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GENERAL INTRODUCTION

All study of man relates to man himself in relation to his surrounding i.e., nature and his fellow men, and also to something which lies beyond this. And of all such studies, viz., science, literature and other arts, and philosophy or religion, literature seems to be the dearest to man's heart because it is not too precise or exacting like science and philosophy and because it has a more meaningful message than the other arts. In other words, of the three prime concepts of man and the cherished values of his life, viz., truth, beauty, and goodness, literature alone seems to hold them in a just and happy proportion, where beauty in its highest and most elevated form i.e., imaginative beauty reigns supreme, and truth and goodness blend with it in a blessed union. Hence the universal appeal of literature including poetry of all kinds — climaxed by its highest form, i.e., dramatic poetry — to all people of all lands and of all times. From this point of view — and we can think of no other sensible point of view in this matter — it may be said that literature provides the imaginative aspect, the imaginative core to man's endeavour to know his own self. To all this strenuous endeavour at self-knowledge, instinctively prompted and urged by the soul of man, literature with its imaginative beauty or beautified imagination lends its own charm, its own
resplendence, its own glory, and its own significance. It has no parallel worth the name; it is a point where all lines converge, and it extends itself unto what lies beyond. To build up an imagery out of some characters in 'As You Like It' of Shakespeare, who will be one of the objects of our present study, Science, Literature and Philosophy — this great trio — may be compared to Adam, Rosalind, and Orlando respectively, who constitute a happy and well-knit family, where, to state in the reverse order, Philosophy is the ruling master, Literature the reigning queen, and Science the able servant who is to serve them. And the queen, beyond all doubt, is the apple of everyone's eye.

This supremacy of literature has been variously acclaimed by the critics of Sanskrit literature also, who are poorly described as Sanskrit rhetoricians and to whom we will have occasions to turn back again and again as we proceed, Kālidāsa being another object of our present study. This acclamation has been in the well-known form of Kāvyā-praśamsā or in praise of poetry. Thus, for example, Bāhūma's Kāvyālaṅkāra viz., "Dharmārtha-kāma-mokṣeṣu vaicāṣaṇyaṁ kāḷasū ca/ Karoti kīrttim prītim ca sādhu-kāvyā-niṣevaṇam//" says that poetry, if it is wholesome, is conducive to the four aims of human life which may be regarded as religions or spiritual merit, wealth or the means of satisfying desire, the fulfilment of desire or of erotic desire in particular, and salvation or the freedom of the soul, besides
producing aesthetic delight. It may be noted here that these four aims, or, if we may call them, values of life do not appear to tally with the three values of life, truth, beauty, and goodness, mentioned in the preceding paragraph. It is, however, beyond the scope of our present study to attempt a comparison and possible synthesis with reference to these two sets of aims or values. We will nevertheless have to make our humble attempt to indicate some way to a synthesis regarding the visions of poetry of the East and the West in the concluding chapter, comparative criticism and some attempt at a synthesis being one of the main planks of our study-structure. For the present, it will suffice to say that both the East and the West are at one in accepting the excellence and supremacy of literature. The direct aim of literature or its immediate effect has been, however, pinpointed by the critics of both the East and the West as no other than pure aesthetic delight, or sheer imaginative pleasure, or, rather, joy from the pursuit of beauty created in words. This has, of course, no reference to the loud and compelling controversy between 'art for art's sake' and 'art for man's sake', because this statement cuts, we believe, across both the points of view and meets at a common point.

But to extend the original idea further in its logical sequence or order, literature attains its consummation in poetry and poetry in dramatic poetry, where, so far as we are able to see up to the present time, literature, and for that
matter art itself, has attained its highest excellence. The
differentia between literature in general and poetry in parti­
cular seems to consist in a certain characteristic difference
in form as well as in a certain heighting of effect. This,
it may be said, is a mere difference in degree rather than in
kind; or it may, again, be said, this is a difference in kind
rather than in degree. Here, as almost anywhere, the question
rather depends on the point of view taken; for it is, indeed,
difficult to distinguish between degree and kind and to specify
whether the distinction between the two, in itself, is one of
degree or kind. However, to do away with verbal quibbles and
to return to normal and sane understanding, we may mention
here that the critics of Sanskrit literature have practically
ignored the current distinction between literature and poetry
and have used the two as one. For example, they define poetry
as 'Śabdārthau sahitau kāvyam' where, by implication, it is
meant that a certain kind of 'sāhitya' or correspondence is
called 'kāvyā' or poetry; and we have the word 'sāhitya' for lite­
rature and the word 'kāvyā' for poetry in Sanskrit, the use of
which may be accepted, the word 'sāhitya' in the sense of "the
science of literature" being ignored for our present purpose."
Again, the names of works, themselves critical works on litera­
ture or poetry, viz., 'Kāvyadarśa', 'Kāvyaprakāśa', 'Sāhitya­
darpāṇa', etc. indicate that the two words 'sāhitya' and 'kāvyā'
mean the one and the same thing, the only difference between
the two being that while the original word was 'kāvyā' meaning 'kaverbhāvaḥ' (or poetness, to put it rather bluntly) or 'kaveḥ kṛtih' (or the work of a poet), 'sāhitya' is a later word developed to emphasise the mutual correspondence between the two constituents of literature or poetry i.e., 'śabda' or word and 'artha' or meaning, used along with the original word 'kāvyā'.

So, broadly speaking, while literature includes all forms of epic, lyric, drama, fiction, essay, etc. and poetry is a particular kind thereof which sometime meant only verse, but ultimately has come to mean a particular kind possessing a particular quality with a certain heightened effect, in Sanskrit critical literature 'kāvyā' is straightaway divided into two classes, viz. 'gadyā' or prose and 'padyā' or verse. This latter division may, at first sight, appear to be rather of little significance; but when we remember that here 'kāvyā' or poetry is identical with 'sāhitya' or literature, the division will be found not only practical but important and essential. This apparently simple distinction signifies that there is not much substance in the distinction between literature and poetry except in their forms and that it is better to hold that all literature is poetry and that only their forms vary and not their true essence. Thus the treatment of this subject like many others in Sanskrit critical literature appears to be more rational and justified than its counterpart in Western criticism.
But to revert to our original theme, poetry as understood in Western literature or criticism is the more heightened form of literature than its other variations. And to cut across our temporary digression into a brief comparative estimate of the question in the East and the West as our earlier digression into a brief comparative estimate of the aims or values of poetry and to pass on to our projected aim, drama is the highest and most heightened form of poetry. Here there is no voice of dissent anywhere in the world of literature or criticism. Beginning with Aristotle, that great ancient thinker or Poetics of Greece, through the celebrated critics of the West, to Bharata, the great ancient thinker on Dramatics of India, through the galaxy of brilliant critics of the East i.e., of India who wrote in Sanskrit, drama remains the supreme form of art, literature or poetry. Hence the critics of Sanskrit literature say 'Kavyeṣu nāṭakām ramyam'. If in every drama there is a climax, to refer to a vital concept of Western dramatic construction which is not without its equivalent in Sanskrit drama, there is drama itself where poetry, literature or art as a whole may be said to have reached its climax in expression, representation and significance. The popular verdict is overwhelmingly in its favour, and the elites of art or literature also are all of one voice in acclaiming it as the closest and the truest representation of human life—overriding the bold claims of painting and sculpture on one side and
of the feeble claims of lyric and music on the other. Whatever the reasons — for at present we are not concerned with them however strong and vital they must be — this is a fact of life, and of art, which is universally accepted and almost regarded as an axiom and element of faith in criticism of literature or art.

In this highest field of human art, i.e., drama, there is no dearth of good and great masters in the various languages of various lands through the span of history of the globe. Beginning with Greek dramas through the Elizabethan dramas climaxed in the great dramas of Shakespeare down to modern dramas it is a long and exciting story; in fact, it is as exciting and dramatic as the stories of the particular dramas in its fold. But this only relates to those which may be called western dramas. Besides these, there are dramas of the East, more particularly, Indian dramas written in the ancient and profoundly beautiful language of Sanskrit climaxed in those few but great dramas of Kālidāsa.

Now, Shakespeare is the one name which, almost by universal consent, reigns in this towering field of human creation. He has, in fact, been regarded not only as one of the greatest, but the greatest, among the dramatists of the world as well as one of its greatest poets, if not the greatest. In his life time, though a popular dramatist, he was known only
as one of the many good and successful playwrights of the
day. After his death the merit of his dramas began to be
really appreciated, and Ben Jonson described him in his obituary
verses as 'not of one age, but for all time'. But even this
high tribute seemed to be more in a spirit of mournful praise
of a contemporary friend and writer than perhaps a full-fledged
appreciation of the beauties and mysteries of Shakespeare's
creations. But Jonson for once hit the mark in his momentary
flash of intuition, and even to this day a higher estimate of
Shakespeare, and in så brief, seems hardly possible than this
pointed golden phrase. Gradually, in course of centuries,
through the tireless and devoted efforts of many good and great
critics as well as actors, Shakespeare has grown to be the
legend as he is today — so much so that were Shakespeare alive
today he would have been probably not a little amazed and
embarrassed to find himself an object of so much fine and
fluently eulogy and even incensed deification.

It is not that Shakespeare's supreme position has gone
wholly unchallenged. Besides other very good and great drama-
tists in different languages of different countries, Germany,
in particular, in her greatest dramatist Goethe, the immortal
author of the great 'Faust', put up a strong challenge to the
supremacy of Shakespeare as a dramatist. Notwithstanding the
great theme and the great poetry of the 'Faust', not to speak
of the other dramas of Goethe or of other dramatists with their great varieties of theme and styles of poetry, all such challenge has gone the same inevitable way, and critics, readers, and spectators of the world have almost all stuck to Shakespeare as inevitably the greatest unsurpassed by any other man in this highest field of art.

In this context of dramas and dramatists nobody seems to think of great Kalidāsa of the East and his few great dramas in Sanskrit. They belong to an ancient world, and very few in the West, and not many in the East too, seem to know much about them. This is unfortunately the position to-day, and it was more so scores of decades back. This is in total contrast to the fate of the Greek dramas which have enjoyed a close acquaintance and wide popularity besides inspiring many modern attempts in dramatic composition in the West. This is no doubt due to the dominance of the Western world in modern life and art. India's long foreign dependence and backwardness are clearly responsible for this sad neglect of her finest treasure in dramatic literature along with her entire national heritage and culture.

But when Sir William Jones, about two centuries back, first described Kalidāsa as the 'Indian Shakespeare' and translated his great masterpiece, the 'Abhijnana-sākuntalā' into Latin and then into English, the long spell of oblivion
and neglect was suddenly broken and the name of Kālidāsa was first introduced into the modern Western world with a bang. Thereafter when Goethe, on reading merely a second-hand translation of the same 'Abhijñāna-Śakuntala', burst forth spontaneously into his passionate and full-throated eulogy in the famous couplet of his, which we shall discuss later, the name of Kālidāsa became firmly established in the Sanskrit-loving society of the modern Western world. Then followed many translations and critical editions of Kālidāsa's 'Abhijñāna-Śakuntala' in the West and a larger number of Sanskrit-loving people there came to be acquainted with Kālidāsa and his great dramatic masterpiece.

But this acquaintance had two principal limitations. First, this acquaintance was mainly limited to the 'Śakuntala' and only in part, to only two other great works of Kālidāsa, viz., the 'Megha-Dūta', the great and unique lyric, made popular by the English translation of Wilson, and to a still lesser degree, the 'Kumāra-Sambhava' the great epic, with its interesting tale which is popular to the ear of the West. Next, even this limited acquaintance with the poet was confined to a still limited number of Sanskrit-loving people of the West, the vast section of the people, to whom the dramas of Shakespeare and other European dramas including, in particular, some Greek dramas, whether in the original or through translation, were naturally familiar, mostly did not even hear the name of our poet.
All this is quite natural and understandable, and we have no regrets on this account. But what we are trying to drive at is the fact that Kālidāsa is not so widely known in the West as Shakespeare in the East; and as we shall see, this is not necessarily due to the superior excellence of the latter as compared to the former. But it is clearly due, to a great extent, to the dominance of the West over the East, in particular, due to the dominance of the British empire and the English language over the rest of the world, so that the voice of the East has been subdued and her golden heritage underrated. It is thus that Macaulay could gleefully boast of a single shelf of a good European library outweighing the entire literature of the East. Apparently Macaulay did not go through possibly a single worthy volume of the literature of the East, not to speak of its entire literature. However, to come to our point, the universal popularity and fame of Shakespeare as compared to the limited eminence of Kālidāsa appears to us to be due to some other cause or causes than precisely due to their respective merits. Besides, it is most important to note in the context of dramas, which we shall elaborate later, that while almost the entire noteworthy works of Shakespeare are in his numerous (i.e., broadly about 35 to 40) dramas, the great bulk of the works of Kālidāsa is contained, first, in his two large epics together with his two small lyrics and then only in his three dramas.
But, to come exactly to the point, why all this talk of Shakespeare and Kālidāsa in the same breath, and in the same context? In answer to this question let us submit that while the object of our study, in general, has been the principles of literary criticism, with special reference to the poetry of Kālidāsa, the object of our study, in our present modest endeavour, is a critical appreciation of the poetry of Kālidāsa in comparison with the poetry of Shakespeare, that model poet of reference in the world of literature, with special reference, by way of a standard example of each, to their recognised masterpieces the 'Śākuntala' and 'Hamlet' respectively. This brief statement, we believe, will indicate the scope of our present study as well as its limitations.

First, we may say that, in the present context, a study of the poetry of Kālidāsa has been our original aim. There have been very few serious studies on this subject; and those studies which have come to our notice are mostly full of the traditional method of showering eulogies, enumerating the many qualities of his poetry and quoting passages from scholars and critics generally of foreign origin. Now, we believe, this is not an adequate or completely satisfactory method of study, though all this may be included in it. What is really required is to analyse and to try to find out, if possible, by an additional effort of the intuition, the secret of the mystery of the extraordinary beauties of Kālidāsa's poetry. This must be done, it
should be noted, with reference to the principles of literary criticism of the land of the poet and of his time by which he must have been, more or less, guided, his genius notwithstanding. To use the words of Eliot, the great modern poet and critic, his 'individual talent' must be understood in the light of his 'tradition.' This cannot be done in isolation from those principles — either in the vacuum or just in terms of the principles of modern literary criticism, or simply by the standard of poetry of Shakespeare or of any other poet. But, again, this study of Kālidāsa, who also must be known, like Shakespeare, as 'not of one age, but for all time', in order that such study may be meaningful, must also be related to the universal principles of literary criticism. Such a study, however, would require a different scope than our present opportunities will exactly allow. For the present, we intend to follow the same objective but with reference to the poetry of Shakespeare, in particular, since Shakespeare for reasons stated earlier, serves as the standard model of reference for all great poetry. In this way, we hope to make an attempt to discover the great beauties of Kālidāsa's poetry and to furnish, perhaps, the golden key to its mysteries, and possibly also to determine the place of our poet in the galaxy of world poetry.

Again, the works of both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare are so vast, varied and tremendously rich that it is impossible to
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1 Eliot - Selected Essays (Faber). *Tradition and The Individual Talent, P15*
do justice to either of them, not to speak of doing justice to both, in this single brief study. We have, therefore, thought it necessary to select only one standard masterpiece of each for a somewhat detailed study, in addition to a brief critical survey of their entire works, so that from this we may find out the essential nature of the poetry of each and then can compare and contrast them which may possibly throw light on the poetry of both. Further, we have selected the 'Sākuntala' of Kālidāsa and 'Hamlet' of Shakespeare because, first, the 'Sākuntala' has been universally regarded as the greatest dramatic masterpiece of Kālidāsa, if not also his greatest literary creation, by all critics, Indian and foreign, as the well-known saying 'Kālidāsasya sarvasvamabhīṣāna-Sākuntalam' will indicate, and, next, because 'Hamlet' has been equally regarded as the 'most representative work' of Shakespeare, and, if it is not the greatest dramatic masterpiece of the poet, in it 'he has revealed himself most', as almost all celebrated Shakespearian critics have observed. As, however, while the 'Sākuntala' is a romance and 'comedy' and 'Hamlet' is a revenge play and tragedy, we may observe at this stage, without anticipating the results of our study, that this will be a study more in contrast than in comparison, and yet a study showing the equal beauty and greatness of the poetry of both. This will explain, we believe, why we have not selected Shakespeare's 'The Tempest' against Kālidāsa's 'Sākuntala', as Tagore has done in his beautiful critical essay on the 'Sākuntala'. Tagore
wanted to explain the 'Śākuntala' in comparison with 'The Tempest' for their limited romantic resemblance. We shall, however, attempt to explain Kālidāsa in comparison and contrast with Shakespeare, rather to explain both, with special reference to their recognised or representative masterpieces, the 'Śākuntala' and 'Hamlet'.

So far we have been trying to give a general outline of the object and scope of our study of the two greatest masterminds of the East and the West in the field of art, to be particular, in the domain of poetry and drama. Now, the approach and the method of our study need to be explained. We have indicated earlier that we shall try to penetrate into the beauties and mysteries of the poetry of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare, and in that process, we shall try to indicate the relative position, each to each, of both their poetry and the poets. This is not an easy task, nor do we think we are especially equipped than others to undertake this task. Nevertheless, we shall endeavour, as best as we possibly can, to fulfil this cherished object — an object, so far as we know, has never yet been seriously undertaken — of correlating the two greatest specimens of poetry ever created by man, and to arrive at a measure of truth about them both, and perhaps about poetry itself.

In this we propose to follow a plan (as it may be seen from the contents) which may be considered reasonable within our limitations. For example, after indicating the object and
scope of our study and after explaining its particular approach and method, we propose to consider certain fundamental principles which are too often assumed in such studies; and then to discuss, in brief, the question of the nature of poetry and drama according to the critics of both the East and the West; and after this preliminary survey to study directly the poetry of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare, both in general and with special reference to this selected masterpieces, in the light of the principles of literary criticism of both the East and the West; and, finally, to indicate the direction where the solution lies, with some measure of truth, in the master under study in our conclusion.
Sec.II
SPECIAL INTRODUCTION

In the preceding paragraphs we have been endeavouring to indicate, besides stating the object and scope of our study, the approach and method we propose to adopt in such study. But so far as the approach and method are concerned, we believe, we should explain them further so that they may be made clear with reference to the fundamental principles or issues involved in the basic approach and method of any such study. In doing this we will be naturally constrained to deal with those fundamental principles or issues and make a working solution of them so that we may tread on solid ground and make solid progress and not merely indulge in vain intellectual acrobatics or move in the vacuum or on airy nothing.

For example, every particular study has a particular point of view and, to that extent, is relative so that no study, or for that matter no human effort, can be absolute, hence complete. This is, of course, generally assumed a priori, therefore, regarded as obvious. We are, however, emphasising the obvious in order to remind us at every step of this limitation and inadequacy so that it may enthrall us to make all the more energetic and concerted efforts to adopt the correct point of view embracing, as far as possible, all other points of view, which, however, we believe, can be possible only as a gift of the intuition and which then only can be expressed in proper logical terms and
sequence. But there are other more concrete and tangible assumptions besides this, some of which we shall now deal with.

We shall briefly discuss some of the various definitions of literature, poetry or drama in the next chapter from the points of view of both the East and the West. For the present, however, we like to focus our attention on one essential nature of literature, poetry or drama, or, for that matter, of any art. And that is that all art, and literature, poetry or drama, in particular, is, by its very nature, intuitive, integral and unique. Practically all critics of the East and the West have especially emphasised this essential nature of art, in general, and of literature, poetry or drama, in particular. The critics of Sanskrit literature have intently described poetry as 'Alaukika', 'Lokottara', 'Apūrva', etc., which can also be called 'Alokasamānya', in the words of Kālidāsa, as well as 'Acintya-hetuka', in the words of the same poet, to view it in another context. Western aesthetics also has deeply recognised the inexplicable nature and beauty of a work of art. This is the universally accepted position and belief of all artists and art-critics all over the world through the ages so much so that sometimes it appears to be a despairing article of faith which makes art one with God. In fact, in modern life, the almighty, mysterious God has almost disappeared from His high pinnacle of glory and art seems to have taken His place as the supreme object of worship for all mankind. However, ignoring
this glorious aspect of art and without entering into any mystification of art, on a simple analysis — i.e., attempt at analysis — of the nature of art, it will be immediately found that art defies all analysis — meaning that it allows analysis only up to a point and thereafter it stubbornly defies all analysis — however penetrating — into its own nature. In other words, art will not reveal its secret. The supremely pregnant phrase in Sanskrit criticism — which is so often repeated and whose significance is unfortunately so often missed in the din of searching and elaborate analysis — e.g. 'Avāmanasagocara' has unerringly pinpointed the point at issue. Kant's description of God as 'unknown and unknowable' or the equivalent description of the soul of poetry in Sanskrit as 'āgneya' (Cf. 'Kecid Vācām sthitam: aviśaye ...' Dwanyāloka) almost comes closely to the point. In fact, in Sanskrit critical literature there is a positive reference to those critics who may be termed 'ĀgneyavādinŚ?

Anyway, the key to the whole controversy or mystery as to the nature of art lies, we believe, in the difference, in nature, between analysis and synthesis, those two basic functions of the human mind and elements of human thought. While the creation of art is essentially a process of synthesis — and, therefore, the nature of art which is thus created takes to this quality of synthesis or unity — the explanation of art is apparently an opposite or reverse process i.e., a process of analysis. On the face of it, therefore, there is an element of
contradiction, and this contradiction has to be resolved before the issue may be made clear. Here, as everywhere else, when we probe deeper into the point, the inevitable contradiction becomes visible, which may perhaps be resolved by a still deeper probe, which alone may give us the correct vision.

Without treading on the grounds of metaphysics but to turn away from just its borders and to come back to our pregnant phrase in describing the essential nature of art as intuitive, integral, and unique, this process of synthesis charged by a creative imagination has given rise to the thing called art and hence the significance of the description should be apparent. In other words, in so far as it is possible to speak apart, this process of synthesis has given rise to what is called intuitive as well as integral, the former referring to the subjective function of intuition and the latter to the objective nature of the product being integral connoting unity, and the guiding force, that is the creative imagination, impelled by its own necessity, sets that super-subtle apparatus called intuition instantaneously working and in a lightning flash, as it were, it produces the thing called art which, therefore, has been inevitably described as above. This is, of course, the ideal, there are manifold realities only approaching it in manifold ways; but we have to consider the ideal in order to grasp its essential nature.
Now, if this is the nature of art and its process of creation — we have seen how its nature has taken its quality from the way it is created — what to do with this art? We mean, in our present context, how to deal with this art? Only to enjoy its beauty — and possibly, to add, to become immortal like the gods themselves — and not to seek its meaning, if it has at all any meaning, as Eliot suggested,¹ i.e., not to try to explain or interpret it? While, by itself, that would be a very pleasant and most coveted task, the mind of man does not rest there. It wants something more. The mind of man, being impelled by nature, does seek both beauty and knowledge, besides many things more. This instinctive hunger and thirst of man for both beauty and knowledge — or, to put it in a composite concept — for an enlightened joy — has to be satisfied. And the result is multifarious attempts at explanation and interpretation of the works of art. As we have seen earlier, this instinct of man for a composite conception — in other words, for perfection — has brought forth the contradiction mentioned earlier.

To resolve the question into its concretest form, if art is a synthetic process, how can it be subjected to analysis and interpretation; this seems to be a contradiction in terms and seems to be rather absurd. Now, this fundamental question

¹ In his notes on his 'Waste Land'.

The
is almost always ignored in any discussion of art, or its answer is simply assumed and it is granted that art is capable of both synthesis as well as analysis. In this way, we believe, much of the significance of art, as of the discussion on arts, is inevitably lost. In order to clear away the mist in this regard, we think, the question should be wrestled with and the right vision attained before any piece of art can be properly appreciated or understood. In other words, like Logic being thinking on thought, or, still better, like Epistemology being an examination of the possibility of knowledge preceding Metaphysics being the science of knowledge, thought on the possibility of interpreting the beauty of art, which is to be known as one of the most vital questions in Aesthetics, must precede any criticism of art. This, again, though only emphasizing the obvious, is a logical and aesthetic necessity.

Now, Bradley, that celebrated critic with the cool reason of a logician, has briefly indicated\(^1\) a solution to the question. He has observed, in effect, that analysis is an essential stage in the appreciation and understanding of a work of art, but that this analysis must culminate in synthesis which is the direct and immediate cause of such appreciation and understanding. This solution seems to be unquestionable; but Bradley has not elaborated upon this theme. Without going
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\(^1\) In his 'Shakespearian Tragedy'.
into fuller details, which will be exceeding the limits of our present scope, we may only say that since both analysis and synthesis issue forth from, and are the functions of, the same mind of man, there should not be any inherent or necessary contradiction between the two; in fact, analysis, though the reverse process of synthesis, may be only the handmaid to, and may lead to, synthesis. So it all comes to this that though the essential nature of art may be 'Avāñmanasagocara,' yet it is necessary and inevitable to view it with the limited categories of our thought and language and by this process the mind may perhaps ultimately attain that wonderful power called intuition which alone can directly and truly seize upon the beauty and meaning of a work of art. So, analysis may be a stepping stone to and cause of the attainment of the power of synthesis, which again, may ultimately lead to intuition, even as 'yogābhyaśa' or exercise in 'yoga' may finally lead to salvation or 'siddhi.' Thus analysis, though the reverse process of synthesis, may, after a while, cease to exist by itself and directly lead to synthesis, which is the immediate and efficient cause of the understanding and appreciation of art. In this way, the contradiction is resolved and the synthesis between analysis and synthesis is attained. This need not sound like a mysterious process, but appears to be the law everywhere in the world, life and art. This law has some parallel to the great saying in the 'Śrīmad-bhagavadvītā', viz., 'Ārurukṣor muner yogan karma kāraṇamucyate/ Yogārūḍhasya tasyaiva sāmaṅ kāraṇamucyate;' as action resolves into non-action, so analysis leads to synthesis.
This is one view of the solution to the problem. There may be another - its opposite. It may be said that the sole purpose or function of all analysis of art or poetry is its own negation, in other words, all attempts at such analysis only prove or tend to prove that such attempts are ultimately doomed to failure, that such analysis is futile and only synthesis, pure and simple, can lead to a proper understanding and appreciation of art or poetry. In this view of the matter, analysis is necessary, nay even essential, but in so far as it proves its own futility. Even though this view is accepted, there seems to be no real contradiction between this and the earlier view. In fact, the latter is contained in the former, and analysis not only proves its own futility, but also leads, by so proving, to its very opposite i.e., synthesis which is adequate to the purpose.

This is, indeed, a familiar process. Let us take an example, viz. a lightning flash to which both the creation and appreciation of art — in fact, all processes of the intuition — are so closely related. A lightning flashes forth in the sky — it is only a matter of a fraction of a second. The eye closely views it and is dazzled by it. Then when it is no more, the eye tries to see it in the imagination (or, we may call it memory, if we like). At this point modern science may come to its aid. It might have produced a vivid photograph of the lightning which the eye can minutely analyse in the still;
but if it has to recapture the original lightning as a whole it has to turn back to the imagination. Even if the photograph is a movie picture and is flashed to the screen, it cannot, in truth, exactly reproduce the original for which the eye has to fall back upon seeing in the imagination. So, analysis, by itself, cannot but, by leading to synthesis, can and does convey the beauty and meaning of art or poetry. From synthesis to analysis, and again, back to synthesis, is the whole process; that is, the poet or artist creates by synthesis, the connoisseur or critic tries by analysis, fails and then turns to synthesis and thereby becomes one, in however inadequate measure, with the poet or artist. That is the proper state of a 'sahṛdaya' or critic — incidentally, 'sahṛdaya' is a much better word than 'critic'. Thus only through and by a strenuous and earnest effort of his imagination — and not by mere analysis, or even by mere synthesis — a person can become a true 'sahṛdaya'.

Thus we see that in the field of Shakespearian criticism Coleridge is a far greater name than Bradley. Though Bradley, no doubt, was one of the foremost Shakespearian critics, Coleridge has been regarded by almost all as 'the greatest English critic on the greatest English poet'. The reason precisely lies in the fact that Bradley excelled in brilliant analysis — cold, logical analysis, Coleridge, a first-rate poet himself, revelled in a splendid and even awe—
inspiring power of illuminating synthesis — a product of his poetic imagination which could at once go into the heart of the matter and reveal its inner-most secrets. This is, we hold, criticism par excellence — creative criticism as it is so-called — somewhat akin to a parallel creation of the original. The same reason applies in the case of Goethe, Schiller, Keats, Tagore, and the like, all of whom were creative critics i.e. critics par excellence. The revealing beauty and truth of a Goethe's saying, the splendid analysis of Schiller with a shrill cry, as it were, for truth and comprehension, the enchanting and flashing utterance in a Keats's exposition and the superb and masterly treatment in Tagore's criticism unerringly pointing to the inner truth and beauty of a piece of art are glowing examples of poetic criticism at its highest. Bradley's criticism, though a recognised masterpiece in its own way, is no substitute for such elevated critical art. It is interesting to study the two styles of criticism in contrast and make one's choice. In fact, it may be observed that creative criticism stands somewhere between the original creation and its ordinary criticism and sets them apart, and to that extent it has a greater hold and sway upon the original creation than its prosaic counterpart.

We may develop the idea further and say that the concept of a 'sahārdaya', as it is generally understood, does not seem to be adequate, but needs to be supplemented. Hence, it
is not sufficient to be a 'sahṣrdaya', but one must also be a 'samāna-dharma', the concept so happily hit upon by Bhavabhūti. Only a person who is one with the poet or artist can truly see his creation and only another poet or artist can be truly at one with him. This is indeed, obvious, but, unfortunately, often lost sight of or ignored. This is, of course, another way of saying that only a 'samānadharma' can be a true 'sahṣrdaya' and others can only approach him in various degrees. The concept of a 'sahṣrdaya' is a fundamental concept and it, undoubtedly, includes the concept of a 'samānadharma' close to its heart.

Mark the word 'sahṣrdaya', which means one who has 'samāna hṛdaya' i.e. a 'hṛdaya' or heart equal to the 'hṛdaya' or heart of the poet. The word 'hṛdaya' touches the matter in its very heart and clinches the issue. There is no such revealing word in Western criticism. Thus one must at once plunge into the very heart of the poet or artist and re-create his creation. Bergson, that famous prophet of intuition, also refers to 'the kind of intellectual sympathy or, if we might say, the kind of imaginative likeness....'¹

Sanskrit critical literature also does not at all lack such examples of creative criticism. Ānāndavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Mammaṭa, etc. those some of the greatest critics of Sanskrit literature, whenever trying to untie a particular

¹ In his 'Introduction to Metaphysics'. P 7
knot in criticism (viz. in their exposition of the phenomenon of 'rasa', 'dhvani', etc.) at once cease to argue, as it were, for the moment, and go in for a poetic description of the matter—an imaginative flight into the heart of the things—which at once reveals the truth in question. Such is the case with many other master critics whether in Sanskrit literature or any other literature. This is the supreme effort of criticism and its supreme achievement. To revert to another concept—the concept of Keats that beauty and truth are the substance of poetry or art—if the creation of the poet or artist may be called beauty in truth, the creation of the critic may be called truth in beauty and thereby has truth has a tinge of beauty. Thus the artist and the critic together hold sway over the world of creative beauty and their task is mutually complimentary.

We shall cite one concrete example of creative criticism from a quite unexpected quarter, viz. Kālidāsa's famous 'Vāgarthāviva sampṛetau vāgartha-pratipattaye'. Critics of Sanskrit literature have spoken and argued volumes on the definition of poetry. One of the main points of dispute is whether word or sense or both constitute poetry. This point, among others, occupied them seriously and they never cease to argue on this. The result, though logically and philosophically interesting, may be sometimes deemed to be aesthetically barren and pointless and even philosophically unsound. Kālidāsa, who
was happily a poet and not a critic and therefore had no need of defining poetry but was content with creating poetry, uttered this immortal line in the very beginning of his greatest epic the 'Raghuvamsa'. Here we are in possession of this profoundly beautiful and pregnant line which sets at naught all critical speculations and at once reveals the truth in beauty in this matter. And this little piece of poetry is, in its essence, a critical piece of poetry, though apparently incidental to a simile brought forth in glory of his favourite and ever-united deities. The style of the poet in unfolding the mystery of Poesy, as it were, in a careless fashion does increase, all the more, the poignancy of the revelation.

We may, further, refer to another piece of creative criticism, which, besides being a great and well-known piece of critical poetry, directly points to the inexplicable nature of great art, being, as we have seen earlier, intuitive, integral and unique, of the poetry of Shakespeare, in particular, which is regarded as one of its greatest specimens, if not the greatest. Here are the famous lines of Matthew Arnold, one of the foremost critics in English literature and a renowned poet himself, on Shakespeare: 'Others abide our question - thou art free! / We ask and ask - thou smilest and art still, / Outtopping knowledge! ...' This has conclusively shown that no one can possibly pluck out the mystery of Shakespeare, besides saying in the following lines that he is a Nature's
child, Nature's darling to whom She has completely revealed Herself as to no other. While Kālidāsa's critical piece of poetry discussed above reveals the heart of Poesy, herself Arnold's critical piece reveals the Poesy of Shakespeare.

In this context, we may perhaps be permitted to quote a few humble lines of our own written on reading Wilson Knight's The Wheel of Fire, in praise of a possible intuitive understanding or appreciation of Shakespeare rather than depending on a dissection - called interpretation - of Shakespeare. Here are the lines:

//On the Dissection of Shakespeare // The splitting of the atom and the dissection of Shakespeare are twin brothers: They both have been fathered by the adultery of the conscious upon the unconscious. What is must be, and cannot be reduced to what is not. But the chain reaction is a factor to be reckoned with. While the action was a joyous creation, the reaction speaks the language of confused agony: life's term is out; death and chaos reign. While the make-believe interpretations increase the pressure, solid ground recedes; only the underwater green enchant the eye and enlivens the spirit. All that remains is what it is and what it was from the beginning; the rest melts into heavy air.//

After these preliminary considerations, we think we should now turn to another point which is closely connected with our present study. As explained earlier, the object of our present study is the poetry of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare
with special reference to their recognised masterpieces, the 'Śākuntala' and 'Hamlet'. Now, as also stated earlier, when the study of either Kālidāsa or Shakespeare is so vast, varied and complex, why then link up the two and make it all the more complicated? To state merely that no such study worth its name has been known to be made so far is no complete explanation. This rather novel attempt has to be possibly and really explained. We believe such explanation is not far to seek. Gradually, the study of a poet or his creation is done singly i.e. in isolation from other poets and their creations. When the object of a particular study is so concentrated, it has certain advantages no doubt. It is easier to handle a particular issue or problem within a limited field. This method helps dissection at its very best and makes possible a more or less detailed study of the subject matter in hand. But this very process of dissection is not very much after our heart as indicated in the preceding paragraphs. Instead of dissection and detailed analysis we are rather inclined to an enlightened overall analysis leading, if we may say so, to a synthetic, and perhaps intuitive, understanding and penetration into the very heart of our subject. But our real explanation for, what may be called, this comparative study, is yet to follow, the preceding remarks form only the basis of such explanation.

If all study must aim at a synthesis, if not also a
reconciliation, the study of a particular poet or his creation cannot remain wholly isolated from similar other studies. It has to be related, more or less, to its own kind and to a higher kind and the particular knowledge synthesized in a general one. All this is, however, universally accepted. But what we seek is to extend this principle further and make two separate studies one. In fact, we endeavour to know each better in comparison and contrast with the other and thereby we push on our knowledge further and raise it to a higher level. From this point of view, a comparative study is superior to an individual study, other things, of course, remaining the same. The 'Gītā' has, in the context of explaining knowledge par excellence, 'Avibhaktam Vibhaktasu Yajjāṇām Vidhi Sāttvikam'. 'Unity in diversity' is a two well-known phrase in the English language. Socrates, the wisest man of ancient Greece, sought, all his life, for a synthesis of all knowledge. Einstein, who may be described as the Socrates of modern science, has his 'Unified Field theory' and also his 'space-time' composite concept. Hegel's concept of 'Thesis, Antithesis and Synthesis' in an infinite series will for ever hold its majestic sway over the entire domain of thought and knowledge and the world process itself. This synthesis is the highest aim of all knowledge, and, to speak the truth, is even a matter of common knowledge. The concept of 'Sādhāraṇīkṛti' or universalisation of Abhinavagupta, if divorced from its particular context i.e. the phenomenon of 'rasa' or
aesthetic delight and is pushed further, may be found to be a ground for justification of a comparative study or a higher synthesis. In fact, synthesis — or if we may put forward as its equivalent universalisation — has at its very roots the one and the same thing, viz. an expansion of knowledge from the particular to the general.

More particularly, however, ever since Goethe, the great German poet and critic, expressed his idea of 'universal literature' and 'universal criticism', the world of critics is agog with it. There can be no truly modern criticism of poetry or art if all its considerations are confined to a particular creation thereof or its particular creator. No criticism is worthwhile if it is apiece. A truly worthwhile criticism — particularly if it is to be truly modern in this modern world of ours — has to be tied to a number of creators and their creations of the same kind or even of the opposite kind. This age-old conception and the philosopher's dream — of the unity of knowledge has lately held the domain of art and criticism in its firm grip, and it is good that it is so. Thereby a real advancement of knowledge will become possible. Indeed, the manifold multiplications of artistic creations and their immense varieties do cry hoarse for such comparison and synthesis.

Especially, again, in the case of both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare, both of whom claim to be two of the greatest poets and dramatists of the world, if not the two greatest, comparative study of
these two seem to be an absolute must. Even if Kālidāsa alone has to be studied and the value of his creations and consequently the poet's own position in the world of poetry have to be properly assessed, we have to compare, as we have seen before, his creation and himself to Shakespeare who is almost universally known as the greatest of the kind. Besides after Sir William Jones' equating Kālidāsa with Shakespeare, it has become incumbent upon us, we believe, to show how this equation is a practical proposition, indeed, based on truth and thus to re-evaluate the poetry of Kālidāsa and also to rehabilitate the poet in his true perspective. Along with this, we have also to re-evaluate the principles of literary criticism as put forth by the critics of Sanskrit literature as also of the critics of the West. To conclude, therefore, we have to say that while both Kālidāsa and the principles of literary criticism put forth by the critics of Sanskrit literature do so far shine forth merely in their isolated glory and thereby do not seem to reveal the whole beauty or secrets of either, they, when studied in the light of Shakespeare and the principles of literary criticism put forth by the critics of the West, may indicate the same in a greater measure and thus pave the way for a fuller understanding and a keener pleasure in these worthwhile matters.

1 In his Introduction to his English rendering of the 'Abhīṣa-Sakuntala'.