CONCLUSION.

Indian aesthetics has a glorious tradition in the world of literature, and the best way to uphold its validity is to apply its theories to literature belonging to alien cultures and varied languages to prove that they work. The main objective of this study has been to accentuate the validity and potency of the theories of rasa and aucitya by effectuating an appraisement of the last plays of T. S. Eliot. A perusal of the last plays of Eliot on the basis of these theories has authenticated the validity of these theories in evaluating Western literature. Eliot's adherence to the principles of aucitya in his last three plays The Cocktail Party, The Confidential Clerk, and The Elder Statesman has created an ennobling aesthetic relish in the sahrtayas, whereas the infraction of all principles of aucitya in The Family Reunion has resulted in rasibhäsa. It would be interesting to denominate the similar dramatic ingredients of these plays of Eliot to ascertain how far they have conduced to the enhancement of aesthetic relish.

The close parallelism between Eliot's plays and the Greek classics has been the subject of many a critical discussion, and it would be appropriate to analyze the decorum exercised by Eliot in his role as a borrower. The Indian aestheticians justify borrowing, when the writer exercises a great element of finesse and dexterity in it, and when the indebtedness of a writer to another work interlopes in no way with the aesthetic relish of his work, it ends up as the appropriate acceptance of the borrowed material. In all his last plays, except The Family Reunion Eliot appears as a drävaka or an ideal borrower, who by the powerful alchemy of his imaginative faculty obliterates all traces of imitation, and comes out successful in converting the borrowed materials into original masterpieces.

The Greek analogies manifested in the themes of his plays are appropriately
modulated by the creative genius of the playwright to suit the contemporary background and to yield intense dramatic effects. All his last plays except The Family Reunion have an intrinsic value, and as such the satārdayas are able to gain aesthetic relish from these plays even without taking into consideration their Greek provenance or the extraneous factors like time and milieu.

Through his plays Eliot has kept the lamp of spirituality burning in an apparently unspiritual generation, and as such his heroes transcend the ordinary joys and pleasures of life like rati and hasa, to find solace in sāma. The theme of Eliot’s last plays revolves round three important concepts like God, the individual, and the society. The heroes of these plays are the pivots of a family or a society and as such they embody the hopes and aspirations of the others. The hero’s arrival at self-realization is not the finis but the genesis of an ennobling influence on the society. The auсitya exerted by Eliot in the treatment of these concepts has made his last plays to culminate on a note of śānta. But in the play The Family Reunion due to the absence of proper vīhāvas to externalize his feelings of guilt the spiritual election of Harry fails to make any impact on the society.

Eliot has incorporated into his moral vision an intricate network of spiritual concerns and psychological principles, but these ideas are blended with the plot in an appropriate manner. Eliot’s last plays are embedded in the ethos of the people, but the perfect auсitya exerted by him in the treatment of the plot and sentiments have prevented these plays from ending up as mere religious propaganda or as philosophical treatises. As his concept of aesthetics is linked with life in its totality, the dichotomy between aesthetic and moral values is absent in his three last plays. Eliot has conveyed certain religious axioms through his plays, but his kārayatripratibha has successfully blended together the
different forms of social-consciousness and ideological beliefs to create the supreme aesthetic relish in the sahṛdayas.

Eliot had exercised great aucitya in the treatment of the sentiments. However certain strong sentiments like vīra, raudra, and bibhatsa that would have jeopardized the position of sānta rasa have been deliberately left out by him. Other sentiments like karuṇa, bhayānaka, śṛṅgāra, and hāsyā exist in his last plays, but the extreme propriety employed by Eliot in the treatment of the theme had reduced them to the status of anga-rasas.

Eliot’s concept of love, which is totally different from that of the Indian aestheticians has served the purpose of strengthening the sānta rasa. The notion of erotics was an important factor that had stimulated some of the basic traits of social and cultural evolutions in ancient India. In the Indian dramas the love between man and woman, highlights their physical union, but Eliot’s concept of love is linked with his concept of dharma, and as such it is purged of all egoism for the realization of a positive end, which benefits not only the individual, but the entire society.

In the play The Confidential Clerk the love between Kaghan and Lucasta prompts them to include the entire family in their circle of love, whereas in The Elder Statesman even in the passionate utterances of the young lovers Charles and Monica there is a religious dimension which, instills the full awareness that both family and social life are going to be enriched by their love. Eliot does not negate the principle of passion, but he justifies its indulgence only when it is governed by the precepts of spirituality, and this paves the way for the subordination of śṛṅgāra to sānta rasa in his plays.
Eliot does not venture into the field of adbhuta rasa as the plays having ordinary men and women thirsting for self-realization as characters did not merit its presence. There is self-realization in the protagonists, and in the other characters, but there are no visions of heavenly beings or divyadarśana and as such the sthāyī bhāva of vismaya is not converted into adbhuta rasa. The adbhuta rasa can also be stimulated by ṇipitamanorathavāpti or the attainment of the cherished desire, but in all the last plays of Eliot the craving of the protagonist is for self-realization and such an attitude mostly culminate in sānta rasa.

Though the protagonists in the last plays exhibit the anubhāvas of vīra rasa like sthairya and tyāga and vyabhicāri bhāvas like dṛṣṭi and māti, this rasa is also conspicuous by its absence in these last plays. As the sthāyī bhāva of sāma is dominant in the heroes there is no undue scope for the display of bravery, vigour and aggressiveness, which strengthens the sentiment of heroism. This has prevented the sthāyī bhāva of utṣāha from being converted into the vīra rasa.

The vibhāvas of raudra rasa are sinister and haughty human beings, but as most of the heroes of Eliot belong to the uttama or the madhyama category ruthless rage is almost eliminated from these last plays. Even the feeling of anger that occasionally surfaces in Harry, the protagonist of The Family Reunion is immediately eclipsed by his spiritual dilemma. If Eliot had introduced the powerful sentiment of bīhatsa in his plays the feeling of disgust would have commanded greater attention than quietism, and this would have resulted in rasābhāsa.

In the Indian scenario a play is primarily a visual spectacle, and the people who
come to enjoy a play are labelled as preksakas or spectators, and not as srotarali or audience.

Since the main part of a play is the visual spectacle almost all the Indian aestheticians have concentrated on the multi-medial unity of a dramatic text, but such visual spectacles are mostly neglected by Eliot in his plays. The suggestive technique of representing the action by stage props, curtains, painted scenery, and gesture language is absent in these last plays. These plays though they do not come under the category called anabhineya, i.e. not actable, provide enough material for irresistible reading pleasure.

While not giving any undue importance to the tangible conditions like setting, scenery, and costumes, Eliot had cared to provide the vital components that are necessary to stimulate the appropriate rasa. He has given importance to verbal expression at the expense of such non-verbal behaviour like looks, motions, dress, and other expressive gestures. It is the character's speech, which constitutes the predominant verbal matrix employed in Eliot’s plays. But the artificial expressions used by the characters in the play *The Family Reunion* alienate them from the sahrdayas, who are made intensely conscious of the artificiality involved in such utterances.

The plays of Eliot like *The Cocktail Party*, *The Confidential Clerk*, and *The Elder Statesman* have adhered to the principles of lokadharma advocated by Bharata. Though the setting of the play *The Family Reunion* is contemporary, the features of nātyadharma like the lengthy dialogues, the lyrical duets, and the runes have diverted the attention of the sahrdayas' from the realistic background. Eliot is able to transmute the subjective emotions into something universal and impersonal by the power of sādhāranīkaraṇa. Though the characters in the later plays of Eliot belong to suburban England they have
adhered verbatim to his dictum that an ideal drama should depict the human soul in such a manner that the audience or the reader can visualize the permanent and the universal in them.

The propriety employed by Eliot in characterization has made it integral to the śanta rasa. His great skill in characterization is marked by freshness and vitality, and this has prevented his characters from ending up as mere stereotypes. In the Indian dramaturgy the characters are divided into three categories like the uttama or the superior, the madhyama or the middling and the adhama or the inferior types. In almost all the last plays of Eliot there exists a superior person, who acts as an Āchārya to the others. The Āchāryas in the plays of Eliot liberate the heroes from their hopeless and desperate situations, and lead them onto self-realization. The majority of the characters of Eliot belong to the second group in whom there is a mixture of good and bad, and who take a turn for the better when the situation demands it. Since śanta is the dominant rasa the characters who belong to the third category are conspicuous by their absence in his last plays.

In the Indian dramas the stress is on the unity of impression created by a work, therefore no undue restrictions are imposed on the unities of time and place. But the division of the plot into five arthaprakāritis is strictly observed to help the plot to have a uniform development in the different scenes. An examination of the dramatic plot of Eliot’s plays on the basis of these theories reveal the fact that he had adhered to the aucitya oṁśivṛttam in all the last plays, except The Family Reunion.

Since śanta is the main sentiment in all the last three plays, the connection between the kāvyagunas employed by Eliot, and the śanta rasa is to be analyzed. The guṇas like ojas
and kānti are altogether neglected by Eliot, and the stress is on prasāda, mādhurya, samatā, and artha-vyakti. In all these last plays there is the clarity of sense brought about by a happy fusion of word and sense, and this communicative efficiency, the sign of kāvya-pratibhā is necessary to create aesthetic relish in the sahrdayas.

If Eliot had resorted to the kāavya-guna called kānti it would have created a kind of sportive movement of the mind to result in śṛṅgāra rasa. Eliot’s deliberate avoidance of this guna has arrested the development of śṛṅgāra as the angī-rasa in all his last plays. The lack of ojas is responsible for the absence of powerful sentiments like raudra, vīra, and abhuta in his last plays. It is interesting to note that the employment of the poetic excellence called ojas in the speeches of Harry has acted as an impediment in the development of sānta as the angī- rasa in The Family Reunion.

Eliot’s treatment of the kāvyadosas is a proof of the flexibility and adaptability of the theory of aucitya. Punarukta ceases to be a defect, when Eliot uses it to highlight the distracted mental state of his characters and to emphasize a point. The defects like anyārtha and grāmyatva are used by him to highlight the inferior social status of certain characters like Mrs. Piggot and Gomez. The kāvyadosa arthahina is appropriately employed by him to depict the distracted mental state of the characters like Amy, Lucasta, Lavinia, and Edward. Most other kāvyadosas are conspicuous by their absence in the three last plays, and this has led to the aesthetic relish of these plays, but the presence of the kāvyadosas like
gūḍārtha, bhinnārtham, abhiplārtham and arthāntaram has created rasabhaṅga in *The Family Reunion*.

Over intellectualization, which is considered as the glaring defect of the early works of Eliot, is conspicuous by its absence in all the last plays except *The Family Reunion*. Eliot’s pratibha as a writer is supplemented by his ucitanucitavivekaḥ or the capacity to discriminate between the proper and the improper in a literary composition. In all the last three plays the action proceeds smoothly owing to the clarity and precision in the dramatic treatment, and the disinterested enjoyment of sensations by sahrdayas is possible only if there is clarity in the overall pattern of the play.

A writer achieves racanaucitya, when the communication of the aesthetic relish is accomplished smoothly and without any obstacle. To analyze the racanaucitya of a writer, we have to evaluate the writer’s choice of words, the figures of speech, the construction of sentences, and the rhetorical devices used by him. Eliot has observed his theory of pattern in all his three last plays and the dramatic components have both utilitarian and architectonic value. The language is clear and powerful and suits the various nuances of emotions. Since it is motivated by the principles of aucitya, violent variation in stylization generally regarded as a defect has ceased to become so in Eliot’s plays. But the racanaucitya in *The Family Reunion* is an impediment in the path of rasa realization as the strangeness of the sentences, and the use of startlingly remote words totally out of tune with the emotions has obstructed the smooth flow of rasa.

The plot construction in his last three plays is perfect, watertight and powerful. Not even a single incident is redundant, and the action moves from incident to incident logically
and with great perspicuity. The five stages of activity by a hero to achieve his goal like prārambha, prayatna, prāptisambhava, niyatā phalaprāpti, and phalayoga are successfully linked to the five artha-prakṛti's or the elements of plot like bija, the bindu, the pātākās, the prakāris, and the kārya to bring about the successful conclusion of these plays. But the presence of two mutually incompatible themes has resulted in rasabhangā in the play *The Family Reunion*.

The verse form employed in the three last plays guided by the dictates of aucitya has great dramatic relevance. The very nature of the theme of his plays preclude any scope for high poetry or intense lyricism, yet in some scenes of dramatic intensity, Eliot has given evidences of his power to handle sublime poetry. Through his last plays Eliot was able to bring poetry into the world, in which the audience live, and the sahādayas are able to identify themselves with this verse form because of the vṛttaucitya employed by him. Eliot's preoccupation with the auditory imagination has prompted him to concentrate on the aural elements of versification, and this has resulted in a soft musical effect that strengthens the sānta rasa. Except in *The Family Reunion* the verse form guided by the principles of ease, elasticity, and transparency operates on the readers in an unconscious manner to strengthen the emotional pattern of sānta.

The Indian aestheticians, well aware of the power of words in the development of the sentiments regard padaucitya as a necessary prerequisite to rasa realization, and in all the three last plays of Eliot even a single ordinary word has become a rich storehouse of suggestive association due to the padaucitya employed by the writer. Almost all bhāvas in his plays are made cognitive through the appropriate use of words. The diction motivated
by the dual principles of sābdauicitya and arthaucitya has helped in the strengthening of the sentiments.

Since his plays are poetic dramas, Eliot has utilized the words to their maximum capacity to convey the sentiments through an organized experience. In certain instances the words almost get elevated to symbols capable of conveying thoughts, feelings, and experiences. Eliot's lament about the inability of the words in communicating the appropriate experience, is perceptible only in the play *The Family Reunion*. In this play due to the anāyuicitya of diction:

Words strain
Crack and sometimes break, under the burden,
Under the tension, slip, slide, perish,
Decay with imprecision, will not stay in place,
Will not stay still.¹

The images in all his last plays except *The Family Reunion* have adhered to the conditions of alankāraucitya requisitioned by the Indian alankārikas. Through the appropriate images, Eliot is able to relate his emotional experiences to objects and phenomena in the outside world. The alankāras integral to the plays heighten their emotional concentration to stimulate the appropriate response from the sahādayas. Precise, definite images almost like those employed by the imagists universalize the emotions of the characters, and lend formal objective beauty to these plays.

The garden image running through all the last plays of Eliot is associated with childhood, with spring flowers and rains, with innocence, and a state of absolute self-realization, and this stimulates the sānta rasa by depicting an ideal world grounded in
spirituality. As the action of these plays consists in liberating the people from their world of illusion and pretence, these images of deceit are closely linked with the ithivṛttam and the angī-rasa śānta.

Barring The Family Reunion, the plays of Eliot in a contemporary setting are free from the vignas that hinder aesthetic relish. This freedom from vignas has created in the sahādayas pramatatva viśrānti or a state in which all discordant impulses are harmonized. The vignas like lack of clarity due to the absence of proper stimuli, subordination of the principal to some other element, and dubiousness of presentation, arise out of the lack of propriety exerted by the writer, and the existence of these vignas is responsible for rasabhanga in The Family Reunion.

Eliot, the creative genius has reduced the imagery to the bare minimum, and has kept the aṅga-rasas, bhāvas, vṛttas, pada, and vākya within the bounds of aucitya to enable the aṅgi-rasa śānta to occupy the pride of place. Prabandhaucitya exists in these last plays noted for their artistic finesse. A perusal of these three plays makes no distinction between the meaning of the play and its rasa, and once a sahādaya arrives at the dramatic meaning, there is rasa realization in him.

The settings of all the later plays of Eliot are the drawing rooms of suburban England but deeply encrypted in it are the moral and religious themes. Eliot was disappointed, and pained at the spectacle of modern families, where the husbands, wives, and children exist as total strangers, so he advocated the revival of the institution of family to arrest this dissolution, and to save the society from its decadence and degeneration. The
Indian aestheticians are of the view that an ideal writer must observe life closely, and must communicate some meaning underlying the bewildering miscellany of apparently incongruous incidents. It is interesting to note that through his last plays Eliot has emerged as a krántadarsi, who is able to penetrate into the mysteries of common man to suggest remedies.

According to Rajasekhara, “A poet is one who is a seer, a prophet, who sees visions, and possesses the additional gift of conveying to others less fortunate through the medium of language the visions he has or the dreams he dreams.” Eliot’s last plays uphold the two-fold influence of literature advocated by the Indian aestheticians, the creation of aesthetic pleasure, and an indirect guidance in the purusārthas. He has blended his ethical considerations with aesthetic, and his poetic genius with sensibility to create rasa an experience that can be grasped, understood, and relished in its entirety by the sahrdayas.

M. Leelavathy’s notion of an ideal literary work is quite pertinent to the last three plays of Eliot. She holds the view that no literary work that yields spiritual peace, which the Indians have described as samyoga viśrānti will debase man.¹ The last three plays of Eliot leave the sahrdayas with a noble, serene, and lofty feeling and this unique feeling is nothing if not rasa.

An evaluation of these plays of Eliot on the principles of rasa and aucitya seems to ascertain the supremacy of these theories in evaluating almost all Western literature. The main contention of this thesis is that since the criterion of aucitya is directed only at an ennobling aesthetic pleasure created in the sahrdayas it will in no way undermine genuine literature’s preference for originality, novelty and individuality.
The Indian aestheticians have never made any attempt to lay down the rigid rules of propriety. Some aspects of the concept of aucitya are restricted to the grammatical and linguistic details of Sanskrit language, and Kṣemendra’s notion of propriety surrounding a family, a lineage or a dynasty is mostly relevant only in the Indian context, but the stress on these salient characteristics of a particular language cannot undermine its potency due to the flexible nature of this theory. Since the concept of propriety presupposes aesthetic relish it is almost impossible for these particular regional aspects to undermine its validity.

The twenty-seven areas of aucitya mentioned by Kṣemendra may not be wholly relevant or sufficient in analyzing modern literature, but his stand that there is no other circumstance, which leads to the negation of rasa than the impropriety in the treatment of the other components has stressed the importance of this theory in rasa realization. The intrinsic value and pliability of this theory can be gleaned from this statement of M.S. Kushwaha:

The Indian approach to the concept of propriety avoids many traps and pitfalls that waylaid the western approach. For one thing it does not allow social, ethical or other extraneous considerations to enter into its deliberations of propriety; they have been conducted almost exclusively, on an aesthetic or literary plane. Indian poeticians have always considered propriety in relation to poetic or artistic beauty, and their criteria of judgement, however variable are essentially aesthetic.4

The theory of aucitya, which arose as a handmaid to the theory of rasa aims at studying literary texts as objectively as possible from the point of view of aesthetic relish. It does not take into consideration details pertaining to the author, the milieu or the other
extra textual data on which the other theories thrive, and in this regard there is a very close similarity between auctiya and stylistics. The theory of auctiya takes into consideration various factors like whether the work has done justice to human experience, whether the different elements are appropriate to its development as an organic whole, but its all pervading criterion is whether it has created a single unified aesthetic relish in the sahridayas.

This deferential attitude of auctiya to rasa upholds the supremacy of Bharata’s dictum: “Nahi rasadrute kaschidarthaprvarte,” “nothing other than rasa operates”. Though the theory of auctiya as a critical criterion is not exhaustive in itself, it is to a great degree indispensable in literary appreciation. By the compliance of all the other literary components to rasa, auctiya accentuates the position of rasa as the soul of literature.

The theory of rasa is free from all rigid canons, and this has enabled it to transcend the particular and localized aspects mentioned by Bharata. Bharata does not insist on a total adherence to the rules laid down by him. He has given the writers complete freedom to supplement his theory with the new developments in various fields. This flexible attitude of Bharata can be gleaned from his statement: “In connection with the dramatic performance we have described many other Vāstraic rites. If anything is left unsaid it should be understood by people conversant with practices imitating the usage in the world.”

An evaluation of the four plays of Eliot has established the fact that rasa theory is capable of fulfilling almost all the requirements of a successful theory in a satisfactory manner. It is capable of evaluating all these plays in totality and not in isolated fragments. It is not cramped by the limitations of language, culture, and geography. The suburban England and its upper-middle class characters do not offer any challenge to this theory.
Eliot’s stylistic variations do not interfere with the rasa of the work as he has moulded them with propriety to suit the overall effect of a work.

A literary text contains varied components like syllables, words, sentences, syntax, images, versification, style, and characters, and its literariness is brought about by a successful orchestration of these different elements. The literariness of a work is its meaning, and as there is no dichotomy between the meaning of a work and its rasa this theory can aspire to the status of a valid literary theory.

There is an apprehension whether the theory of rasa can be applied to experimental literature, in which intellectualization and ambiguity play an important role. Such open ended works, where nothing is concluded, and where the language has variable intention and meaning are characterized by private idioms and vague personal allusions, and this trend has deep alarming implications as far as the sahrdayas are concerned. They are denied aesthetic pleasure, which is the prime objective of any literature, and any work that fails to satisfy this basic demand of the sahrdayas suffers from rasabhanga.

This suspicion that the theory of rasa will disintegrate once it encounters such works that invalidate the concept of communicability has prevented it from assuming the position of the only one theory capable of evaluating any literature. Each theory of criticism has its own value, but has its own limitations too, but as far as rasa theory is concerned its advantages far outweigh its limitations. In spite of the above-mentioned limitation it is to a considerable extent impossible to underestimate the supremacy of the theory of rasa in evaluating genuine literature. V. K. Chari holds the view that the theory of rasa still promises “to give a reasonably good account of what many people in all ages and countries
have thought to be valuable in literature and also one that avoids the shortcomings of other competing theories.  7

It is interesting to note that the search for a reasonably sound literary theory that began at rasa, the fountainhead of Indian aesthetics, has culminated at the starting point itself, thus ascertaining beyond doubt, the infinite potentiality and ineffaceable charm of this truly indigenous theory, which "draws orient knowledge from its fountains pure."  8