

The Concept of Subject in Writing of Shombhu Mitra

Samira Manna

Ph.D Research Scholar, University of Calcutta

Abstract

In philosophy, the concept of the "subject" generally refers to the individual or the conscious self that is capable of thought, perception, and experience. The subject is often contrasted with the "object," which refers to anything that is experienced, perceived, or acted upon. The subject in philosophy can be understood as the conscious agent or individual who experiences, perceives, thinks, and acts, and whose existence is central to discussions of selfhood, agency, and knowledge. To elaborate the concept of subject in the aspect of philosophy, I have chosen Shombhu Mitra, a legendary figure in Indian cinema and theatre, director, playwright, storyteller, and a highly renowned personality in Indian theatre. He is especially known for his involvement in Bengali theatre, where he is considered a pioneer. He dedicated his entire life to the evolution of Bengali theatre. We have chosen his works Putul Khela, Raktakarabi, Dahsachakra and Charadhyay for this presentation. Among them, Raktakarabi and Charadhyay are influenced by the original work of Rabindranath Tagore, while Putul Khela and Dashachakra are influenced by the original work of Norwegian writer Henrik Ibsen. Shombhu Mitra's protagonists embody the subject through their struggle for autonomy, resisting societal constraints and embracing personal freedom. In all the plays, the subjects struggle against social obstacles to establish themselves as ideal subjects.

In this article, the definition of subject in the philosophical aspect will be discussed. As already mentioned, Shombhu Mitra was significantly influenced by the works of Henrik Ibsen, a famous Norwegian writer, as well as by the writings of Rabindranath Tagore, so the concept of the subject explained by Ibsen and Rabindranath Tagore has been also defined in this article. Henrik Ibsen defined the "subject" as the core theme or idea driving a drama, often rooted in social, moral, or psychological issues. His works focused on individual struggles against societal norms, exploring personal freedom, identity, and ethical dilemmas, reflecting the tension between personal desires and societal expectations. While according to Rabindranath Tagore, the "subject" is viewed as a harmonious interplay between human emotions, nature, and spirituality. He believed it should transcend personal concerns, embracing universal truths, beauty, and moral values. His works often explored the eternal connection between individuals and the divine, emphasizing love, freedom, and the unity of existence. Thus, we can find various definitions of the "subject" in Shombhu Mitra's works. This perspective is held by a subject, a free being. In all his works, there is a subject who is the main protagonist, a free being who speaks of their choice, as every individual is different from another. Not only in terms of choice, but an individual also takes responsibility for their actions.

Introduction

In philosophy, the concept of the "subject" generally refers to the individual or the conscious self that is capable of thought, perception, and experience. The subject is often contrasted with the "object," which

refers to anything that is experienced, perceived, or acted upon. The subject in philosophy can be understood as the conscious agent or individual who experiences, perceives, thinks, and acts, and whose existence is central to discussions of selfhood, agency, and knowledge. To elaborate the concept of subject in the aspect of philosophy, I have chosen Shombhu Mitra, a legendary figure in Indian cinema and theatre, director, playwright, storyteller, and a highly renowned personality in Indian theatre. He is especially known for his involvement in Bengali theatre, where he is considered a pioneer. He dedicated his entire life to the evolution of Bengali theatre. We have chosen his works *Putul Khela*, *Raktakarabi*, *Dashachakra* and *Charadhyay* for this presentation. Among them, *Raktakarabi* and *Charadhyay* are influenced by the original work of Rabindranath Tagore, while *Putul Khela* and *Dashachakra* are influenced by the original work of Norwegian writer Henrik Ibsen. Shombhu Mitra's protagonists embody the subject through their struggle for autonomy, resisting societal constraints and embracing personal freedom. In all the plays, the subjects struggle against social obstacles to establish themselves as ideal subjects.

In this article I am going to elaborate the definition of subject in the philosophical aspect, and we will discuss the presence of the term "subject" in the writings of Shombhu Mitra. As already mentioned, Shombhu Mitra was significantly influenced by the works of Henrik Ibsen, a famous Norwegian writer, as well as by the writings of Rabindranath Tagore. Thus, we can find various definitions of the "subject" in Shombhu Mitra's works. This perspective is held by a subject, a free being. In all his works, there is a subject who is the main protagonist, a free being who speaks of their choice, as every individual is different from another. Not only in terms of choice, but an individual also takes responsibility for their actions.

The definition of the subject

The definition of the subject in philosophy is a complex and central concept that has been explored by numerous philosophers throughout its history. The philosophical subject generally refers to the individual as a thinking and conscious entity, but its meaning and scope vary according to different philosophical traditions. In the West, this subject has been deeply examined by thinkers such as René Descartes. For Descartes, the subject was the thinking entity par excellence, a distinct and immaterial being capable of doubting, reasoning, and perceiving the world. This dualistic view of the subject, distinct from the material body, had a significant influence on modern philosophy. However, other philosophers have adopted different approaches. For Immanuel Kant, for instance, the subject was both active and passive in knowledge, actively contributing to structuring our experience while also receiving sensory data from the external world. His philosophy of subjectivity emphasized the role of the mind in constructing reality. As Kant, "Kant seems to treat the terms 'soul' and 'subject' as identical; for example, when he speaks in a general way of the faculties or capacities of the soul. Most of the time, however Kant claims that the soul is an object of inner sense; that is, that the soul is identical to the thinking I precisely as it appears to itself under the form of time. In this case, Kant is referring to the phenomenal or psychological I, and he clearly distinguishes this from the I of transcendental apperception, that is, from the transcendental subject of thoughts, which cannot be the object of self-knowledge"¹

Ultimately, the definition of the subject in philosophy remains a constantly evolving debate. It can vary depending on the philosophical, cultural, and historical context, but it generally explores the nature of consciousness, individual identity, freedom, and perception of the world, while questioning fundamental assumptions about reality and knowledge.

¹ MOLINA Eduardo, "Kant's conception of the subject", Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Santiago, Chile, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.14321/crnewcentrevi.17.2.0077>

Ibsen's concept of subject

Henrik Ibsen addressed various themes in his groundbreaking theatrical works. One of the most central themes in his work is the questioning of social norms and Victorian-era conventions. His plays, such as *A Doll's House*, often depict main characters, particularly women, struggling for their independence and freedom in the face of oppressive social constraints. Ibsen also explored human nature, morality, and truth in his works. His complex characters and provocative plots frequently challenged traditional moral values and confronted audiences with troubling moral dilemmas. Moreover, he often used theatre as a means to expose societal hypocrisies and criticize power structures. Ultimately, in another play, *An Enemy of the People*, Ibsen's central theme was the quest for truth and personal authenticity, along with the questioning of social conventions that restrict individual freedom. His plays had a profound impact on theatre and social thought of his time and continue to be studied and interpreted today for their exploration of the complex aspects of the human condition. According to his works, he depicted various types of subjects. Among them, he showed that the voice of an individual is suppressed by the voice of the world, or rather, by society. The individual becomes isolated and passive, confused about speaking their own voice. Generally, they accept society's decision.

“In Ibsen's eyes modern man is losing his individuality in his novel age of technology and mass communication. He becomes passive like pawn and receives everything via mass media. This man loses his mental and intellectual independences and individuality.”²

But we find a different image in Shombhu Mitra's presentation in his plays. He was a fervent advocate of experimental theatre and played a key role in the "Theatre of Roots" movement in India. He believed in the importance of drawing from the cultural and traditional roots of the country to create authentic and meaningful theatrical productions. This forms the foundation of the "Theatre of Roots."

« It has compelling power, it thrills audiences, and it is receiving institutional recognition. It is deeply rooted in regional theatrical culture, but cuts across linguistic barriers, and has an all-India character in design.”³

His plays were often inspired by Indian mythology, local legends, and folk customs, seeking to integrate these elements innovatively into contemporary theatre. He deeply explored human experience and intense emotions. His theatrical productions were frequently characterized by powerful performances and an in-depth exploration of human relationships, internal conflicts, and existential questions. The subject was rather active in Shombhu Mitra's works. The characters in his theatre make decisions for themselves and even for society as a whole. They also take responsibility for their actions and are accountable for what they do, feeling the weight of that responsibility. There is a similarity between the image of the subject described by Shombhu Mitra and that of the subject described by Sartre in the existentialist theme. In illustrating an example of the subject, Walter Kaufmann effectively explained the term subject within the existentialist theme.

“When, for instance, a military leader takes upon himself the responsibility for an attack and sends a number of men to their death, he chooses to do it and at bottom he alone chooses....In making the decision, he cannot but feel a certain anguish. All leaders know that anguish.”⁴

² GHAFORINIA, Fatemeh. JAMILI, Dr. Leila Baradaran, “The individualism in Henrik Ibsen's An Enemy of People”, IRJABS, Vol-7, April-2013

³ AWASTHI, Suresh, “Theatre of Roots” Encounter with Tradition. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1145965>

⁴ KAUFFMAN Walter, “Basic Writings of Existentialism by Sartre, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Kafka, Heidegger, and others Existentialism From Dostoevsky to Sartre”, USA, 2004, Page-352

So we conclude the subject is an ideal being.

Tagore's concept of subject

This image is also found in the writings of Rabindranath Tagore. Tagore believed in the interconnectedness of the individual, society, and nature. For him, the subject could not be understood in isolation but was intrinsically linked to its environment. He developed the idea of an ever-evolving individual, influenced by their experiences and the surrounding environment. Tagore also explored the notion of the subject through his social and political engagement. He was a strong advocate for integrated education and the pursuit of truth through knowledge.

«Tagore is a pioneering educational thinker who could put into practice the principles of a holistic and realistic education. Today it is considered as a very revolutionary and progressive educational theory, even though not practiced by many. At present, when India is trying to find appropriate educational direction for its development, Tagore's treatise on education needs to be revisited.»⁵

He also advocated for interreligious harmony and the peaceful coexistence of cultures, considering it essential for the evolution of the collective subject. In sum, the concept of the subject according to Rabindranath Tagore transcends individual boundaries to encompass humanity, society, and nature in an integrated vision. He significantly influenced India's philosophical, literary, and cultural thought, and his legacy endures as a source of inspiration for those seeking to understand the complexity of human existence in an interconnected world. For example, in *Raktakarabi*, there is an intense connection between Nandini and nature. She is always adorned with flowers, which is highly symbolic. She also represents humanity, respecting the inhabitants of Yakshapuri as fellow human beings and always thinking about their freedom.

But the subject is described differently by Shombhu Mitra. According to him, the subject is responsible. Their existence is projected through their actions and free choices. They take responsibility not only for their own choices but also for the choices of others. This image of the subject is like Jean-Paul Sartre's description. According to Sartre, existence precedes essence, meaning that individuals are born without a predetermined purpose or fixed personality. They are confronted with radical freedom, but this freedom is accompanied by existential angst, as it implies that everyone is responsible for their own choices and for creating their own essence. For Sartre, the subject is thus an ever-evolving being, shaped by their actions and decisions. In short, Sartre's concept of the subject emphasizes freedom, responsibility, and the need to give one's own life meaning in a world without inherent meaning. Here, the subject is an ideal individual who represents ordinary people.

“Man has indeed a project that has a subjective existence, rather unlike that of a patch of moss, a spreading fungus, or a cauliflower. Prior to that projection of the self, nothing exists, not even in divine intelligence and man shall attain existence only when he is what he projects himself to be—not what he would like to be”⁶

Thus, we will elaborate on the images of the subjects in the writing of Shombhu Mitra.

The presence of the subject in the works of Shombhu Mitra

The concept of the subject in Shombhu Mitra's play *Putul Khela* is based on the exploration of social roles and oppressive conventions that have shaped the lives of the main characters. The play primarily focuses

⁵ G, Dr. Shanti, “Rabindranath Tagore” <https://ebooks.inflibnet.ac.in/socp13/chapter/139/>

⁶ SARTRE Jean Paul, “Existentialism is a Humanism”, Yale University, 2007, Page-23.

on the character of Bulu and her transformation into an independent and self-aware subject. At the beginning of the play, Bulu is presented as a woman submissive to her husband, Tapan, and to the patriarchal society of the Victorian era. She is treated as a puppet in a doll's house, with little control over her own life. Her role is determined by societal expectations, which compel her to act superficially to satisfy her husband's desires. Shombhu Mitra and Henrik Ibsen, both playwrights, share a profound exploration of human and social conflicts in their works. They used theatre to critique the social and political norms of their time, highlighting the inner struggles of characters and their complex interactions with society. Their plays often address universal themes such as morality, family, and the quest for individual freedom. Mitra and Ibsen have left a legacy, influencing subsequent generations of playwrights worldwide.

“In *A Doll's House*, all the characters are inside constructs of performance, where the language, behaviours, and actions of individual's construct a performance in order to integrate themselves within the pre-established societal norms. As a result, there are both contested versions of femininity and masculinity that rival the traditional gender dynamic of there being only two categories, male and female, where men are dominant and have the privilege of power and control and woman are powerless victims subject to male domination-translate in French”⁷

However, over the course of the play, the concept of the subject evolves for Bulu. She begins to question her own identity and subordinate status. The revelation of secrets and lies in the play prompts her to challenge social conventions and ask herself who she really is as a woman and as an individual. Bulu's transformation into an autonomous subject is symbolized by the end of the play, when she makes the radical decision to leave her family to pursue her own life, even if it means uncertainty and loneliness. It is an act of liberation and taking control over her own existence, breaking the chains of social roles that held her back. Critics have noted that Henrik Ibsen's play also raised questions about women's freedom in European society.

“Ibsen's choice of writing about the oppression of women in a patriarchal society as well as the inability of the men in the play to escape the societal pressures and traditional conventions invites Ibsen's audience to question their own individual emancipation and identity in a society governed by limitations and biases.”⁸

Not only is the presence of the subject evident, but a deep conflict is also found in being the subject in the play. The major conflict is embodied in the character of Bulu, who is initially presented as a submissive woman devoted to her husband, Tapan. She acts in accordance with the social norms and expectations of her time, but she also hides a crucial secret: she forged her father's signature to obtain a loan in order to save her husband's life. This secret keeps her in a constant state of anxiety and subjugation, preventing her from truly being herself. Not only did Shombhu Mitra adapt Ibsen's play, but he also added several new elements to the plot.

⁷ INSENGA, Claudia, “A doll's house: Gender Performativity, Quest for Identity and Productions shifts over time.” Harvard University, 2002. Page-iv, <https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/37370709/Claudia%20Insenga%20Thesis.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

⁸ INSENGA, Claudia, “A doll's house: Gender Performativity, Quest for Identity and Productions shifts over time.” Harvard University, 2002. Page-xiv, <https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/37370709/Claudia%20Insenga%20Thesis.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

The conflict reaches its peak when the secret is about to be revealed, thus threatening the stability of her marriage and her reputation. However, Bulu makes the bold decision to leave her home and family at the end of the play, breaking free from her dependence on Tapan and on society. This inner and outer conflict reflects her struggle to become the subject of her own life, even if it means pushing against the boundaries imposed on women by restrictive social conventions and gender roles of the time. In summary, the central conflict of *Putul Khela* revolves around Bulu's desire to become an autonomous subject, to break free from social constraints, and to forge her own identity. This conflict highlights the tension between societal expectations and the pursuit of truth and individual independence. Thus, a struggle for subjecthood emerges among the characters in the play. Tapan projects himself as the subject who makes all the family's decisions and is responsible for his family, but Bulu also emerges as a subject in seeking her individual liberation, defying the oppressive social conventions of the time. The play emphasizes the importance of becoming a conscious subject of one's own life and choices, rather than remaining a puppet in society's dollhouse.

The existence of the subject is also evident in the play *Char Adhyay*. Here, the main protagonists resemble subjects through their actions. Indranath, one of the main protagonists, wants to declare himself as the leader of the revolution for the war of independence. He is focused more on seeking ultimate power to lead the war than on the social conditions of the time. He wants to establish his identity as the supreme leader in the war. Here, he behaves as a subject who regards the members of his party as objects. He also believes that the members of his group must follow him without question. He thinks that everyone's fate should be decided by his decisions. According to him, he alone possesses the ultimate power to decide the fate of others. His concept of leading others portrays him as a subject.

Other presences of the subject are found in Shombhu Mitra's play. Another main character, Atin, is a member of Indranath's group. He possesses a free spirit. He has no intention of being the leader or gaining ultimate power in the war of independence. He never wanted to lead or be the representative of the independence struggle. Rather, he wanted to be part of the war, desiring to play an important role in freeing the country. However, he never wanted to follow a path decided by others. He didn't want to be led by Indranath, because, possessing a free spirit, he understood that Indranath's group never truly respected humanity. According to Indranath, human values no longer existed; he viewed others as mere objects. Thus, Atin's opposition to Indranath's decisions serves as evidence of the presence of a subject. Consequently, Atin represents himself as a subject in the play *Char Adhyay*.

In this play, there is also a struggle to be the subject. Indranath wants to be the subject who can make decisions for everyone in society. He wanted to be the master of the entire nation. He sought to have the ultimate power in the war of independence. This desire to be the subject is also present in the character of Atin. He never wanted to follow Indranath's decisions. He wanted to be free and lead the war of independence while respecting human emotions. This was the only difference between Indranath's desire and Atin's. Indranath never considered humanity. In his view, man is projected as an object. Thus, a deep struggle is present among the characters in the play.

The concept of the subject in *Dashachakra* by Shombhu Mitra highlights the complexities of human nature and society. This play explores the tension between the individual and the collective, particularly through the character of Dr. Guha. The main protagonist, Dr. Guha, embodies the idea of the rebellious subject. He discovers an uncomfortable truth about the contamination of water in his hometown, which endangers the health of the population. He feels compelled to reveal the truth to the public, even though it puts him in direct conflict with the interests of the majority. The subject in this play faces a crucial moral dilemma.

The question of whether to follow individual conscience and reveal the truth raises broader questions about the responsibility of the individual towards society and how subjects are often manipulated by political and economic power.

The character of Dr. Guha represents the struggle of an individual to maintain his integrity in the face of overwhelming social tensions. His resistance to conformity raises essential questions about democracy, individual freedom, and truth. Ultimately, *Dashachakra* reminds us that the concept of the subject is not static, but rather constantly evolving and influenced by the social and political forces at play. It is a profound exploration of the struggle between the individual and the collective, highlighting the complex ethical dilemmas that any subject may face. Here, the existence of man as a subject is explained in contrast to the existence of others. We see a man who exists and makes decisions for himself and for the existence of others. This concept is well described by Walter Kaufmann in his book,

“To choose between this or that is at the same time to affirm the value of that which is chosen; for we are unable ever to choose the worse. What we choose is always the better; and nothing can be better for us unless it is better for all”⁹,

The lives of others are determined by the decision of one person. Thus, he appears as a subject against the presence of others as objects. These objects follow the path directed by the subject without questioning. This concept of the subject is well explained by Jean-Paul Sartre in his work *Existentialism is a Humanism*. He argued against the theories of Descartes and Kant. According to Sartre's theory, the existence of the subject in its individual consciousness is always concerned with the existence of others.

« Contrary to the philosophy of Descartes or of Kant, when we say, ‘I Think’, we each attain ourselves in the presence of the other, and we are just as certain of the other as we are of ourselves. Therefore, the man who becomes aware of himself directly in the cogito also perceives all others, and he does so as the condition of his own existence”¹⁰

Like in other selected plays by Shombhu Mitra, this play also presents a struggle to be the subject between the characters Dr. Purnendu Guha and Amalendu Guha. Both wanted to be the subjects among the city's inhabitants. Dr. Purnendu struggled to establish the truth of the lives of others and sought to find his own identity through that struggle. He was also willing to take responsibility for his actions. On the other hand, Amalendu Guha, the mayor of the city, wanted to make decisions about the lives of the inhabitants. He wanted to conceal the truth and be the subject among the city's residents, while also taking responsibility for everything. Throughout the play, we see who the true subject among them is according to the Sartrean theme.

The concept of the subject in *Raktakarabi* by Shombhu Mitra is a profound reflection on the human condition and power. This play explores the dynamic between individuals and the oppressive power that surrounds them. The plot revolves around the main character, Ranjan, an idealistic and revolutionary young man who rebels against colonial oppression and the tyranny of the local lord, the King of Yakshapuri. He embodies the rebellious subject, fighting for justice and freedom on behalf of the oppressed people. The subject in *Raktakarabi* represents the struggle against injustice and oppression. Amrit, as a subject, challenges the authority of the King of Yakshapuri and plays the role of the rebellious hero. His commitment to the cause of freedom and justice highlights the individual's ability to resist the forces of evil and work for the common good. The play also explores the nature of power and tyranny.

⁹KAUFFMAN Walter, “Basic Writings of Existentialism by Sartre, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Kafka, Heidegger, and others Existentialism From Dostoevsky to Sartre”, USA,2004, Page-350

¹⁰ SARTRE Jean Paul, “Existentialism is a Humanism”, Yale University, 2007, Page-41

The King of Yakshapuri, as a figure of power, represents oppression and brutality. The confrontation between Ranjan and the King highlights the struggle between the subject and authoritarian power, and the play raises questions about the legitimacy of power and the necessity of resistance.

Ultimately, *Raktakarabi* examines the dynamic between the individual and society, highlighting the individual's ability to stand up against injustice and fight for a better world. The concept of the subject in the play resonates with universal themes of justice, freedom, and revolt, making this work a powerful exploration of the human condition and the struggle for meaningful social change. It is rather the image of women described by Rabindranath Tagore. According to him, women are a symbol of life. Rather, women are the symbol of power.

“Instead of talking directly about the feminine principle in the cosmos who is looked upon as Prakriti/Shakti in the Hindu Shastras, Tagore alludes to the feminine as a life-giving, nurturing power which can resist the destructive propensities of the world around”¹¹

In his writings, Tagore celebrates their inner strength, resilience, and ability to influence the world. He recognizes the depth of their being and their capacity to inspire social and cultural change. For him, women embody the vitality of life, creativity, and wisdom. He sees them as pillars of society, capable of shaping a better future. In his works, he gives them a central place, honouring them as figures of invaluable influence. As seen in the play *Raktakarabi*, the main protagonist, Nandini, represents the symbol of power. She has a free heart that only considers her own decisions. She spreads the notion of freedom among others. She explains the importance of freedom in life to the inhabitants of the city. She declares that man cannot be a mere number but must be free and act according to his own free thought. She takes full responsibility for her actions. According to her, human values are the most important, and the grandeur of humanism must be recognized by all ordinary people. Throughout the play, there are several events where she makes the king of Yakshapuri (the leader) understand the importance of humanity. She always appears as the catalytic subject among the inhabitants of the city of Yaksha. Her existence symbolizes the quest for the people's freedom. According to her, man should not be captive as an object; instead, he must seek his own freedom in life. Man must earn life according to his desires.

Raktakarabi is not an exceptional play where one can find the presence of the struggle to be the subject among the main protagonists. Here, the conflict to become the subject in *Raktakarabi* by Shombhu Mitra is a complex exploration of the struggle between the individual and the oppressive power, embodied by the King of Yakshapuri. The central character, Ranjan, aspires to become the subject of his own destiny, to defend justice and freedom against the brutal authority of the King of Yakshapuri. His conflict lies in his quest to free himself from oppression and become the main actor of his own story.

However, the King of Yakshapuri represents a formidable obstacle to this quest. He embodies the tyrannical power that seeks to keep Ranjan and the people under his control. The conflict reaches its climax when the King of Yakshapuri tries to suppress Ranjan's revolt and strip him of his ability to become the subject of his own story. Not only does the conflict unfold between Ranjan and the King, but the presence of Nandini is also integrated into the struggle to be the subject. Nandini emerges as the central subject, embodying beauty, passion, and desire amidst oppression. Her role as a dancer and object of desire symbolizes the freedom of artistic expression within a repressive society. She becomes the subject of her own destiny by rising above the constraints imposed by the King of Yakshapuri. Her complex relationship with Ranjan reflects a desire for freedom and love, but she is also used by the King of Yakshapuri to serve

¹¹ “Tagore's Idea of New Woman: The making and unmaking of Female Subjectivity.” <https://sk.sagepub.com/books/tagores-ideas-of-the-new-woman>

his interests. Nandini thus embodies the duality of the subject, both an agent of her own destiny and a victim of the oppressive forces that seek to control her.

This conflict to become the subject highlights universal themes of resistance to oppression and the struggle for freedom. It emphasizes the individual's ability to rebel against the forces that seek to dominate them and take control of their own destiny. *Raktakarabi* thus offers a profound meditation on the quest for individual emancipation amidst oppression and authoritarian power.

In all Shombhu Mitra's plays, there is a vivid presence of subjects. The subjects decide their own destiny. They consider their choices at every moment. They never follow the path decided by others. They see themselves as free beings who take full responsibility for their actions.

Conclusion

We can conclude that Henrik Ibsen's works often delve into the individual's conflict with societal conventions, focusing on personal freedom, moral dilemmas, and existential struggles. For instance, *A Doll's House* critiques gender roles and societal expectations. In contrast, Shombhu Mitra, inspired by Ibsen, localized these themes within the Indian socio-political and cultural context. His works emphasize collective struggles, familial bonds, and the challenges of balancing tradition with modernity, reflecting India's complex social realities. Through adaptations like *Char Adhyay* and original productions, Mitra broadened Ibsen's focus on individuality to include societal dynamics, often intertwining personal liberation with broader community and national issues. On the other hand, Rabindranath Tagore's subjects frequently reflected philosophical introspection, nature, and the quest for harmony between modernity and tradition. Shombhu Mitra, deeply influenced by Tagore, adapted these themes into a theatrical framework that resonated with contemporary socio-political realities. While Tagore emphasized poetic universality and introspection, Mitra's approach was more grounded, highlighting collective struggles and human resilience. His adaptations, like *Rakta Karabi*, emphasized the urgency of societal transformation, blending Tagore's ideals with dynamic dramatic realism to connect with audiences.

References

1. MITRA, Saoli, «*Shombhu Mitra Rachanasamagra* » volume I, Ananda Publishers, Calcutta, India, 2017.
2. MITRA, Saoli, «*Shombhu Mitra Rachanasamagra* » volume II, Ananda Publishers, Calcutta, India, 2017.
3. SARTRE, Jean-Paul, «*Existentialism is a humanism* », Yale University Press, New haven & London, 2007
4. KAUFFMAN, Walter, « *Existentialism From Dostoevsky To Sartre: Basic Writings of Existentialism by Kaufmann, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Jaspers, Heidegger, and Others* », England, 1989
5. SARTRE, Jean Paul, « *Existentialism and human emotions* », Secaucus, New Jersey, 1957
6. INSENGA, Claudia, "A doll's house: Gender Performativity, Quest for Identity and Productions shifts over time." Harvard University, 2002.
<https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/37370709/Claudia%20Insenga%20Thesis.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
7. AWASTHI, Suresh, "Theatre of Roots" Encounter with Tradition.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1145965>

8. MOLINA Eduardo, "Kant's conception of the subject", Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Santiago, Chile, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.14321/crnewcentrevi.17.2.0077>
9. GHAFORINIA, Fatemeh. JAMILI, Dr. Leila Baradaran, "The individualism in Henrik Ibsen's An Enemy of People", IRJABS, Vol-7, April-2013
10. G, Dr. Shanti, "Rabindranath Tagore" <https://ebooks.inflibnet.ac.in/socp13/chapter/139/>
11. "Tagore's Idea of New Woman: The making and unmaking of Female Subjectivity." <https://sk.sagepub.com/books/tagores-ideas-of-the-new-woman>