earth, in which the selves as Selves are described to have enjoyed and expressed the transcendental love (\textit{priti}) for Him. In other words, the significance of these stories for \textit{Gaupiya vaisnava} school lies in their being the narrative form presentation (3.5.1) of the laws of nature according to \textit{Gaupiya Vaishnava} school, namely, the self who acts with the self knowledge as Self gets liberated from miseries; and that self with this self knowledge but with an additional feature of self as Self non-different from \textit{Bramhan} experiences a formlessness; whereas, that self as Self with a transcendental loving relation with \textit{Bhagavan} experiences (\textit{bhakti}) \textit{rasa}, which is full of an infinite and exuberant pleasure because of this transcendental love (\textit{priti}); and the self without this self knowledge gets rewards and punishments for the compliance and non-compliance with \textit{dharma}. It may be seen that this frame of laws of nature makes the Advaitic laws of nature (3.4) only a special case of the laws of nature from \textit{Gaupiya Vaishnava} perspective. In the words of Chaitanya's answer to Sanatana mentioned earlier (3.5.1), these laws of nature can alternatively be stated as follows. The self with \textit{das} self
knowledge experiences the infinite bliss in the form of rasa through the associational activities with Bhagavān and the self who acts devoid of self knowledge suffers from miseries.

However, it may be observed that, among the stories from the Purānas and the Itihāsas such as the Mahābhārata and the Ramayana, the same themes may be written and performed for Natya for Trivarga, Natya for Jñāna and or Līlā. For example, it can be seen that Bhatta Narayana took a theme from the Mahābhārata and wrote Vānisamhāram as Natya for Trivarga. In this play the Pāndava-s (especially Yudhīstīra and Bhīma) attain artha in the form of the kingdom through following dharma. Dr. Ambadapudi Nagabhushananam, in his introduction to this play holds that, Vānisamhāram, by offering instruction about dharma, proposes Trivarga (in Bhatta Narayana, 1988: xxxxiv). As mentioned in the last chapter, themes from Mahābhārata when written as Natya for Jñāna instruct Jñāna and provide the experience of santa rasa (2.6.1). But when the same themes portray the Pandavas as the associates of Kṛṣṇa expressing transcendental love for Him then they become Līlā-s as is seen in the case of Mahābhārata Līlā-s in Vrindavan).

3.7. The validity of the concept of Bhaktirasa as a theatrical experience.

3.7.1. The distinction of Bhaktirasa in the issue of self fulfilment

Using the same name Bhakti rasa, (given, as above, to the transcendental level spiritual experience) to refer to the experience of the audience resulting from watching/hearing Līlā performance/recitals has become controversial in the literature on poetics of rasa. Certain ancient scholars rejected the stature of rasa to Bhakti in the literature/theatre whereas, certain others accepted Bhakti rasa in literature/theatre, but some of them merged that into santa rasa.

Reviews on poetics of rasa by the modern scholars have been done as if these polemics by both the parties, for and against the separate status for Bhakti rasa in the poetics of rasa, are being
done from the same background. This resulted, as shall be demonstrated in future, in the modern scholars such as Surendemath Shastri and Raghavan accepting one stance of a given author of poetics of rasa as correct and the stance of the other author of poetics of rasa as wrong. Now, with the different backgrounds of these stances of the authors of poetics of rasa becoming clear from the earlier discussion in the present research work (2.5.2, 2.8, 3.4 & 3.5), each of these stances can be found to be correct from within the background on which the stance is based.

It has already been demonstrated above that Natya for Trivarga and Lila have the back grounds of Karma Kārda and Vedanta (jnana Kārda section of Veda-s) respectively. When Dhananjaya suggests that Priti (love) and Bhakti (devotion) are bnava-s alone and should not be given a separate status, because they merge in ārśa (joy - a vyabnicaribhava) and utsāha (enthusiasm - a sthāyī bhāva) (Daśanāpakam IV.83) and when Mammata refuses to accord the status of rasa to Bhakti in Natya, on the ground that rati related to gods and the like, which is only a transitory emotion, can be called only a bhāva (and thus not rasa), and only that which is expressed in relation to a woman is ärgha (rasa) (1995 :135), it may be noted that their stances are strictly in accordance with the list of sthāyī bhāva-s and vyabnicaribhāva-s given by Bharata (2.6.1). Thus, consciously or unwittingly, they are arguing within the framework of Natya for Trivarga, which is the framework of Karma Kārda (2.5, 2.6.1 & 2.8) and are treating the concepts of rati, rasa and so on, to be valid only within that framework. Surendemath Shastri is probably echoing, probably uncritically, the argument of Dhananjaya, Dhanika and Mammata, when he says that "love in the form of devotion of God [Bhakti - ratiT] is an immature sentiment" (not mature enough to evolve into rasa) (1961 :290).

In a similar vein, it may be noted that when scholars such as Abhinavagupta, Rupa, Jiva and Madhusudana Saraswati reject the above mentioned arguments against Bhakti rasa and accept
Bhakti as a rasa, they are taking a Vedantic position. Among these, it is Madhusudana Saraswati, though is historically the latest of them, who articulates on behalf of all the pro-Bhakti rasa theoreticians, the reasoning behind rejecting the position of Mammata, Dhananjaya and others. He says that the argument (of Mammata) that the love towards gods can not give rise to the experience of *rasa*, is applicable in the case of gods such as *indra* (2.7.2) and others. In the case of these gods, *rati* may be a *bhava*, but in the case of the Absolute (*Paramātmā*), Bhakti is a *rasa* (as quoted in Ramakrishnamurthy, 1981:180).

Madhusudana is pointing out that Mammata and others have used the word *devādi* (concerned with gods and the like. By others, Madhusudana indicates the love for elders, children and so on) uncritically to refer to both the gods such as *indra* and Bhagavan, the Absolute. His suggestion is to distinguish between the two. It may be noted that 'gods such as *indra*,' here, refers to the realm of *Karma Karda* (2.7.2), where the self knowledge is in the form of *Trīvarga* seeking self and the case of Bhagavan ‘refers to the realm of *Jñāna Karda*, where self knowledge is in the form of self as Self. What probably Madhusudana misses to highlight is that the word *rati*, when used in the context of the realm of self as Self, is not the same as the word *rati* used in the context of the realm of *Trīvarga* seeking self. As long as *rati* is used in reference to *Trīvarga* seeking self, it does not belong to the realm of self as Self and vice versa. Madhusudana’s statement amounts to saying that when *rati* is used in the context of gods such as *indra*, it (it is only this and not the *rati* for Bhagavan, which is possible in this realm) can not be a *rasa* and can be only a *bhava*, because the norm of *Nātya* for *Trīvarga* requires a conjugal relation in *rati* for it to become *rasa*. But, when the word is used in the context of self as Self, *rati* for Bhagavan (which is the only *rati* possible in this realm. *BhagavSn* for Madhusudana is a synonym of *Bramhan*, the formless aspect of the Absolute) is a *rasa*. A corollary of this analysis of Madhusudana can be that as long as the self is a *Trīvarga* seeking one, the *rati* of that self, even if it is called (perceived as) Bhakti and is (described to be or perceived to be) a relation with the Absolute, is not a *rasa* but only a
Madhusudana, after establishing Bhakti as a rasa, goes on to the extent of saying that the experience of Bhakti rasa is far more superior to the experience of the eight Natya rasa-s mentioned by Bharata. According to him, 'Natya rasa' (the eight rasa-s mentioned by Bharata in 2.6.1), when compared to Bhakti rasa, is like a fire fly as unto the sun (Ramakrishnamurti, 1981 : 180).

But from among those who accept Bhakti as rasa, the status given to Bhakti vis-a-vis santa by them, varies based on the particular school of Vedanta they adhere to. For example, Abhinavagupta holds that Bhakti merges in santa (as quoted in Rama Krishna Murti, 1981 : 178). Whereas, for Jiva and Rupa, Bhakti rasa has a separate status and santa rasa recognized by Abhinava, being centered around the formless Bramhan (with which Bhakti relation, as understood by Gaudiya Vaishnava school, is not possible) is not a (Bhakti) rasa at all, but ianta as a neutral emotion for Bhagavan can be only a kind of Bhakti rasa called sānta Bhakti rasa. The reason for these two stances can be easily understood on the basis of the position of these schools towards the form of the Absolute and the place of Bhakti as a process of attaining the realization of the Absolute discussed above.

Since, for Advaita vedanta, the divine form, on which the devotee meditates, merges with formless Bramhan, in the ultimate realization of the meditator (3.3), the experience of Bhakti, which is experienced by the meditator as he meditates on this divine form ultimately merges into the bliss of the formless Bramhan realization or into the experience of the realization of non-difference from the formless Bramhan. Even in the case of Līlā performances, for an Advaitic audience, the divine form of Kṛsna appearing on stage, is merely a manifestation of the formless Bramhan and all the experience of Bhakti (3.3) for such a divine form, thus, ultimately merges into the experience of non-difference with the Absolute, which is called sānta rasa. It is in this sense that Abhinava's
stance for Bhakti rasa merging into santa rasa can be understood.

In this context, Jagannatha also stands in line with Madhusudana and Abhinava, in having been able to recognize the reasons for the possibility of the status of rasa to Bhakti. Deviating from Abhinava, Jagannatha does not agree to merge Bhakti into santa. He agrees that like other rasa-s, Bhakti rasa also has constituents like vibhāva, anubhāva, vyabhicārībhāva, anubhava, and sthāyi bhava. But strangely, all of a sudden, he resolves to reject the status of rasa to Bhakti, merely on the ground that the established opinion of Bharata and other mūri-s (sages - probably referring to Anandavardhana, Abhinava and others) allows for the acceptance of only the nine rasa-s and no more, lest there be chaos in rasa theory. This fear of chaos in Jagannatha is very much justified within the framework of santa rasa poetics because, in this context, a place for Bhakti as rasa obviously leads to several fallacies. The solution to the problem of chaos may be seen to be found in Jiva's conception of Bhakti rasa discussed in the previous sections, as he takes Bhakti rasa into a totally different platform than that of Īśāna rasa (3.5.2).

It may be noted that when Raghavan, in his book Number of Rasas, says that in "dramas [sic] on Rama, KSra and Siva, which are very large in number, there is Bhakti and through it santa is depicted as the ultimate rasa..." (1975 AT), he appears to be taking the stance held by Abhinava. There is evidence, in the above mentioned book, to believe that Raghavan knew of the minute differences in the stances of Bharata, Abhinava, Madhusudana, and Rupa and Jiva. But strangely, he includes Caitanya Candrādaya of Kavi Kamapura, more strangely, despite recognizing that it belongs to Chaitanya tradition (Gaudiya Vaisnava school) (1975 : 41), under his long list of santa rasa plays merely on the ground that "... dramas [sic] on the life of saints and devotees are Šánta Rasa plays" (1975 : 47). As noted above (3.5.3), according to the Gaudiya Vaisnava poetics of Liīa, when the plays on Rama, KSra and the saints are performed as Liīa-s, they are meant to give the experience of various kinds of Bhakti rasa-s and not Šānta rasa. It can be seen that by listing
Caitanya Candrodaya under santa rasa plays, Raghavan is, at least, not placing this Gaudiya Vaisnava play in the perspective of its tradition, if not committing the mistake of calling a play meant for Bhakti rasa experience as a santa rasa play. Thus, it can be assumed that Raghavan did not care either to apply his knowledge of the distinction of Gaudiya vaisnava poetics vis-a-vis Abhinava’s or to acknowledge overtly that he is taking the stance of Abhinava. It is in the context of this kind of approach by the modern scholars of rasa theory that the distinction between Natya for Trivarga, Natya for Jnana and Līla and the corresponding stances of Dhananjaya/Dhanika, Abhinava/Jagannatha and Rupa/Jiva, being delineated in the present work, becomes significant.

3.7.2. Rasa from the play as a result and means of rasa in the play.

It may be noted that the presentation of (the process of) self-fulfilment as a provision for the emulation of that (process of) self-fulfilment was mentioned to be part of the theory of Natya for Trivarga and Natya for Jnana (just as it is in the theory of Līla, as mentioned above) (2.4, 2.6.2 & 3.5.2-3). Whether this idea of emulation is part of the theory of Drama or not is not clear but the presentation of failure in self-fulfilment as mentioned above (2.2.2) clearly distinguishes Drama from all the three kinds of Natya, namely, Natya for Trivarga, Natya for Jnana and Līla, in as much as these three kinds of Natya present the success in self-fulfilment. As mentioned earlier, this presentation of success (in self-fulfilment) is a precondition for the possibility of rasa in Natya (2.6.1). Now the possibility of rasa in all the three kinds of Natya may be seen to be based on this presentation of success (in self-fulfilment). The principle of the kind of rasa resulting from the performance of a play being governed by the kind of self-fulfilment presented in the play (2.6.1), leads to the idea that the rasa resulting from the performance of Līla is different in kind from the eight rasa-s of Natya for Trivarga on the one hand and from the santa rasa resulting from the Natya for Jnana on the other. It may be noted that in Natya for Trivarga, rasa is limited to the
experience resulting from the play and is not recognized (by the most) to be existing in the play (2.7.3). It may also be remembered that in Natya for Jnana, rasa resulting from the play is equated with the experience presented in the play (3.4). Now, as a result of Gaudiya Vaisnava school's recognizing rasa as the experience in the content of the play (which is the transcendental loveful activities of the selves as Selves in the Vaikuntha internal energy of Bhagavan and its manifestation on earth), rasa becomes not only a result of (the performance of) play but also that which is existing in the play. Coupled with the pan Natya idea of the purpose of play being to provide a model for emulation (2.4 & 2.7.2), this leads to the idea of rasa resulting from the play being a means to emulate and ultimately attain the rasa in the play. It may be noted that if what is considered to be provided for emulation in Natya for Trtvarga and Natya for Jnana is self fulfilment, it is the rasa resulting from or contained in the self fulfilment also, which is considered to be provided by Lila for emulation. It may be argued that even the goal of Natya for Trtvarga also is the pleasure resulting from the fulfilment of the urges of sex, power and order (2.5). But, it may be noted that this pleasure can not be called rasa on account of not being transcendental. A similar argument may be possible in the case of Natya for Jnana too. It is true that the consideration of śānta rasa to be non-different from the experience, resulting from or contained in the fulfilment of self as Self nondifferent from Bramhan presented in Natya for Jnāna, also amounts to saying that Natya for Jnana provides the same experience for emulation as the one resulting from it. But Gaudiya Vaisnava school's approach of vice versa (considering the experience emulated itself as rasa and the theatrical experience as non-different from it) emphasizes the place of rasa as a goal of Līla (type of Natya).

This is one of the most significant aspects of Gaudiya Vaisnava school. It may be noted that the principle of bhaktavat na tu kṛṣṇavat (the human individuals should emulate devotee but not kṛṣṇa) (3.5.3) implies that in a Līla performance (unlike in Natya where in accordance with the principle Of ramādīvat varttāvat na kvacīt rāvanadīvat - one should emulate Characters like Rāma and not
characters like Rāvana - the audience identify with the hero and not with the antagonist) the audience (are supposed to) identify with the devotee self but not with Kṛsna, though Kṛsna is the hero of the Līlā plays. It goes without saying that the variegatedness of rasa in the transcendental realm has its implications for the experience of rasa in the theatre also, since, as mentioned earlier (3.5), the audience have a wide choice of self knowledges to identify with and since each self knowledge is experienced in the form of a kind of rasa and finally since rasa from the play is the result and means of rasa in the play, rasa from the play also is as vanegated as rasa in the play and, in fact, all the rasa-s from the play are just corresponding to rasa-s in the play with the same names and the rasa experienced by a specific audience corresponds to the self knowledge chosen and emulated by that audience (Priti Sandarbha, section 111).

3.8. Rasa as the purpose of instruction in Līlā.

The position of rasa in the play as a goal of watching Ula performances, discussed above (3.7.2), has another implication. It is with regard to instruction vis-a-vis pleasure aspect of Līlā. Līlā, as a form of Natya, by being a narrative form presentation of the ideas of Vaiṣṇava, shares the feature of Natya, namely, being a conversion of a kinglike instruction into a belovedlike instruction (2.3). That is, Līlā shares the feature of pleasure being the means of instruction. But the implication of rasa being the goal of all endeavour in Gaudiya vaisnava school, as mentioned above (3.5.2-3), implies that rasa is the goal of this instruction too. If in the words of Rapin who, as mentioned earlier (4.4) says, “nor no other end is [Drama] delightful man it may be profitable”; for Natya for Tīvraṅga, rasa is given for no other purpose than to instruct in Tīvraṅga (which, in turn, may lead to a worldly pleasure) (2.2.2); in Ula, rasa from the play is the means of instruction in pūrṇa, which is, in turn, the means of rasa in the play. Thus, in the case of Līlā, rasa becomes both the means and goal of instruction. Another point to be noted here is that (based on the idea
that instruction is the means of rasa in this play, it can be said that) apart from giving rasa to those who have self knowledge, Lila, by instructing the audience in the Gaudiya Vaisnava scheme of emulation of self knowledge, aims also at transforming those who can not experience rasa (owing to the lack of self knowledge), into those who can experience it.

3.9. Bhakti Rasa as a day to day experience.

Another significant implication of the conception of rasa (Bhakti rasa) as the experience of fulfilment of self as Self in ‘playful’ association with Bhagavan is that rasa does not remain to be a theatrical experience alone. It is conceived to be the experience, in other daily activities also, of an individual experiencing the fulfilment of self knowledge in the form of self as Self in a transcendental loving relation with Bhagavan. It may be noted here that in the case of poetics of Nāṭya for Trivarga, rasa is considered strictly to be a theatrical experience and not at all a daily life experience (2.6.1). In fact, even in santa rasa poetics, a situation similar to Gaudiya Vaisnava poetics is possible, because, there, śāntarasa is being conceived to be non-different from the experience of the self fulfilment in the form of self as Self non-different from the formless Bramhan. But the word used for the daily life experience of such a self fulfilment in ianta rasa poetics is bramhādvaita sukha and santa rasa, the theatrical experience, is considered to be non-different from this daily life experience (3.4), whereas, in Gaudiya Vaisnava poetics, the word rasa is given to the daily life experience too.

However, as mentioned above (3.5.2), Gaudiya Vaisnava poetics considers that rasa, whether in theatre or outside that, is possible for a human individual only if the self fulfilment in the form of self as Self in das relation with Bhagavan is attained by that individual. The attainment of das self knowledge, according to Gaudiya Vaisnava school, is possible only if the emulation of das self knowledge becomes a round the dock activity (Bnakti Rasāmrtta Sindhu 1.2.8 and Bnakti Sandartha,
sections 94 & 115). For this, Rupa in his Bhakti Rasamrta Sindhu proposes an elaborate list of activities with sixty four items (I.2.74 - I.2.243) such as worshipping the deities at the temple, studying devotional scriptures such as the Bhagavata Purana, associating with the other practitioners of Bhakti, living in holy places (like Mathura) and chanting the names of Krsna, to be made part of a day to day activity. Rupa cites the examples of all these actions from various Puranas (which, as mentioned in 3.5.1, supposedly describe the actions performed by selves who are established in das self knowledge) and other sources. In other words, by following these actions, the selves are supposed to be emulating the actions of the selves as Selves established in their das self knowledge. These actions are expected to give relish (rati) for Krsna (Bhakti Rasamrta Sindhu I.2.245), and when this is intensified the selves attain transcendental love ( Caitanya Caritamrta, madhya Līlā XIX. 177) for Krsna and thus self fulfilment in the form of das self knowledge. That is, these actions help the selves to give up their identity which is devoid of dās self knowledge and to cultivate the das self knowledge which helps in experiencing rasa.

The possibility of rasa experience for human individuals on earth is considered by Gaudiya Vaisnava school to be exemplified in the behaviour of great devotees like Gaurangadas Babaji, Panditdas Babaj, Krishnadas Babaj and so on (whose stories are described by O.B.L Kapoor in his book Braja Ke Bhakt). Caitanya’s behaviour mentioned, at the beginning of this discussion (3.5.1), is considered to be the best example of the most intense levels of experience of rasa (plates 1-3). The aim of all Gaudiya Vaisnava practitioners is to reach similar levels of experience of rasa. All the daily routine of a Gaudiya practitioner has this single goal of such an experience of rasa.

Watching Līlā performances is, thus, considered by the followers of Gaudiya Vaisnava school to be only one of all these activities, which help the individual attain das self knowledge and
experience rasa. Whether it is participating in Līla or in the other kind of activities, all of them are means of experiencing rasa inside and outside the Līla performances. It may be noted that watching Līla performances and other kinds of activities are complementary to and continuities of each other (see 4.4).

The concept of rasa, thus, dominates the entire Gaudiya vaisnava discourse imposingly. It works not only as a key concept of this philosophy but also as its characteristic feature. The criterion for the claim of this philosophy as the most choosable path among the paths of Vaiṣṇava also is the provision of rasa in this philosophy.

3.10. Playfulness' as the distinction of Līla.

Another key concept of Gaudiya Vaisnava school (apart from the concept of rasa mentioned above) is the concept of Līla. The literal meaning of the word Līla is a 'playful' activity. Interpretation of playfulness (of activity being called as Līla) as absence of expectation of desire for gain/purpose is well established (for example, Yamadagni, 1980 : 2 and Pandey, 1980 : 37). But if the word playful can be interpreted as dose in expressions like 'playful' relations and 'playful' form, it has been shown above that parama madhurya rupa (the sweetest form = the utmost closeness inspiring form) can be called as the most 'playful' form and madhura bhāva (literally, the sweet relation here, the conjugal relation, considered to be the closest relation) can be called as the most 'playful' relation. Based on this reasoning, it has also been shown that the Gaudiya Vaisnava school's scheme of greater and greater choosability of parama madhurya rupa (the utmost sweet form), madhura bhava (conjugal relation) and madhum bhava (conjugal relation) with parama madhurya rupa (the utmost sweet form) can be understood to be rooted in or implying the greater and greater choosability of greater and greater degree of playfulness,' i.e., greater and greater degree of Līla-ness.
However, Jiva’s explanation for the greater choosability of parakiya madhura bhava (non-wifely conjugal relation), among all the relations possible between self as Self and Bhagavan, has also been shown earlier (3.5.3) to be based on the idea of absence of expectations of either this world or the other world, in other words, on the basis of the playfulness in this sense. Since interpreting Liśa in this sense of playfulness is well established, this explanation of Jiva can be seen as based on greater išā-ness.

This is how the idea of Liśa can be seen to be all pervading in the Gaudiya Vaisnava school and to be a key criterion for the Gaudiya Vaisnava value system. This centrality of playfulness in Gaudiya Vaisnava theology leads to the centrality of the same notion in Gaudiya Vaisnava poetics and in Gaudiya Vaisnava theatre also, because Gaudiya Vaisnava theatre, i.e., Liśa, is only a theatrical presentation of Gaudiya vaisnava theology, through a narrative language (3.5.1). This is what makes Liśa, the Gaudiya Vaisnava theatre, the theatre of playfulness.

It may be noted that the distinction delineated so far between Drama, Natya for Ttvarga, Natya for Jnana and Liśa, at different occasions in the past discussions of this work, can now be understood in terms of playfulness. For example, the distinction between these different kinds of theatre, in terms of playfulness, can be seen to be as follows. In Drama and Natya for Ttvarga, playfulness is not possible for the self, because the self in both these forms of theatre has passions which are just the opposite of playfulness (purposelessness). Though Natya for Jnana also presents a self which is free from passions, in this theatre, the self as Self is considered to be in association with the formless aspect of the Absolute which has no activity (either playful or non-playful) as its feature. This leaves no scope for the entire variegated world of playfulness conceived in Gaudiya vaisnava school to exist in Natya for Jnana. Since in Gaudiya Vaisnava school, as mentioned earlier (3.5), the self as Self is in association with Bhagavan.
who has playful activity as one of His important features, there is a scope for the huge variegated world of playfulness conceived in Gaudīya Vaishnava school in Līla. Thus, among Drama, Natya for Tnvarga, Natya for Jñāna and Līla, it is only in Līla that there is a scope for the presentation of playful activity.

In the last chapter (2.6.2), it was shown that there is scope for the presentation of actions in Natya for Jnana also. These actions are free from desire and in this sense may be considered to be playful. But the distinction in the actions presented in LIB is that they are presentations of playful (transcendental loving) activities of self as Self with a playful Bhagavan.

It may be noted that the word kṛdaniyakam, often quoted from Bharata’s Natya Śāstra, literally means playable and thus is applicable to different forms of Natya or at least to Natya for Tnvarga which has been the subject matter of the Nātya Śāstra. As discussed earlier (2.6.1), this word, in fact, can be seen to be referring to the rasa giving nature of Natya and in this sense, it can be seen to be applicable to all the three forms of Natya, namely, Natya for Tnvarga, Natya for Jnana and Natya for BhaktiLīla. But playfulness of Līla is not limited to the playability (Kṛdaniyata) of this kind. Its distinction is, in fact, in the kind of self that it presents. As a theatre which presents a playful self and a playful plane/aspect of Reality, Līla can be called as a Theatre of playfulness.

The name theatre of playfulness, being given here to US, may appear similar to the name theatre of the Absurd. This similarity in the coinage of the name is not only unwarranted but also deliberate. The similarity is justified at least for one reason. Both the theatre of the Absurd (at least as represented in the plays of Samuel Becket) and the Theatre of playfulness, i.e., Līla, give an impression of total absence of action (‘absence of action’ in the sense of insensitivity/indifference) in the Theatre of the Absurd and in the sense of no conflict in (Līla). But
Table 10.
Comparision between different schools of Nāṭya.

I. Common features.

1. Happy ending.
2. Themes from Íṭhāsa-s and Purāṇa-s.
3. Self presented as models for emulation.
4. Worldview basis is Vedic.
5. Performance as a Vedic activity.
6. Personality of the participants restricted.
7. Rasa as the term for the aesthetic experience of the audience.
8. Theatre as theatrical form presentation of the narrative form of the Vedic laws of nature.
9. Self fulfilment in terms of the urges of the self.

II. Differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nāṭya for Trivarga</th>
<th>Nāṭya for Jñāna</th>
<th>Līlā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karma Kārṇḍa section of the Vēda-s</td>
<td>Jñāna Kārṇḍa (Vādaṭa) section of the Vēda-s - Advaita Vādaṭa perspective.</td>
<td>Jñāna Kārṇḍa section of the Vēda-s, Bhakti Vādaṭa perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Issue : Philosophical background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trīguṇa bound self.</th>
<th>Trīguṇa free self (Self).</th>
<th>Trīguṇa free self (Self)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Issue : Self in terms of qualities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karma bound self.</th>
<th>The self as self seeking/attained non-difference with the formless Absolute.</th>
<th>The self as Self seeking/attained transcendental loving association with the Absolute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Issue : Self.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trivarga seeking self.</th>
<th>Jñāna (Knowledge) seeking/attained</th>
<th>Pṛiti seeking/attained self.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Issue : Self in terms of urges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yajña, the Trivarga giving ritual.</th>
<th>Jñāna giving ritual.</th>
<th>Pṛiti giving ritual.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Issue : Attitude towards performance.

| Eight Rasa-s listed by Bharata | Śānta Rasa. | Several different kinds of Bhaakti Rasa. |
7. Issue: Comparability with the spiritual experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considered to be similar.</th>
<th>Considered to be the same.</th>
<th>Considered to be the same.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Issue: Identification by the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With the Trivarga seeking protagonist.</th>
<th>With the Jñāna seeking/attained protagonist.</th>
<th>With the Priti seeking/attained protagonist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Issue: Possibility of Rasa inside and outside the theatre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Only inside.</th>
<th>Both inside and outside.</th>
<th>Both inside and outside.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Issue: Pleasure from the theatre due to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfilment of Trivarga</th>
<th>Brahmādvaīta [non-difference from Brahmān].</th>
<th>Fulfilment of Priti.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Issue: Instructs as goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dharma.</th>
<th>Jñāna.</th>
<th>Priti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Issue: Type of happiness experienced by the self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed with miseries</th>
<th>Born of Jñāna, free from miseries</th>
<th>Born of Priti, free from miseries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Issue: Laws of nature depicted/instructed

| Law of Karma (2.2). | Law of Advaita Vedānta (2.5&3.4). | Law of Bhakti Vedānta (3.5). |
Table 11.
Comparison between Drama and different kinds of Nāṭya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Nāṭya for Trivarga</th>
<th>Nāṭya for Mokṣa</th>
<th>Līlā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Issue: Qualities of the self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate and/or insensitive/ignorant</td>
<td>Passionate but order bound and passionate but order violative.</td>
<td>Free from passions.</td>
<td>Free from passions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Issue: Type of self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Issue: Laws of nature depicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various forces of determinism</td>
<td>Law of Kama (2.2).</td>
<td>Law of Advaita Vedanta (2.5 &amp; 3.4).</td>
<td>Law of Bhakti Vedanta (3.5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there is a difference in the cause for lack of 'action' in these two. If there is no play' (conflict-free interpersonal communication) in the Theatre of the Absurd there is only play' (conflict-free interpersonal communication) in Līlā. If lack of play in Absurd Theatre is because the self in it is depicted to be 'cut off from the religious, metaphysical and transcendental roots which gave meaning and purpose to the existence, . . . '(1.2.7), there is only play' in Līlā because the self is cut off from the nature, the guṇa-s and their resulting qualities (2.5.2), but still in action (performing activities immensely).

3.11. Conclusion.

Thus, it may be seen that extending the worldview-based study of Natya to Līlā-s, taking the help of Gaudiya Vaisnava literature on poetics to trace the worldview underlying the Līlā-s, helps in understanding the distinction of Līlā-s from the other forms of the Natya on the one hand (see table 10) and from Drama on the other (see table 11), in terms of self and self fulfilment.

It has been mentioned in the earlier chapter that Drama and Natya can be distinguished on account of the presentation of failure alone and success along with the failure, respectively, of self and self fulfilment. There, it has also been mentioned that Natya for Trivarga, among the various categorizations of Natya, shares with Drama the presentation of the self with passions, though it differs from Drama in presenting the successful passionate self. Now at the end of this chapter, it can be seen that Natya for Jñāna and Līlā, while sharing the presentation of successful self fulfilment with Natya for Trivarga, both differ from it in the presentation of a dispassionate self. Līlā among these two categories of Natya presenting a state of self transcendental to the three modes, differs from the other because of the presentation of playful' activities of a playful' self in association with playful' Bhagavan. If Drama and Natya for Trivarga present the self with the urges for sex and power, Natya for Jñāna and Līlā present a self free from these urges. Fulfilment or
non-fulfilment of Dharma, Jñāna and Prīti, respectively, are the determining factors of success and failure, in Natya for Tnvarga, Natya for Jnana and Liia, respectively.

If each form of Drama, is a presentation of one of the discoveries of the material laws of determinism (1.1 & 1.3), Ula, the Theatre of playfulness, is a presentation of a Reality conceived to be free from such a material determinism, which in Vedic worldview is explained in terms of bondage to three modes (2.4.2). If Natya for Tnvarga is a presentation of actions in compliance and non-compliance with the laws of determinism of the self in bondage with the three modes, Natya for Jnana and Liia are presentations of liberation, of the self which surpasses the three modes, from these laws. But as mentioned above, Natya for Jnana does not have a conception of actions of the self in that mode in association with a 'playful' Absolute. Whereas, Ula is a presentation of actions of the self liberated from these laws and yet in association with the Absolute (which too is conceived to be a) 'playful' (acting) entity.

Thus, the axis of the concepts of self and self fulfilment helps in understanding Liia in relation to Drama and helps to see that in line with the phrases such as the Theatre of the Absurd, used in the case of Drama, it deserves to be called as the Theatre of playfulness.'

The predominance of the concept of 'playfulness' in the context of Liia resulted in the form and technique of it being predominantly 'playful,' in the Rās Liia-s performed in Vrindavan (4.4). The details of this technique will be studied in the next chapter.
End notes:

1. It should be noted that Jnana Kārda of Veda-s, mentioned earlier (2.5.2 & 2.8) is a section of Veda-s, which deals with the issue of liberation of self from miseries and laws of nature applicable to self as Self and so on, where as, Jnana marga is a particular path or method or school of interpretation/practice of this Jnana Kārda.

2. With an equation to the stories of devotees mentioned in the Puranas, even the stories of devotees from the history are referred to as Līlā-s.

3. These three miseries are interpreted by O.B.L. Kapoor, a Gaudiya vaisnava scholar, as follows. He describes ‘ādīndavika as that "which proceeds from the gods, e.g., famine and epidemics,' ādhībhautika as that which proceeds from material causes’ and ādhyātmika as that which pertains to the mind (1976 :135).

4. It may be noted that though Bhakti is used in a general way to mean devotional service, Jiva gives this term to the particular mood of a devotee, who considers Kṛṣna as His master and himself as Kṛṣna’s servant.

5. Madhyārya (sweetness) should not be confused with Madhum (conjugal) bhava.

6. For Madhusudana, Paramārtha is a general word referring to the Absolute, unlike in Gaudiya vaisnava school, where it refers to only that aspect of Bhagavan, which organizes the universe according to the laws of nature (3.5.1).

7. It may strike to a student of Drama that Miracle plays, among the plays of the West, have not
been taken up for comparison here, though, these plays are closest to the Līlā performances, at least to the extent of being religious. Probably, it will be interesting to compare these plays also with Drama and see how the problem of self is dealt within these plays differently than in mainstream Drama, just as it has been done here, in comparison with the Līlā-s, thus placing Līlā-s and miracle plays into one slot. But given the well known dissimilarities between the Christian theology and Vādānta, obviously Miracle plays can not be seen as identical to Līlā performances. Bringing these into discussion would require a whole lot of discussion of the complicated problems of differences between Christian theology and Vādānta. Such a discussion is beyond the scope of the present work as the focus here is to understand Līlā vis-à-vis Drama and Natya.