So far we have endeavoured to make a critical general study, in brief, of the poetry of both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare as well as a critical study, in more details, of their two recognised masterpieces, 'Śākuntala' and 'Hamlet', respectively, after having made a critical general discussion, in brief, of some of the basic principles of poetry and drama. As observed earlier, in doing so, we have not taken any particular point of view, but we have adopted a broad point of view encompassing as far as possible, all sides of the questions involved in such study. Or, if we may say so, we have tried to adopt and maintain an universal perspective which may possibly exclude no particular point of view and possibly include all. We do not, however, know how far we have succeeded in this. However, after having made our humble study so far, it is now incumbent on us to make an attempt, in brief, at making certain concluding remarks, however tentative or relative they may be or appear to be. We believe the following concluding remarks and observations will appear to follow, naturally and legitimately, from our humble study of the poetry of both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare in their various aspects and our humble comprehension of them both.

To begin with, the traditional stories about Kālidāsa are well-known to all, though their historicity cannot be proved to be authentic. But whether they are authentic or not, people seem to have come to believe in or like these stories, and they
are ever fond of weaving them round the memory of the immortal poet. If the saying, 'na hyamūla jenaśrutih,' — tradition is never without some basis — be true, then these stories must have some basis of their own. Maybe, their historical validity cannot be guaranteed, but the stories seem to carry some truth in them or about them. Their truth has hardly ever been doubted, though their origin cannot be ascertained. Maybe, they have been handed down from generation to generation. If so, they seem to have a greater claim for truth. If not, they are nevertheless significant. Rather, we would say, they are all the more significant. For, in that case, they must have been coined or invented by some unknown critic or critics — and with a purpose. And that purpose seems to be no other than emphasising dramatically the inspired quality of his creations which seems to defy any ordinary law or which is beyond the bounds of ordinary art. For this was necessary, they thought, to conceive the poet as one who had been, at the outset, rather a 'fool' who subsequently received poetical inspiration through some divine grace or other. As his poetry is not of the earth, earthly — as it is 'alaukika' in the truest sense of the term more than that of any other poet in Sanskrit literature — so he must have been blessed with divine grace. In other words, Kālidāsa must have been an inspired poet. But what does this description 'Inspired Poet' actually mean? Does it mean he wrote
and fined for stealing deer from the famous deer park of Stratford-on-Avon, his native place. In that same period, it is said he was involved in a rather unequal love affair with a widow, many years older than himself, and was compelled to marry her. Then he was forced, the tradition goes, to leave for London where he began as a page in the Globe theatre, and then as a prompter and subsequently as a joint writer of plays from which he gradually grew to be his own self. Another tradition says, he was for some time a school master, while in Avon. His 'small Latin and less Greek,' however, has been disputed by some Shakespearian scholars, who find evidence of a world of learning in the various lores in his works. This, possibly, led to the theory - 'Bacon wrote Shakespeare.' It is generally believed that Shakespeare was not one whom we call a scholar or a learned person. He had some learning, no doubt, - possibly considerable learning adequate to his purpose; but it cannot be said that he had any great learning, or that his learning was very much pronounced in his works. The evidence of wide learning as found in his works is mostly due, most critics think, to his great power of intuition rather than to any great learning. Certainly, his learning was very small compared to his intuition or natural genius. This is the picture of Shakespeare as furnished by almost all celebrated critics. Though some earlier critics thought him to be almost an uneducated person and some modern researchers point out
that he had adequate education and knowledge necessary for his art, all of them are at one in declaring that Shakespeare's genius cannot be explained by his learning. This may be true of almost every poet or artist, to a certain extent; but it is true of Shakespeare in a most extraordinary sense. This may be made clear, when Shakespeare's poetry is compared to Goethe's. Goethe was a great scholar and philosopher, and his 'Faust' and other works show ample evidence of this; while Shakespeare's poetry has some extraordinary quality of a different kind, where penetrating insight into the human mind and an eerie eye for subtle imagination and verbal beauty, more than possibly in any other poet, predominate, and all this points to an extraordinary intuition rather than instruction.

To say that Shakespeare, like Kālidāsa, was an 'inspired poet' does not necessarily mean that he was less as an artist. As in Kālidāsa, certainly his 'inspiration' haunted him to create his great poetry as his great art - but with this difference that while Shakespeare's poetry and his art, in so far as they can be spoken apart, do not seem to be always in perfect unison, in Kālidāsa, it may be said to be almost always so. For example, Tolstoy, Voltaire, Shaw, etc., some of the great creative artists and critics themselves, have contended that Shakespeare's poetry sometimes lacks art and finish as it is full of excessiveness, grossness, vulgarity, etc.
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Even some of his more favourable critics have not always agreed as to the art and finish of some of Shakespeare's poetry, his inspiration notwithstanding. On the other hand, Keith was charmed with the 'sheer beauty of form' in Kālidāsa's poetry as well as with the compression of idea or thought - i.e., suggestiveness - in it, which enables him to express an idea or thought in one single line which Shakespeare requires to express in a whole sonnet or so. In this, Keith said, not the poets themselves were so much responsible as their vehicles of expression viz. their languages, for while English is analytical, Sanskrit is very much synthetic. However, we thus find that in point of sheer inspiration and accompanying lack of traditional or profound learning or scholarship - as reflected in their respective poetry as also in their art, in a more or less degree - both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare are on the one and the same footing and are each other's magnificent equals.

This can be shown by reference to some of the famous criticisms of both, embodied in critical pieces of poetry. For example, Jayadeva's "Kavikulaguruḥ Kālidāso vilāsaḥ..." (in his 'Gītagovinda'), 'vaidarbhī kavitā svēyaṁ vṛtvatī śrīkāli-dāsām varam', etc. all indicate that the poet was one with the goddes of Poesy herself, in other words, his poetry was, to
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use a famous English phrase relating to Shakespeare, 'one with nature.' Though this primarily refers to his poetry, in so referring, it also refers to the poet as one who must have been divinely inspired. It is the same with Shakespeare. Only one out of a host of flowing tributes by competent critics will suffice. We refer to Matthew Arnold's famous lines, already quoted and touched upon by us earlier, his 'Others abide our question, thou art free...' This means, in brief, that Shakespeare saw Nature face to face, as no other poet did, and that his poetry is one with Nature and that it possesses an inexplicable charm which will not reveal its secret. All this clearly means Shakespeare was an inspired poet; and hence the extraordinary and inexplicable charm of his poetry. All these end other imageries, relating to both the poets, bring out the same unmistakable significance. As stated earlier, every poet or artist may be said to be, more or less, 'inspired' in this sense; but both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare are so in a most extraordinary sense. The magic word 'inspired' may be rendered in Sanskrit, to have a synthesis and reconciliation of the concepts of 'inspiration' and 'Śakti,' as 'śaktipracodita' or 'śaktinirbhaba.'

So far regarding the kind of poets. What about their kind of poetry? As is well-known and as indicated earlier, while Kālidāsa is known more for his poetry as such i.e., non-dramatic poetry, Shakespeare is known more for his dramatic
poetry than otherwise. While Kālidāsa has 2 large epics, 2 lyrics and 3 dramas, Shakespeare has about 35 or so dramas and only a handful of minor lyrical works. So, at least judged by volume, Shakespeare may be said to be about 95% or so an author of dramas than of lyrics; while, judged by volume, Kālidāsa may be called 80% or so an author of non-dramatic i.e. epic and lyrical poetry than of dramas. This is approximately about the relative volume of their dramatic and non-dramatic poetry. If their respective quality is to be considered it is clear that the quality of Shakespeare's dramas far transcends the small merit of his poems; but this is not so in the case of Kālidāsa, whose poems and dramas both possess a comparable quality, each to each, though the volume of his poems is far greater than that of his dramas. This means while Kālidāsa is, primarily and essentially, a non-dramatic poet, Shakespeare is, primarily and essentially, a dramatic poet. There cannot be any doubt about it. But this does not mean that each does not shine in the other kind of poetry. Rather, both of them do shine in both the kinds of poetry; but while Kālidāsa does shine, almost equally, in both kinds of poetry - dramatic and non-dramatic; Shakespeare, judged by his works, does shine far more in dramatic poetry than in non-dramatic poetry. To view the matter from another angle, it may be said that while Shakespeare does not compare f
favourably with Kālidāsa with regard to the quality of their poems, Kālidāsa shares the same fate when compared to Shakespeare, with regard to the quality together with the volume, variety, complexity and depth of their dramas taken as a whole. In short, while Kālidāsa is an epic poet, a lyric poet and a dramatic poet - three in one; Shakespeare is a dramatic poet and a lyric poet - two in one. But while Kālidāsa is more a non-dramatic poet than a dramatic poet - his dramatic poetry, however, forming a substantial part of his works; Shakespeare is far more a dramatic poet than a non-dramatic poet, his non-dramatic poetry forming only an insignificant part of his works.

Thus a difficulty arises, one might think, with regard to this comparative study of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare, as also indicated earlier. Since Shakespeare's genius revealed itself, almost wholly, in dramatic poetry, while Kālidāsa's genius revealed itself, mainly, in epic and lyric poetry and then only, substantially though, in dramatic poetry, this may sound as an unequal comparison. For Kālidāsa's dramatic creations, including the great 'Sākuntala', compare most unfavourably with Shakespeare's, though not in individual excellence, but in the great variety, complexity, depth and reach of the latter's numerous dramas taken as a whole including a number of great creations. The position will be reversed if we compare both as non-dramatic poets, for Shakespeare has nothing, to equal
the great epics, 'Reghuvāṃśa' and 'kumārasambhava' and the
great, and unique lyric 'Meghadūta.' Nevertheless, taken as a
whole, the achievement of both in the realm of poetry, drama­
tic or non-dramatic, as we see, from our study so far made,
seems to be equally great, though they may differ in the vari­
ous aspects, and even in their kinds of poetry. How? - we
shall presently see. This equal quality if not kind - and
significance-of both has made it possible for us to bind the
two in one.

Now, regarding the two recognised masterpieces, 'Sākun­
tala' and 'Hamlet,' 'Sākuntala' has been selected as the uni­
versally recognised masterpiece - rather we think the, great­
est masterpiece of Kālidāsa, discarding the claim of the
'Reghuvāṃśa,' his greatest characteristic poem, in order to
facilitate a comparison (and contrast) with the drama 'Hamlet',
which has been selected as the most characteristic or represen­
tative dramatic masterpiece, if not the greatest masterpiece,
of Shakespeare. We believe, if only one masterpiece of each
poet, among so many, has to be taken as a representative piece
of each for a comparative study of both, these two, unmistak­
ably, are the pieces necessary and possibly also adequate for
our purpose. So far as Kālidāsa is concerned, we believe there
will be no controversy as to the truth of this, for the 'Sākun­
tala' is clearly the finest fruit of his poetic endeavour.
More so, because Kalidāsa - happily, one might say - has weaved all his poetry, more or less, in a single 'pattern.' What that 'pattern' is we shall presently see. But this can hardly be said of Shakespeare, who has been a weaver of multiple 'patterns' of his poetry - whence follows the great charm and mystery of his poetry. For example, there is a great controversy as to whether tragedy or comedy is the essential nature of Shakespeare. Many modern scholars and critics laugh at this controversy and say that drama as such was the essential nature of Shakespeare or that he had to earn a living by writing plays for the stage, and he had little choice in the matter. However, some think that comedy, and not tragedy, was really characteristic of Shakespeare the man, who has been described as 'gentle Shakespeare,' etc. On the other hand, most others hold that it was certainly tragedy which was dearest to Shakespeare's heart or which was, at least, the greatest achievement of Shakespeare. But why prefer 'Hamlet' to the other tragic masterpieces, while opinions and tastes vary? Because 'Hamlet' has almost been universally acclaimed as the 'most representative work' of Shakespeare, if not his greatest creation. Besides, it is recognised as the most modern drama and so is representative of modern man. In it, the problem of evil has been most strikingly portrayed in as much as Hamlet himself may be said to be the purest of protagonists and the evil most unprovoked, unholy and unbearable, and the resultant
pain and suffering most agonising as, above all, Hamlet is divided against himself, as even Macbeth is not. It has a touch of infinity in it - and that also in an infinitely greater measure than say in 'Antony and Cleopatra' and 'King Lear.' And, as critics say, Shakespeare revealed himself most in 'Hamlet' than in any other. We can, therefore, develop our concluding ideas from our study of these two masterpieces, the 'Sākuntala' and 'Hamlet', in particular, of course, coupled with a general study of the entire works of both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare.

In comparing and contrasting these two poets, we have to find out their likeness and unlikeness in their various aspects as well as in their entirety. We have already seen that both are inspired poets as well as inspired artists. In this, they may be said to be each other's equals or each other's parallels. We have also seen that Kālidāsa is, possibly, a greater artist than Shakespeare, though Shakespeare also is almost as great an artist as Kālidāsa, in so far as 'sheer beauty of form' - and, we should add, perfection - is concerned. We have not elaborated upon this point. For this, as we have seen, their respective languages have been responsible to a certain extent. But this is not all. We believe their respective kinds of poetry are no less responsible for this. The great armoury of 'vāgartha' or word and sense as employed by
Kalidāsa is different from that of Shakespeare - not only in a literal sense, but also in a material sense. The import of the poetry of each is different from the other, though there is also some likeness; and their corresponding poetry also necessarily varies. To try to find this difference in their poetry, we may, first, try to understand the 'pattern' or 'patterns' of each in which their whole poetry has been weaved. This 'pattern' or 'patterns' of each will furnish a clear outline in which to view and judge the poetry of either or both as contrasted to each other.

Eliot, when studying Shakespeare, hit upon this concept of a 'pattern' which he sought to find in him. He was, however, unhappy in not being able to find a single common 'pattern' in Shakespeare - which 'pattern', whatever particular form it may take, he happily found in Dante. So, to him, Dante had a greater appeal as a poet, than Shakespeare. In other words, Shakespeare has no single 'pattern,' but a number of 'patterns' - as well as corresponding styles - in his poetry, while Dante has one. Shakespeare is many poets in one, so to say, while Dante can be easily identified, whether accepted or not. This 'pattern' may be expressed in simpler but stronger words as 'philosophy of poetry,' but this expression, we know, will at once provoke most of the critics, as they would refuse to accept any 'philosophy
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of poetry' as such in poetry. Whatever the term or expression, there is, after all, such a thing as the total import of poetry of a particular poet, taken as a whole. In the 'Dhvanyāloka' we have got the conception 'granthadhvani' i.e., the total import of a particular piece of work. So, this 'pattern' may, perhaps, be rendered in Sanskrit as 'mahādhvani' signifying the total import of all works of a particular poet taken together. Kālidāsa, like Dante, has no doubt one single 'pattern' of his poetry; while Shakespeare has many. This is one of the basic differences between the two, and if probed deeper, will signify some vital truths about them both.

We need not elaborate upon this single 'pattern' of Kālidāsa. This 'pattern', or if we may say, 'philosophy of poetry' has been clearly stated by us in our general as well as special study of Kālidāsa, in particular, in connection with the 3rd and the 5th Cantos of the 'Kumārsambhava' and, of course, of the great 'Sākuntala'. In these two, his 'pattern' has been most fully and most beautifully revealed as in no other. This 'pattern' may possibly be described, in brief, as a serious tragic-comedy with a striking tragic effect, but finally culminating in a triumph of love through the penance of suffering. This is how the divine in man suffers from his inherent frailty as well as from adverse circumstances but ultimately it reasserts and regains itself. This divinity in
man is no less than his love which is at once the highest, the greatest, and the noblest thing in his life, of his life, and to his life. Thus his fleshly love becomes his soul's love, and it becomes one with his God, and thus his sweetest 'śṛṅgēra' finally becomes one with his most serene 'śānta'. This love, and the bounteous nature which sustains this love, are both beautiful, and one with the infinite. It is not merely sensuous pleasures; things of the flesh which are the ultimate concerns of man. It is the refined pleasures of the keen and brooding aesthete; which, when impregnated with the ardour of love, the power of the spirit, become the possession of the soul. This is the 'pattern' of poetry of our 'poet-philosopher', though he has been misunderstood in this respect by most who think he is a mere poet of sensuous pleasures. And this is quite in tune with the teachings of the 'Upaniṣadś' and our entire heritage and culture. And this is not in conflict with the 'pattern' of Dante, either. If Dante has his 'purgatory' or hell, where man is purified through suffering, Kālidāsa has also his 'purgatory' or hell of suffering through the device of a sage's curse or a god's wrath, which is but the external manifestation of a natural inward flaw. And this 'pattern' of Kālidāsa would seem to be also, substantially at one with the 'pattern' of Goethe in his 'Faust.' In fact, this seems to be, in essence, the most universal 'pattern' of almost all great poets of the world.
Hence the universal appeal of his poetry to all people of the world and of all time. Besides the substantial universality of his 'pattern', his poetry has its specific unique character in his most loveliness of music, happiness of song, utter vision of beauty, sheer joy of enchantment and all that is at once the highest, the greatest and the noblest in life leading to the everlasting heaven of love, concord and peace.

As against this one 'pattern' of Kālidāsa Shakespeare has not just one 'pattern', but many 'patterns'. He has his tragic 'pattern', comic 'pattern', and historic 'pattern'. His tragedy is of many kinds, his comedy is of many kinds and his history is of many kinds. But, as we have seen earlier, his tragedy has one single 'pattern', and so his comedy and history, largely, each has a single 'pattern'. What that 'pattern' is relating to each we have already studied before. His comic pattern may be said to be, inspite of all their many variations, comparable, essentially, to Kālidāsa's 'pattern'. But his historic 'pattern', as we have seen before, is a practical study of how the English monarchs succeeded or failed in life through virtue or strength or through sin, folly or weakness. And, above all, his tragic 'pattern' which seems to be his characteristic 'pattern', as also we have studied more than once before, constitutes a grim study of man's soul, which through some natural 'tragic flaw' in
him as well as hostile forces beyond his control suffers agonisingly, yet fights valiantly, but ultimately meets his inevitable doom himself and brings forth ruin to others, and yet rises in power of the soul to our admiration and awe touched with profound pity and fear. This substantially, is his tragic 'pattern.' And this 'pattern' has such an universal appeal to all man - in particular to modern man - that this has easily made Shakespeare the universal poet of man. But critics are at variance regarding this patternising of Shakespeare. Most critics seem to find these multiple patterns in him, and they contend that is why Shakespeare, of all poets, must alone be regarded as 'one with nature.' His objectivity and 'fidelity to fact' are so complete that one cannot find a little trace of subjectivity in his poetry, that is, dramatic poetry. He never preaches anything; he just describes things as they are. That is precisely why it is futile to search, in him, for any 'pattern' except the 'pattern' of nature. This is no doubt true to a great extent. And for this, what is responsible is his unique kind of genius, which has naturally found its expression in that most objective kind of art and poetry i.e., drama. On the other hand, there are other critics headed by Dowden who think that there is, naturally and surely, to be found a common enough 'pattern' underlying all his clearly manifest 'patterns.' And that common and essential
his pattern for Shakespeare is his tragic pattern. This same pattern is also illustrated in some of his histories, and is also seen, in splashes, in some of his comedies. But what about his comic pattern? They may be supposed to be resting places from the onslaught of his grim tragedies, and as runaways from life. But this does not seem to be a proper interpretation of his comedies. Life, as it is, holds both comedies and tragedies; it is not wholly one or the other, it is both. So, Shakespeare, in his early optimism, was naturally fond of comedies; in his growing manhood, he saw clearly tragedies as the essential realities of life, and ultimately in his mature age, he sought comedies, again, but comedies of a higher and strange kind for reconciliation and peace of soul. Dowden has clearly shown this sequence and necessity for Shakespeare of this evolution in his soul as in his creations. But, in doing so, Shakespeare has easily mirrored nature in almost all its various shapes and dimensions. This vast and various achievement, taken in its entirety, constitutes a world of its own, and has justly lent the magnificent appellation of 'myriad-minded Shakespeare' to its creator. It will be seen, however, that Shakespeare, in his mature age, ultimately reached the shores of his 'enchanted island' which is not very much unlike Kālidāsa's magic woodland, as Tagore's comparison of the 'Ṣākuntala' with 'The Tempest' will indicate. If it was given to Shakespeare to
travel the whole arduous way in his steady, boyant steps through the raging tempest and tearing convulsions of nature slowly but surely to his desired land of secure peace, it was Kālidāsa's lot to easily attain his heaven of peace directly and immediately by his power of intuition as also by the strength of his tradition and circumstances. In the case of Shakespeare, his tradition and circumstances have not been aidant in this. He had to struggle hard and find for himself his heaven of peace; while Kālidāsa was happily born in it and freely breathed its pure air. From this fundamental difference in their 'pattern' of poetry, of poetical voyage, so to say, follows much of their other differences in various aspects of their poetry, the one great quality of their poetry notwithstanding.

From the foregoing remarks as well as from our previous study of both, it is apparent that, to use two rather seemingly commonplace and much used terms, while Kālidāsa's poetry is, essentially, idealistic and subjective; Shakespeare's poetry is, essentially, realistic and objective. We believe we need not fight shy of these two so-called common terms, and refuse to accept facts as facts. If we are to show as much 'fidelity to fact' as Shakespeare himself shew, we must admit that there are possibly no better words than these two to explain the essential nature of the poetry of these two
great poets, relative to each other. Speaking strictly, both
the poets and their poetry show much of both idealism and
realism as well as the attendant subjectivity and objectivity
respectively. In fact, all poetry - and for that matter, all
art - must have a dose of both, in a more or less degree. We
have earlier used the expression 'the ideal-real correlative'
in connection with the nature of poetry and drama in Chapter
II. But these terms 'idealism' and 'realism' must be under­
stood in the overall dominant import of the poetry concerned,
that is to say, with regard to the 'pattern' or 'patterns' of
their poetry. We believe it is merely giving expression to
the most natural and universal impression of their poetry to
say that while Kālidāsa's 'pattern' is predominantly idealistic,
Shakespeare's 'pattern' is predominantly realistic and with
idealism goes subjectivity and with realism objectivity, as
a matter of course. To show that both the poets have both
the quality is not at all a difficult task. If Kālidāsa had
no realism in his poetry, but if it were all idealism, his
characterisation would not be possible at all, nor his poetry
would have such an universal appeal to all men everywhere,
as would not be credible at all. Similarly, if Shakespeare
had no idealism in his poetry but if it were all realism, he
would not have such an universal appeal to all men everywhere
either, as it would not be fascinating. In fact, all poetry -
in particular, all great poetry - must possess these two
qualities in one, whatever their respective proportion might be. While realism makes a creation credible, idealism makes it fascinating, and these two qualities of credibility and fascination may be said to constitute what is called 'appeal' of a work of art. So, when we arrive at these fundamental tenets of the poetry of both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare as the 'idealistic pattern' and the 'realistic pattern,' respectively, we believe we touch the very core of the matter with regard to our relative estimate of both; and from this follows, as we have stated earlier, most of their other vital differences, relative to each other.

To resolve the two terms 'idealism' and 'realism' into their simplest possible expressions, while idealism - in our present context - consists in describing man as he should be, realism - in the same context - consists in describing man as he is. This overall idealism in one and overall realism in the other certainly constitute the most fundamental difference between the two great poets Kālidāsa and Shakespeare, respectively. For example, Kālidāsa, of all the possible variations of a man's life, has taken an ideal variation - and the highest, and the greatest, and the noblest variation of them all - as exemplified in the great poetry on the love of Dūṣyanta and Sākuntalā or Pērvatī and Paramesvāra or Rēma or Sītā, or of Purūravas and Urvāśī, or of Mālavikā and Agnimitra, etc.
It is no mean life, or mean love which he has sung in his beautiful poetry. It is great in majesty and power, great in soulfulness and ardour, great in beauty and splendour, great in fulfilment and suffering, and great in redemption and resurrection, to use rather a term of Shakespearean criticism and the other a Biblical one. It is all great and noble and grand and magnificent. It is all heavenly, even though the men and women be earthly. It is a spectacle which all men - even all gods - do aspire to see, it is a glory which all men - even all gods - should aspire to achieve. So, this is the ideal creation of Kālidāsa; and according to the Sanskrit critical literature, poetry should, however imperceptively, instruct through beauty (‘Kāntasammitatayopadesayuje’). The Shakespearean critics' equivalent to this is 'dilate through delight' with regard to the creations of Shakespeare. Shakespeare, as we have seen, has a realistic pattern; and this is at once evident from his numerous dramas where the dramatist only speaks through the different characters. In these, he has objectively, portrayed the manifold lives of manifold characters. If there is any pattern, at all, in these, or a number of 'patterns', it belongs, or they belong to life itself, and not to him. His own conception of holding the mirror, as it were, up to nature, which includes life, he has truly and faithfully fulfilled in his dramas. Otherwise, how can one conceive of a whole world of
men and women such as Hamlet and Ophelia and Claudius and Horatio and Othello and Desdemona and Iago and Macbeth and Lady Macbeth and Duncan and Banco and Lear and Cordelia and Regan and Goneril and the fool and Brutus and Cassius and Caesar and Antonio and Bassanio and Portia and Shylock and Henry V and Richard II and Richard III and Falstaff and Antony and Cleopatra and Caesar and Prospero and Ariel and Caliban and Miranda and Ferdinand and Gonzalo, etc, etc, etc.
to be created by one man? It is a god's creation, where the highest, the greatest and the noblest of men and women, where the good and the bad, the wise and the fool, the serious and the funny, the saintly, the virtuous, the brave, the ambitious, the cruel, the cunning, the lowly, the base, the vicious, the deadly, the murderer, the adulterer, the oppressor, the imposter, the saviour, the sacrificer - in fact, almost all possible and conceivable kinds of men and women abound. It is a world in miniature. If Kālidāsa's creation is a paradise on earth, Shakespeare's creation is the entire earth itself with all men and women inhabiting that earth. This is the true image of the two creations contrasted to each other. The 'Upaniṣad says 'Neha nānāsti kiñcane' (there is nothing many here).’ This description is exactly true of Kālidāsa; and its opposite is exactly true of Shakespeare, in whom there are always many, not one. And this follows from the clear basic principle that the ideal is one, while the real is many. And
To this many have been added the complexity and depth of Shakespeare's characterizations, all of which constitutes, as the critics say, the chief characteristic of his creations.

To understand more clearly this pattern of idealistic poetry and that of realistic poetry of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare, respectively — we have seen how Shakespeare, though he has a number of patterns, may be said to have one predominant pattern — we may refer back to some of our earlier concepts, viz. poetry as 'emotion recollected in tranquility' and literature as 'at bottom, criticism of life' or art as 'imitation of nature,' whether in the ideal or in the real. Now, we believe, our brief discussion of these concepts in chapter II will be found clearly relevant. From our foregoing discussion it will now be seen that the concept of poetry as 'emotion recollected in tranquility' (of course in words) more applies, speaking relatively, to Kālidāsa's poetry than to Shakespeare's. Similarly, the concept of literature as 'at bottom, criticism of life' far more applies, speaking relatively, again, to Shakespeare's poetry than to Kālidāsa's.

So far with regard to the English concepts of poetry or literature. Regarding the great Aristotelian concept of art — including poetry — as 'imitation of nature,' whether it is an ideal imitation of nature or a real imitation of nature, it is evident, again, that while Shakespeare's poetry fits in,
speaking relatively, of course, more with a real imitation of nature, *Kalidāsa's poetry fits in, speaking relatively again, more with an ideal imitation of nature.* These profound but apparently simple truths have now become all too evident. To refer to another twin concept of poetry i.e., 'rasa' and 'āhvani' of the Sanskrit critical literature, it may now be stated that while the poetry of *Kalidāsa* seems, relatively, more rasaprādhāna than vyangypadrāhāna, that is, more evoking sentiments than being suggestive, the poetry of Shakespeare seems, relatively, being more suggestive than evoking sentiments.

This last point needs some clarification. As we have seen before, according to Sanskrit critical literature, there cannot be any evoking of sentiments without the phenomenon of suggestion. True; but our point is that regarding the 'pattern' or the total import of *Kalidāsa* as a whole, the suggestion is rather plain (sphuṭavyāngya) and not far to seek. But regarding the 'pattern' or 'patterns' or the total import of Shakespeare as a whole, the suggestion is rather deep (gūḍhavyāngya) and acute. For example, to put the question rather bluntly, what is the significance of *Kalidāsa's* and of Shakespeare's poetry for man? In other words, what is the ultimate message of each poetry for mankind? We are not asking, like the heroic but unimaginative Napoleon, 'after all, what does it prove?' If that
were a blasphemy, we are certainly within our rights to ask ourselves this legitimate question, delightful as the poetry of Kālidāsa or the poetry of Shakespeare is, how it enriches our lives or how it instructs through beauty or 'dilates through delight.' In other words, what is the 'moral' of their poetry? As we have seen earlier in our study of 'Hamlet,' discerning critics have found that there is, indeed, 'some moral,' however disguised, in Shakespeare, and for that matter, in all poetry or art. Regarding Kālidāsa, however, the question does not almost arise, because the answer is only too apparent. But in case of Shakespeare, it is not so easy to guess the answer, as his mind seems to be so inscrutable in the midst of his complex and apparently conflicting creations. Nevertheless, Dowden and others have found an answer, which seems to be quite true. And that answer is this; man is a great being; he is the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals; he has infinite faculties, and boundless possibilities; he is one with his god. But he is also so frail and faulty. There is evil in the world, as also in him. There is also the great power of his soul. He has to combat evil, both in him and outside of him, and bring forth good. He must put in his whole soul-force in this combat and fight like a man. He may succeed, or more frequently and more possibly, may not succeed, and even bring forth ruin upon him and others. And though he may fail and even be ruined, he must, on no occasion, yield or surrender before evil.
valiant fight and a magnificent defeat are possibly are possibly his best destiny, which he can hope, and live, and die for. Now, this 'moral' or total import of Shakespeare's poetry is not as apparant as Kālidāsa's, which, though beautifully suggestive in parts, is evidently clear in its entirety. The great fascination of Shakespeare is due, to a large extent, to this subtle import or suggestiveness of his poetry taken as a whole. So, this the significance of Shakespeare's poetry for man. We have earlier seen the 'pattern' of Kālidāsa's poetry from which it is easy to draw out its significance for man. Man is essentially a loving being, and loved. Love is the centre of his life and existence. Beauty sustains this love - beauty in man and woman sustains each other's love. And the inexhaustible beauties of Nature sustain the love of both. The pleasures of the senses are sweet and exhilarating. But they are not enough. They must be impregnated with beauty, and upheld by the power of love - the vision of the soul. Then alone they are shown of all dross and attendant suffering, and through the penance of suffering, they become one with bliss.

We have seen the significance or 'the moral' of the poetry of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare for man. We may turn to the question of treatment of love in both. So far as Kālidāsa is concerned, we have seen how love is almost the sole concern of our poet. To him love seems to be almost identical with
life; but love is not exactly identical with or the whole of life. Something else remains. And that is his call of duty or 'dharma,' where the soul-force dominates. If love is sustained by this soul-force or power of the spirit, love is holy and divine. If not, it generates into mere sensual pleasures and brings forth suffering and ruin into man. But by this soul-force and power of the spirit, expressed through penance, man can rise again and regain this love. So, love and beauty - but both being sanctioned by 'dharma' or the spirit of man - are the two prime concepts in Kālidāsa, of which love, again, is supreme. Whether we look at this fact in Kālidāsa whether in the name of his 'pattern' or significance or treatment of love, it all comes to the same thing. With regard to Shakespeare, however, this is not so. He has so many 'patterns', though there be one underlying 'pattern' behind these. As his 'patterns' and their significances are difficult to guess, so his love is varied and various. We have seen earlier in our studies of the various works of Shakespeare and, in particular, in our study of 'Hamlet,' how Shakespeare has skillfully depicted the picture of love in its multifarious forms and combinations. He is always extensive in his studies, as well as intensive. Whatever problem he studies in his works, whether it is love or war, jealousy or ambition, virtue or folly, piety or treachery,
murder or self-sacrifice, whatever it may be, he studies it most thoroughly and arrives at his own conclusions— which are also varied and many. He tries all possible combinations and all possible solutions; while Kālidāsa sticks to one—but the one most delightful and significant. We are not here elaborating upon the various types of love-portraits by Shakespeare, as we have already seen them in our previous study. One may say Kālidāsa’s types also are not identical, but different. But as we have said earlier—their ‘pattern’ is the same. But not so with Shakespeare, whose ‘patterns’ also vary. He seems to have exhausted all possible aspects of the various problems of the life of a man or woman, both in their extensity as well as intensity. While Shakespeare is thorough, Kālidāsa is steadfast; while Shakespeare is both extensive and intensive, Kālidāsa is more intensive rather than extensive—in the treatment of love-theme.

It remains for us to touch upon their treatment of nature. Without going into details at this stage, we may say, as we have seen earlier, that to Kālidāsa nature is a part of life—an inseparable part of a man’s or woman’s life. Nature also is an inseparable part of his or her love. Man or woman, love, and Nature—all constitute an organic whole, to Kālidāsa. But to Shakespeare, it is not exactly so. He, sometimes, includes, one might say, substantially, the ‘pattern’ of nature—
-treatment as comparable to that of Kālidāsa. But still there is a vital difference. While, in Kālidāsa, Nature has a separate and distinct personality and individuality of her own, as in the 'Sākuntala'; in Shakespeare, it is not so. In Shakespeare, nature always serves as a proper background, no doubt, in the context of which men and women play their different roles. True, this background either increases or takes away his or her power and contributes to his or her success or failure, happiness or misery. But it is a background nevertheless, not a person on her own right, which Nature clearly is, in Kālidāsa. As we said earlier, Nature is a mother companion in Kālidāsa, where she nourishes her child, blesses it, comforts it and does good to it; she is, indeed, the 'Adhidevata' (presiding deity) of man or woman. This humanisation--nay even deification--of Nature by Kālidāsa, in the great spiritual tradition of his land, seems to be his great characteristic contribution to world literature, possibly next only to his great treatment of love--the noblest of its kind. Shakespeare has no such particular vision of love--though he has so many noble as well as vulgar aspects of it; but he has clearly no such vision of Nature--though he has so many aspects of nature as backgrounds to his multifarious creations. In fact, it may well be said with some amount of calculated exaggeration--that while Kālidāsa, essentially, is a poet of nature, Shakespeare, essentially, is a poet of
man. Nature is not so much vital in Shakespeare as in Kālidāsa; as man, taken in his entirety, is not so much vital in Kālidāsa as in Shakespeare. But so far as love is concerned it is vital in both, though it is one in Kālidāsa, while many in Shakespeare. While Kālidāsa, essentially, is a poet of love and of Nature, one may say, Shakespeare, essentially, is a poet of man, whether in love or out of love, in his manifold aspects, loving, hateful, cruel or kind.

We have briefly seen, in our study of both the 'Śākuntala' and 'Hamlet', how both of them are rich in what may be called the wisdom of the ages. Besides their overwhelming poetry, both of them are the two treasur-houses of knowledge— not in the sense that flashes of wisdom are very many in them, but in the sense that, whenever they occur appropriate to their context, they are penetratingly revealing, and they signify some great truth or other regarding the life of man. In fact, the quality of their rareness together with their character of penetration make them all the more charming. Such revelations of truth in the poetry of both seem to characterise them as seer-poets. They have not only created beauty but also truth. Perhaps this is the essential quality of all great poetry. Great beauty and great truth meet at a point. Earlier we have discussed the great utterances of both the 'Śākuntala' and 'Hamlet' and have called them 'mahāvākyas' as the four
'mahāvākyas' of the 'Upaniṣads': In them, seeing wisdoms and penetrating beauties have become one. This is, perhaps, the meeting point of great poetry and great philosophy. However, to speak in terms of the three prime concepts of truth, beauty and good, touched upon by us in our Introduction, we may possibly say, speaking relatively, that while, in Kālidāsa, beauty and good seem to dominate rather than truth, in Shakespeare, truth and beauty dominate rather than good. This follows from the essential nature of the poetry, which we have already seen as 'idealistic' in one and 'realistic' in the other. While 'idealism' lays stress on beauty and good, 'realism' lays stress on truth and beauty, relatively speaking. But both meet at one point that is beauty - the extraordinarily unique beauty of their poetry which conveys such great truth or meaning. Judging the matter from another point of view, i.e., the 'Upaniṣadic conception of 'ānāma Brahman, 'prāṇa Brahman, 'vijñāna Brahman' and 'ānanda Brahman', one might possibly say that while Kālidāsa's vision essentially consists of 'prāṇa Brahman', 'Vijñāna Brahman' and 'Ānanda Brahman', Shakespeare's vision essentially consists of 'ānāma Brahman', 'prāṇa Brahman' and 'vijñāna Brahman'. That is to say, while Kālidāsa's flight is higher, his sweep is less; and while Shakespeare's flight is less high, his sweep is greater - down to the very grass roots, speaking relatively. Speaking relatively, again, while Kālidāsa is based on life, Shakespeare is rooted to life; and
while Kalidāsa reaches heaven, Shakespeare touches heaven — one might say.

We may possibly conclude this modest study with the observation that what really makes the poetry of each what it is certainly is its extraordinarily unique quality, which has no parallel or even a near approach in world literature or art. Of the two constituents of 'Vāgartha' which constitutes poetry, we have, it may be said, so far considered 'arthā' as opposed to 'vāk', in particular, in so far as the two may be spoken of separately. Whether it is the 'pattern' or its significance or 'moral,' or whether it is treatment of love or nature or any such matter, it all flows from the 'arthā' or meaning of the poetry concerned. But that meaning, however, great or glorious it might be, must be expressed in - rather suggested by - corresponding beautified poetry or its prime constituent, the 'vāk', or the radiant words which give rise to such pregnant meaning. The emphasis on word rather than on meaning, in poetry, though the two are inseparable, as revealed in some definitions, viz. 'remaṇīyārthapratipādakaḥ śabdāḥ kāvyam' of Jagannātha, etc. is not without its significance. Apart from its logical approach, it has a distinct aesthetic value. The word is the more tangible poetry, if one may say so; whence the meaning flows. The rose is the thing - tangible, concrete and objective. The flavour
in the air, flows from it. Similarly, all the world of beauty, of significance of the poetry of either Kālidāsa and Shakespeare would be no more there, if they were not laid in their magnificently unique poetry. Otherwise, any amount of prosaic interpretation of their poetry would be equivalent to their poetry. This is the core of the matter - the thing-in-itself, so to say. There is a controversy, like so many others, regarding Shakespeare as to whether he is greater as a poet or as a dramatist. The solution seems to be that he is a great dramatic poet, dramatic poetry itself being his essential nature and special field of activity. Regarding Kālidāsa, however, the controversy is not so keen. As we have seen earlier, poetry as such may be considered his essential nature. But in Sanskrit critical literature, 'kāvya' or poetry is clearly divided into two kinds, 'śrāvya' and 'dṛśya' or non-dramatic (epic and lyric) and dramatic. From this point of view, poetry as such may be regarded the essential nature of Shakespeare too, like Kālidāsa. One might say, while drama is the form, poetry is the content. Now, this poetical aspect of both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare is the most essential aspect. This is the precisely the point, where both surpass the rest of their tribe, and where both of them meet with equal magnificence. In fact, all readers and critics of their poetry are at once fascinated by extraordinarily unique quality, which seems to be nothing short of magic or incantation,
so to say. Now, this magical quality of the poetry of both is a never-ending mystery, an enigma to all concerned. How­soever one might analyse it or try to explain it with the various canons of aesthetic principles, one can never pluck out its secret. It baffles all understanding, and yet continues to delight all mankind possibly more than anything else in this world. Like 'piece that passeth all understanding', it is a creation of beauty 'that passeth all understanding' and sanctifies man possibly more than anything else in his life. And this beauty consists, among others, in the extra­ordinarily unique verbal music and rhythm of their style and the sweetness and charm of their diction and yet a sustained vigour and elegance of both as well as their suggestiveness and significance.

In almost every science or study in Sanskrit, there is such a thing, which may be called its 'Aupaniṣada Adhikaraṇa' - and in the 'Gītā' itself, there is the 'Rājavidyā- Rājaguhyāyogā', which embodies its esoteric revelation. We have no power or intention to make any such revelation. Never­theless we may ask ourselves what is the secret of this extra­ordinarily unique poetry? We have seen that this beauty of poetry of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare is inexplicable and belongs to an indefinable quality, which is another name for 'avāmanasagocara-tattva'. But we may possibly probe a
little deeper. Without going into the details, with regard to the poetry of \textit{Kālidāsa}, among all the principles being acclaimed as the soul of poetry, viz. '\textit{rasa}', 'dhvani', '\textit{rāti}', 'vakrokti', 'aucitya', etc., together with the essential quality of such poetry viz., 'prāsāda', 'mādhurya', 'ojas', etc., it appears to us that possibly 'dhvani' on the one hand and 'mādhurya' and 'ojas' on the other constitute what may be called the more essential features of this poetry. Of these three, again, while 'dhvani' primarily enhances the beauty of the meaning, 'mādhurya' and 'ojas', striking a balance between them, primarily enhance the beauty of the words. As this is with \textit{Kālidāsa}, so this is with \textit{Shakespeare}. Suggestiveness on the one hand and sweetness and vigour on the other appear to be the more essential qualities of \textit{Shakespeare}'s poetry. We give stress on suggestiveness or 'dhvani' instead of the resultant emotional effect or 'rasa' because, as we have indicated earlier, though the two are interrelated, in order to view poetry with 'the poet's eye' it seems more reasonable to emphasise the aspect of suggestiveness rather than that of emotional effect which more dominates in the 'sahādaya.'

But there still remains, some unknown factor, some organic whole which possibly combines all the finest qualities and possibly avoids all blemishes of style and diction. What it is or how it is may perhaps never be known. But still the question may be considered a little further. We have
seen earlier in Chapter II that this question may better be judged from the point of view of the poet who creates poetry, as Shakespeare has, in fact, done in his 'Midsummer Night's Dream,' that is to say, in his famous lines 'The poet's eye in a fine frenzy rolling ... do,' already discussed by us.

If we try to judge its essential nature from the cold finished product called 'poetry' we think we shall probably not be able to penetrate its veil of mystery. But if we try to view it with 'the poet's eye,' we can probably see a little better and see a little more. What we have said before may be illustrated in a diagram as the following:

```
suggestiveness

   poetry

sweetness          vigour
```

where poetry has been represented as a triangle of which sweetness (the element of water) and vigour (the element of fire) form the base, and suggestiveness (the element of air) forms the apex, so that the poet — rather his poesy — may declare — like Cleopatra, and yet unlike her — I am fire and air — and water — / And the rest of me I give to baser elements! But all good, not to speak of great, poetry
has these essential qualities. Then what makes Kālidāsa and Shakespeare different from others? Possibly, the intensity of these qualities - the 'fine frenzy' - which characterises them more than any other poet. It is this 'fine frenzy' or 'pracodenā' ('cāpalāya pracoditaḥ'), which has brought forth a near perfection in their style and diction and their whole poetry. Now, from the point of view of the poet, that is, the process of his creation, the matter may possibly be described in the following diagram:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity and vividness of imagination</th>
<th>myriad-mindedness</th>
<th>urge for universals or fundamentals</th>
<th>Zeal for perfection in artistic expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compression or suggestive-ness</td>
<td>the concrete product called unique poetry</td>
<td>Unfolding of the compression in the mind of 'sahṛdaya'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears the mind of either poet (Kālidāsa or Shakespeare) has possibly worked in some way similar to the one illustrated above. The poet has already got his myriad-mindedness and urge for universals or fundamentals. Then the creation of poetry starts with the sudden flash of imagination which is intense and vivid. Then there is the zeal for perfection in artistic expression which gives rise to compression or suggestiveness. At last the concrete product called unique
poetry comes out. Above all, the intensity and vividness of imagination is the soul-force of the creation of such poetry - this 'fine frenzy' or 'divine madness' is its father. Myriad-mindedness and urge for universals or fundamentals seems to be its mother. Again, that imagination naturally carries with it the zeal for perfection in artistic expression which gives rise to compression or suggestiveness, which, again, creates, as it were, the concrete product called unique poetry. And, finally, the unfolding of the compression in the mind of 'sahṛdaya' is what makes it possible for him to 'appreciate' the piece of poetry. This seems to be the process concerned in the creation and appreciation of poetry; and this 'fine frenzy' or 'pracodanā' seems to be the most vital thing we can conceive of as the cause of such great poetry as of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare; beyond this we cannot see.

Now, finally to conclude this our modest study, we may possibly say that this essentially 'idealistic' pattern or kind of Kālidāsa's poetry and this essentially 'realistic' pattern or kind of Shakespeare's poetry seem to be the two most characteristic kinds of poetry in the history of world poetry. There may be some mixed or middle kinds - for example, perhaps Goethe's 'Faust,' which may, again, be considered as essentially belonging to the 'realistic'
kind - but the above-mentioned two kinds of poetry seem to be the two extreme kinds of all great poetry. In particular, the 'Sākuntala' and 'Hamlet' seem to be the two extreme examples of such kinds of poetry. Mankind does not seem to know of any better kind than either or any better example of either kind. All the endeavours of man - artistic and historical - seem to have reached their consummation in these two great kinds of poetry - Kālidāsa and Shakespeare - and in these two concrete pieces of poetry - the 'Sākuntala' and 'Hamlet'. To speak relatively, again, the dreaming man and the living man - in his urge for perfect beauty - has ultimately got his dream realised and his life realised, so to say, in these two monumental creations of beauty, the 'Sākuntala' and 'Hamlet'. While the one has reflected his 'ideal' vision, the other has reflected his life itself. Both are sources of everlasting joy, and never-ending inspiration for man. While the one inspires with a direct vision of ideal beauty and truth and goodness, the other inspires with an indirect vision of ideal beauty and truth and goodness while directly mirroring life itself - or its most vital reality. The two taken together constitute a double vision, as it were, the ideal and the real in one. It seems, therefore, that either of them is not, possibly, complete in itself, however, great or significant or beautiful
it might be. But both, when taken in unison, make the vision of man complete. These are the two possible visions of truth, beauty and goodness. As man sees a thing with his both eyes, not with just one or the other, so mankind possibly may see itself completely in these two kinds of poetry, Kalidasa and Shakespeare, and in these two great masterpieces, the 'Śākuntala' and 'Hamlet.' These are possibly the two greatest mirrors that reflect nature, including man himself, completely; and these are possibly the two greatest possessions of man of which he can feel proud justly - next possibly only to the great 'Upaniṣads' and the 'Bible'; but in so far as art or poetry is concerned as opposed to religion or philosophy - these two possibly have no parallels in world art or poetry. Like the sun and the moon being the two eyes of god ('sāsīsūryāndhram'), these are the two eyes of Nature, so to say - the one delightful and the other resplendent or terrible. They constitute and unified vision of life, so to say, like Einstein's 'unified field theory'; and they, taken together, make an ideal-real vision of life, like 'space-time,' the composite entity. Or, they are precisely also the two visions of Poesy, so to say - laid in almost perfectly beautified poetry - so that man may say to one (i.e. the 'real' vision), 'Rudral yatē dakṣiṇāṁ mukhāṁ tena māṁ pāḥi nityam!' (O Terrible! save me ever with that which is they gentle face!)
as also perhaps say to the other (i.e. the 'ideal' vision),
Śiva! yat te vāmāṁ mukham tena māṁ śādhi nityam (O Gentle!
teach me ever with that which is thy terrible face!).
If man cannot see their unity, they are one in the Infinite.