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CONCLUSION

As per the information received from different legends and anecdotes, Bhavabhūti and Kālidās were believed to be contemporaries and had adorned the royal courts of their respective patrons. But historical and literary evidences have already proved this idea to have been based on simple imagination. So far we have discussed in our first chapter, we have already seen that there is a big gap of around three hundred years between the periods of both the playwrights. Historically it has been deduced, basing on the records available, that Kālidās was a poet under the patronage of Chandragupta II who had assumed the title of Vikramaśāitya in 4th–5th century A.D., whereas Bhavabhūti was a protégé under Yasovarman, king of Kanauj in 7th–8th century A.D. Outwardly there is no difference between the two playwrights as both of them were court poets and were enjoying royal privileges. But inwardly there is a lot of difference between these two poets. Of all poets Kālidās was singularly fortunate. During his very lifetime his mellifluous works had earned universal praise and attained worldwide celebrity. Enjoying a considerable extent of prosperity in the golden age of India under the virtuous king, not only did he spread and elevate his literary activity but also rolled luxuriously in wealth and comfort. One of the famous verses in favour of Kālidās, written by Saḍāhala in his Udayasunvārīkathā reveals that Kāli-
Kālidāsa was a man of creative genius and of worldwide celebrity. His expression is so chaste and delicious to be substituted for nectar. His fame in the guise of poetry has reached the other shore of the ocean in the form of the solar race (1). Thus Kālidāsa had no occasion to become a victim to sorrows and sufferings. That is why we do not yet plenty of reference of tragedy, pathos and tears, in its real sense, in his works. Instead, we get a complete revelation of cheerfulness, pleasure and joy.

But the life of Ļhavabhūti was completely different. He had faced in his very life the hard realities of existence. He had to move place to place for the recognition of his intellectual pursuit. Even he had been a target of vehement criticism by his contemporary critics. During the period of his literary activity he did not earn any recognition or reputation. The reason behind his unpopularity, despite his extraordinary calibre, probably was his approach to literature which was not at all in conformity with the convention. He wanted to present himself as a reformer, for which he had to suffer a lot. A tone of disappointment in him is clearly evident from a verse of the Kālātimādha where he desperately says that he was not going to make his literary effort.
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ort for those who do not try to understand him; rather his all efforts were meant for the person of his taste and temperament in the vast universe and endless time (1). Under this difference of circumstantial background it is but natural for both the playwrights to reflect ideas and expressions differently in their respective works. It does not mean that there were no points of similarity in them. Had there been no similarity at all in them convention or literary tradition would not have associated one with the other, without any hesitation, for thousands of years. There is a good deal of points of similarity in them for which one is always associated with other; at the same time there is a good deal of points of difference in them which differentiate one from the other. Kālidās and Bhavebhūti, the two most important playwrights of Sanskrit literature, have written three plays each. Abhijnanāsākuntalam represents the culmination of Kālidās's dramatic art and Uttararāmācharita shows the excellence of Bhavebhūti's skill as a playwright. To draw a comparative estimate between them, therefore, it would be sufficient to show points of resemblances and differences between their masterpieces, of course, without thoroughly ignoring their other works. So in this chapter we shall
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है नाम श्रीमद्धु कथापरिवारोऽनुवाद
जाबलते ने विज्ञापक तनाव पुरोजनो महारे ।
उत्सर्गवेत् तु गाम जोगिक समादनेरी
काले द्यान निर्देश विपुलयो च पृष्ठी ॥
try to bring out their points of similarity and dissimilarities under the following heads.

SIMILARITIES:

(1) Both, Aâlidâsâ and Bhavabhûti are playwrights of high order. Both have drawn plots of their plays upon the great epics. When Kâlidâsâ draws upon the plot of his masterpiece from the Mahâbhârata, Bhavabhûti has dealt with the later life of Râma which is the seventh kanda of the Râmâyana. In broad outlines both the playwrights have dealt with their themes in a similar way. In both, the heroines are abandoned when they were pregnant. Both the playwrights have portrayed their heroines in a lamenting state. When deplorable state of Sâkuntâlây is observed by Duśyanta (1), the most pitiable state of Sita has been described by Tûmasâ (2). The heroes of both the playwrights are unexpectedly reunited with their queens and sons in the hermitages of the ascetics.

Both the playwrights have made important changes in the original stories in order to save their heroes from public censure. In Abhijñânasâkuntalam the playwright has tried to save the hero Duśyanta from the blame of treachery.
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Sakuntala by introducing the incident of curse. Similarly Bhavabhuti has also tried to save Rama from the blame of injustice to his beloved wife by introducing Rama's assurance, to his 'Kulaguru', to propitiate his subjects at any cost (1). Another striking point of similarity is that both the playwrights do not excuse their heroes when they go beyond the limit of tolerance. In both, attempts have been taken to bring the heroes under control through critising their wrong doings. Then Kālidāsa has expressed his indignation against Duṣyanta through the words of rebuke of Sāfragāva(2) Bhavabhuti has shown his resentment against the unjudicious behaviour of Rama through insinuation of Vāsanti (3).

(2). Both the playwrights are poet of high order. Kālidāsa has produced as good as four pieces of poetic wo-
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works such as two Mahākāvyas and two Khandakāvyas with uncommon poetic excellence. In case of Harabhūti, now, no poetic work is available at hand under his name. But both the quality and quantity of verses, found hundreds in number, in each of his plays, certify Harabhūti as a poet of uncommon skill.

(3). Both the playwrights are rich in vocabulary. We do not find any occasion when either of the playwrights under discussion is at loss for a suitable word while going to depict a situation or a character.

(4). Both the playwrights are genius. It is but natural for a successor to be influenced somehow or the other, by the predecessors. In this way we find some traces of influence of the predecessors on these playwrights. But their originality in the field of drama as a whole cannot be questioned. In this connection it is to be observed that these playwrights also have become ideal for successive dramatists.

(5). Both the authors are gifted with the power of description. By the power of description they can draw the attention of the readers and spectators. Both the playwrights have attained the state of perfection in delineating their desired sentiments.

(6). Both the playwrights have as far as possible observed the conventional rules of dramaturgy. Of course, some of the later exponents have propounded their respective theories keeping the plays of these playwrights in view.
DISSIMILARITY:

1. Introduction of Viḍūṣaka in a play:—

The most outstanding among the points of dissimilarities or contrast between Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti is the introduction of the character of Viḍūṣaka into the play. When the Viḍūṣaka, as an important character of the plays of Kālidāsa holds the strings of the action in the play, the same character of Viḍūṣaka is conspicuous in its total absence in the plays of Bhavabhūti. If one observes the role of Viḍūṣaka in the plays of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa, one cannot imagine a play in the absence of the character of Viḍūṣaka especially in a romantic play. In the plays like the Mahāvīracharita and the Uttararāmacharita the absence of Viḍūṣaka may be justified because, as the play, 'the Mahāvīracharita' is full of heroic incidents and the play Uttararāmaccharita is full of pathos and seriousness, the playwright might not have found occasions befitting for introducing the character of Viḍūṣaka, whose primary function is to rouse the sense of humour in the audience. But the absence of the character Viḍūṣaka in the Mālatimādhava, which is out and out a romantic play, really creates wonder. This shows Bhavabhūti's purposeful avoidance to the character of Viḍūṣaka in his plays. The reasons behind his purposeful avoidance of Viḍūṣaka's character may be his repugnance to make his show lighter; present a brahmin ridiculous and denigrate the standard of the play by introducing cheap elements into his play.
2. Delineation of Sentiments.

In our previous chapters and also in the introduction to this chapter we have already stated that the circumstantial backgrounds under which the two playwrights made their literary activities were quite different from each other. As a result, their attitude towards life and literature was also different from each other. This is quite evident from the point of difference in delineating sentiments in their plays. In this connection it may not be out of place to mention that it is only the experience, whether direct or indirect, of a poet which manifests itself in a sentiment. In Kalidasa's plays we observe such sentiments in abundance which normally suggest the erotic, humorous and pleasant, sight of life. Such as Snhayara, Dasya, Santa and Patsalya etc., sentiments may be his comfortable and luxurious state of life under the patronage of Gupta kings. There was no occasion for him to shed tears from heart and soul. The entire world was full of dreams for him. So he has been able to delineate the sentiment of erotics with naturalness and perfection.

But Bhavabhuti's state was totally different. He had to struggle for existence in the world of literary creativity. Due to lack of recognition of his intellectual and literary skill he was disappointed, a reference of which is clearly found in the Malatimadavasva. Thus he had experienced the hard realities which seem to represent the dark side of human life. That is
why we get plenty of occasions delineating the sentiments of Karuna, Vīra, Raudra, Vayānaka and Vibhatsa with vividness and perfection.

From Kālidāsa most striking difference in Bhavabhūti is that he propounds a theory on the sentiment of pathos. According to him Karuna (pathos) is the only sentiment in the life of a man which, as an underlying current, is present in all the other sentiments manifested in different forms. This conception of Bhavabhūti is not only a feature to differentiate him from Kālidāsa but also an invention of higher consciousness of life. Not only the conception of the sentiment of pathos but also the variety of sentiments found delineated in his plays deserves universal attention. For examples, delineation of sentiments like Vīra in all his three plays Raudra in Mahāvīracharita, Vayānaka in Rāmatīmadhava, Vibhatsa in Rāmatīmadhava and Adhunata in the "Ādīmadhava" and the Mahāvīracharita may be observed in addition to the common sentiments such as erotics, humour, tranquility etc. which are found delineated on many occasions in his plays. Thus, the points of difference between Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti in this context may be stated that when Kālidāsa is an authority on delineation of sentiments of erotic, both of union and separation, Bhavabhūti is the authority in propounding the theory of the sentiment of pathos as the only sentiment which pervades all other sentiments in the form of an underlying current. It does not mean that Kālidāsa was absolutely oblivious of
the role of pathos in human life. But the difference
is that his feeling of pathos is one sided. In Ajavilāp
and Rativilāp we find only an onesided lamentation.
In Ajavilāp man laments for the woman and in Rativilāp
woman for the man. Even in Meghadūtam, one of the fine­
est specimens of Vipralambha Śṛṇgāra, we observe that
the Yaksā laments for his beloved. But Bhavabhūti's
sentiment of pathos is full in its scope, because we find
both Rāma and Sītā suffering simultaneously for each
other as a consequence of their adverse fate. Thus, when
Kālidāsa dwells upon erotic sentiments and some other sen­
timents which are homogenous to erotics like hūṣya, vātsalaya, sānta and vīra, Bhavabhūti covers the entire ra­
nge of sentiments. He even delineates the sentiment of
opposite properties with equal force and perfection. As
a result, when Kālidāsa portrays a part, of course, one of
the most vital of human life, Bhavabhūti portrays the to­
tality of life.

(3). Characterisation :-

It is the characterisation in a play which
reveals the personality of a playwright in a comparatively
bigger scope. In this field we find a lot of differen­
ces between Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti. If we take the main
characters i.e. heroes and heroines of their masterpieces,
we find a very big difference. The hero of Kālidāsa,
Duṣyanta, is handsome, courageous and strong built. He
is even sought by God Indra for his heroism. But it is
deporable that he has a weakness for the fair sex. For
this sort of weakness and practice of polygamy the image
of hero does not remain unabated. Ka lidasc[s hero is helpful to his subjects and inmates of hermitage but is not strictly dutybound as there are occasions when he has shoton dereliction to his Kingly duties and responsibilities. For his attachment for Sahuntala he was not willing to comeback from the grove to his palace and after the cessation of the effect of curse when Dusyanta became conscious of his fault at the repudiation of Dakuntala he handed over the responsibility of his kingdom to his minister and brooded over his misfortune.

But Bhavabhuti's hero, Rama, is quite opposite to Dusyanta in many respects. Unlike Dusyanta he is strictly monogamous. His love for Sita is profound and mature as a result of long association with mutual regard and understanding. Even after banishing Sita from his mind he had in his mind slightest possible thought of loving or weding another woman. Even on the occasion of attending the horse sacrifice when the presence of his wife was a must, he preferred the golden image of Sita to another woman. He was a character to be excited by the outward beauty and charm of maidens. As a dutiful king the outward beauty of his subject he is even prepared to make the supreme sacrifice by banishing his most beloved and virtuous wife.

Thus, Bhavabhuti's hero is a model and truly representative of traditional idealism.
As regards the character of heroines also there is a marked difference between the two playwrights under discussion. \(\text{Sakuntalā of Kālidāsa is a young and delicate girl brought up in nature. Her youth is full bloom, and though unsophisticated, she is not immune to the attraction of the other sex. Her mind becomes a victim to a secret longing at the very first sight of the king. Being the daughter of a heavenly nymph, she does not display that feminine restraint and modesty that are normally expected of a hermit girl. She, though not immediately, offers herself to the king on his lustful approach and consents for marriage without waiting for the approval of her Godfather. Even she has expressed her desire to reenjoy the association of the king, of course, in an indirect way (1). As a would-be wife, \(\text{Sakuntalā is not free from jealousy towards her future co-wives. This is evident from a scene where \text{Sakuntalā says to Priyamvadā that there is no meaning in requesting the royal sage for a stay who is eager to get united with his other consorts in his harem (2). She is very much conscious of her self respect; for, when she is repudiated by the king, her pride is hurt and casting off all bashfulness she flares up with anger and fearlessly rebukes the king for his treachery. As a whole she appears to have}

1. Abhi. Sak.-III- Sakuntala
\(\text{अज़लावस्य ! साँढ़पुस्तका ! आज़वस्य ता जहाँशिव तारिपकाय} \)

2. Ibid.-III- Sakuntala.
\(\text{हां ! तर अज़लावस्य सांढ़पुस्तका राज़क्षेत्रवर !} \)
been conscious of her rights. Bhavabhūti's heroine on the other hand, presents a contrast to the character of Śaṅkuntalā. In the first act of Uttarārāmācharita the whole personality of Sītā is revealed at once. She is delicate, virtuous, lively and timid, but is deeply devoted to her husband. On hearing from Rāma that he is even prepared to abandon Sītā for the sake of pleasing his subjects, she is not at all disturbed. On the contrary, she felt elated with pride and glory for having been the wife of such a great personality. And pertinently remarked that that is why her lord is foremost among the Rādhavrīṣṇī. This only statement is enough to prove Sītā as a devoted wife. Everywhere in the whole play Sītā is presented as full of concern for Rāma. Her character as a queen or even as a mother has not been revealed at all. As a whole Bhavabhūti's heroines are not versatile in their approach. Even in Mālatīmādhava, where there is ample scope to become versatile, the heroine has been presented only as a lover who is found oscillating between emotion and duty, and in Mahāvīrācharita also the heroine has been presented as a shy and silent lover. As a matter of fact, Bhavabhūti has failed to bring out other womanly qualities which would have made the portrayal of the character of heroines realistic in nature. Of course, the justification behind his ignorance to present a full portrayal of the character of heroine may be his manly attitude and concept of refined muscular...
line superiority. This justification appears to be sound in case of Bhavabhūti because nowhere in his plays he is found to be indulged in describing scenes of sensuality and lasciviousness. As a whole the characters of Bhavabhūti are comparatively refined, grave and virtuous whose attitude towards life is based on duty and sacrifice.

(4). Idealism.

One of the objectives of literary creation is to preach idealism. The purpose behind this preaching is to elevate the moral standard of the people. But preaching of idealism is appreciable if it is presented in a realistic manner. In this connection we find a contrast in the plays of Kālidās and Bhavabhūti. In Kālidāś's play we find a robust optimism working in every sphere of life. All his characters are fortunate and happy. Adversity may appear, but the end is invariably associated with happiness and joy. In other words, Kālidāś is always found conscious of the bright side of life.

But, on the other hand we see that Bhavabhūti's attitude is different. Bhavabhūti is also equally conscious of preaching idealism. But he preaches it in a systematic manner. His characters are very much practical and realistic in their approach. There is less scope for imagination. Bhavabhūti's characters are presented to face the harsh realities of life. On this point it may be said that when Kālidāś's plays are more idealistic than realistic, Bhavabhūti's plays are more realistic than idealistic in nature.
(5). Description:

Both the playwrights are skilled in description in its usual sense. It means, as both of them are endowed with vast vocabulary and poetic skill, it is but natural for them to portray an object with vividly. But perfection does not mean that. Really perfection of playwrights depends completely upon the capability of creating dramatic scenes. In this context Kalidas’s power is really unparalleled. He creates such dramatic scenes in his plays by the power of his art and imagination that they really evoke emotion and thrill in the mind of the audience. His scenes are really picturesque, hence exciting. For examples, the scenes of the hermitage where the hermit girls are watering the trees and Dushyantha is observing hiding himself under a tree and the conversation between Dushyantha and hermit girls, in the 1st Act of Abhijnānasākuntalam; of the love smitten state of Sakuntala with her two close friends and her writing of love letter and her union with the hero in the III Act of the same play; of Sakuntalā’s separation from the lap of nature and Anca; of Sakuntalā’s repudiation of Dushyantha with his son Sarvadamana in the hermitage of Karicha; of performance of dance by Kālavikā in the palace of king Agnimitra etc. attract the audience to fix their eyes at those with rapt attention. But we don’t find this type of picturesque dramatic scene in the plays of Bhavabhūti. Of course, Bhavabhūti has tried to give a lively scene on the occasion of fight between
Parasurama and Rama, between Lava and Chandraketa and also lamentation of Rama before Vasanti in the forest of Panchavati where so many people are involved. But the proportion of the scene is so lengthy that in stead of evoking emotion it causes boredom in the mind of the audience.

Another point in this connection, may be noted that Kālidāsa's dramatic technique appears to be natural whereas that of Bhavabhūti's appears to be artificial. Both the playwrights have introduced new elements into their plays such as in case of Kālidāsa the episodes of signet ring and the episodes of Chāyāsītā (Sītā in the form of shadow) in Uttararamacarita and episodes like Surpanakha's entry into the body of Manthara and Vālī's willful fight with Rāma appear to be somewhat unnatural, hence comparatively less appealing.

(6). Style :

Another important feature of difference between the two playwrights under discussion is the literary style. When Kālidāsa adopts the style of Vaidarūhi as his way of expression Bhavabhūti adopts the style of Goudī for his expression. Of these two style one is characteristically different from the other. For his Vaidarūhi style when Kālidāsa makes use of Prasāda amī Kādhurja yuna, Bhavabhūti utilises the 'Ojas' and abnormally long compounds for his Goudī style. By the use of Goudī style Bhavabhūti covers the total range of variety in expression. This is the reason for which in Bhavabhūti's
expression sound follows the sense. Due to his full command over style, literary properties, and vocabulary, Bhavabhūti can apply language befitting to occasions. This is a rare poetic skill with which Kālidāsa was also endowed but the matter of difference lies in quantity. Kālidāsa has also established in his play, the poetic skill of sound following sense. But as, he, unlike Bhavabhūti has not delineated all the rasas in their full scope, the feature of sound following sense is not that conspicuous in him as it is in Bhavabhūti. Another point of difference in this connection is that when Kālidāsa adopts Vyanjanāvrūti (power of suggestion) Bhavabhūti resorts mainly to Abhidhāvrūti, (power of expression) while describing a particular scene in their plays. To summarise the concept we may say that when Kālidāsa's statement suggests more than it expresses that of Bhavabhūti expresses more than it suggests. As suggestion in a piece of literature is considered by the connoisseurs to be worthier than expression, the literary works of Kālidāsa may be placed comparatively at high order. (7). Dramaturgical conformity :-

It may be a fact that later authorities on dramaturgy have enunciated their canons accepting plays of playwrights like Bhūsa, Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, Śudraka, as models. Even though the dramaturgy of Hararata was in vague during the period of their literary activities still probably the contemporary critics had a lenient view on the adoption of dramaturgical canons by the
playwrights in their plays. That is why we do not find strict obedience to the canons of dramaturgy by the playwrights under discussion. But a careful observation reveals that Bhavabhuti's plays are comparatively close to the rules of dramaturgy. As Bhavabhuti had an intention to show his scholarasticity and erudition it was but natural on his part to be conscious of making use of the canons of dramaturgy as far as practicable. On the other hand it is natural for the plays of Kālidāsa to be less dramaturgical because his literary activities are based on spontaneous overflow of powerful emotion.

(8). Social Reflection.:

It is believed that literature is the mirror of the society. It means that normally a piece of literature should contain reflections of the contemporary society; and when it is a drama, where the lives of social beings are expected to be vividly portrayed, it must contain the total image of society. In this connection we may find considerable difference between the plays of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhuti. In Kālidāsa's plays we get a narrow picture of the society because those deal only with a specific portion of social order i.e. imperial life with its surroundings. We get only a picture of palace, a king with his harem and few attendants found busy in appeasing the king with all possible means. But in Bhavabhuti's play we get plenty of information regarding the contemporary society. Especially the play 'Kāliṭi-Madana' throws sufficient light on social order. The
Kingship, system of education, custom of sacrifice, celebration of festival like Madanotsava, system of marriage, the deteriorating state of Buddhism, practice of tantra; all these present a concrete picture of prevailing society.

(9). Concept of Woman. :

Even though women are the indispensable part of the society and they have an equal share with man in each and every field of life still their position fluctuates in the society depending upon the views of men on women. In this connection the role of poets, playwrights, authors, novelists, etc. is of vital importance. We find a difference in the attitude of the playwrights towards woman. In the plays of Kālidāsa we find that woman is nothing but an object of enjoyment. In all his plays heroines have been treated like objects of passion and lust. Woman, as a whole is judged by Kālidāsa only in the light of beauty, youth and enjoyments. In the eyes of Kālidāsa Sakuntālā, the heroine is a young and fully grown-up girl who is as delicate in her youthful exuberance as a flower-laden creeper. (1). We donot find woman having been given the emphasis as an indispensable partner of man.

But Gāvav̄hutī looks at woman with resp-
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ect. We find no occasion in the plays of Bhavabhuti where he has underestimated woman, rather, he has given adequate emphasis on reciprocal understanding between man and woman, as a sign of peaceful and harmonious co-existence. Bhavabhuti's Šitā has been considered such a partner of life whose obtainment is the result of good fortune (1). Bhavabhuti has not only admitted but also propounded the theory that after the marriage of husband and wife, one is everything for the other (2). If people follow this ideal, no occasion will occur for the practice of polygamy or polygamy to pollute the social order.

According to Bhavabhuti love is not dependent on external factors but is spontaneous causeless and binds the hearts together (3). It is never artificially made as seen in the plays of Kālidāsa. But if grows internally in the heart of the animate objects of nature.

(10). Didacticism:

In comparison to the plays of Kālidāsa, Bhavabhuti's plays are more didactic in nature. Kālidāsa's poetic skill was a gift from Jōdi, whereas Bhavabhuti's erudition was the outcome of his incessant efforts for learning under strict discipline.
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of knowledge made him grave and conscious of his possession of knowledge. That is why through the characters of Rama, Parasurama and Maahava, Bhavabhuti wants to recommend a stage of rigorous studentship for everybody. His high sense of duty and reverence for the elders is revealed in all his plays. Through the depiction of scenes like cemetery and delineation of sentiments like Raudra, Bhayunaka and Vibhatsa and Adbhuta, Bhavabhuti wants to preach the humanity about the hard realities of life; a human being is expected to confront. So, Bhavabhuti indirectly cautious his spectators and readers not to be overwhelmed with pleasure and enjoyments but to be restrained and disciplined so as to understand the total meaning of life. Unlike that of Kalidasa, Bhavabhuti's life itself was a lesson for the humanity, wherefrom it is learnt that it is the very nature of the society to point finger at everything reformative however precious or ideal it may be. So, at least, in the field of literary creativity a person should perform one's duty without caring for the public opinion or criticism. The time is endless and the universe is vast. Definitely someone is there, may be in our ignorance, or will be there in future to appreciate and make the literary creation, thereof, worthwhile. So, there is no reason for an author to become a victim to despondence and pessimism.

(II) INDEXED:

It is quite natural that great authors in-
fluence their successors in many ways. As both the playwrights are really great in the field of drama, it is quite obvious for the later writers to borrow ideas of expression from them. But the most interesting feature in this context is who, of the two playwrights, has influenced and made indebted to the other. We have already discussed in the first chapter, on the problem of the date and identity of the playwrights, that Kālidāsa had flourished at a period when Gupta dynasty was at its culmination and most possibly he was the protegé under the patronage of Chandra Gupta II of around 400 A.D. Also we have discussed that Bhavabhūti was the court poet of Yasovarman, king of Kanauj during the period 675 A.D to 725 A.D. From this it is evident that there is a gap of more than three hundred years between the periods of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti; the former being anterior to the latter. Thus, it is but natural for the latter (Bhavabhūti) to be influenced by the former (Kālidāsa). Moreover, Bhavabhūti, as a playwright, is found so confident of his literary skill, as a whole, that he does not even hesitate to borrow ideas and expressions from his former poets and playwrights. He is never found being afraid of repetition. Even, he does not bother if he repeats himself which is a common feature of his literary style. As a result we find some ideas and expressions which are found borrowed from works of Kālidāsa. The idea of introducing the character of Kāmandakī in Nūlātimāchāva might have been the result of the influence of
the character Pandita Kausiki in Kalidasa's Malavikagnimitram. The scene of lamentation of Madhava due to Malati's separation from him, asking the cloud to carry his message to his beloved seems to have been a direct reflection of the famous lyric of Kalidas, 'The Meghadūtam' (1). Besides, there are certain descriptions of Bhavabhūti which closely resemble the expression of Kalidasa.

**CONCLUSION:**

An analytical study on the works of both the playwrights reveals that both are poet and playwrights, of high order. Of all the Sanskrit dramatists only the two playwrights under discussion can be compared with

---

1. Meghadutta-I-10—आभारमचिवलसमस्तो भावोऽनुमोक्तानि। 
   स्वप्नयाति प्रचंडसंस्कृते विस्मयोऽस्मिन्ति। "

(ii) Meghadutta-I-10—केशवो भीतवन्निति यथाविषयमानि केतुभूतः हृदि मो 
   कृंचिन्तो! 

(iii) Abhi. Sak.-I-20—मालिवामिषि विःशेषिणां ताहेत्समतिति।

(iv) Abhi. Sak. -II-17—आभारमचिवलसमस्तो भावोऽनुमोक्तानि। 
   अन्तः प्रक्वस्वस्वगतस्वस्वात्माने भवायतु च गंगायतु भीतिसमातिति।

UHC.-IV-4—अतिकालस्वस्वभिषेकं विस्मयवतः 
   अधिकरणं स्वस्वभिषेकं विषयं व्यक्तप्रवते 
   अल्पकालः वल्लभदेवादि निरूपणं स्वाते वाङ्गम् 
   स्वस्वभिषेकमन्युन्माणिपतिः।
each other. More or less all sorts of literary merits are found present in the plays of these two playwrights. If some one is lacking in some literary element it is duly supplemented by the proportionate increase in some other element. As a whole in no way the total beauty of their works is marred. He may not find that grace and sweetness of Kālidās in the works of Bhavabhūti, but we find luxuriant and pompous description in Bhavabhūti, what is conspicuous in its absence in the works of Kālidās; both being the universally accepted literary style. He may not find Kālidāsa's that ecstasy of joy in the plays of Bhavabhūti but also we donot find Bhavabhūti's heart breaking agony in Kālidās's plays, both seem to have represented the two extremes of human expression, i.e., smiles and tears. One may be disappointed if he tries to find Kālidās's high imagination in Bhavabhūti but at the same time one may not get Bhavabhūti's gravity and seriousness. Kālidās, Kālidās, again, is great for his simplicity and tenderness. But it is also to be admitted that Bhavabhūti's state of maturity and depth is ordinarily unattainable. One may not find Kālidās's obedience to convention and tradition in Bhavabhūti but Bhavabhūti's revolutionary approach is not found in Kālidāsa. From above comparision it is evident that in many ways both the playwrights have shown their instinctive differences in the field of literature. But the dimension of literature is so vast that it welcomes and adorns both of them with celebrity and glory. Both the playwrights represent both the sections of human feelings i.e. the
smile and tear. In other words when कालिदास is a playwright of heart, Bhavabhuti is a playwright of mind. He cannot expect a moon to become a sun or a sun to become a moon but we should be contented that both are the shining treasure of the world.

- *** -