Chapter – V : Conclusion

In this research work I have endeavoured to present the working of similes and metaphors stylistically as well as literarily by adopting a comparative approach. Though there are advantages of language as an artistic material, we must not, however, forget its disadvantages. The main one is that poetic work based upon language, a historically changeable phenomenon, is more easily liable to changes after its completion than are the other works of art. Its artistic structure can be palpably disturbed and even broken down by the further development of language. What was intended by the poet to be aesthetically effective can lose its effect, while, on the contrary, components which originally remained untouched by the poet’s artistic intention can acquire aesthetic effectiveness. But such a transformation does not effect the work of Kālidāsa and Wordsworth who wrote such stylistically artistic work as their suggestiveness of figurative language still resonates as new as it must have been in their era.

I do not claim to have done full justice to the similes and metaphors and their functions in the poems selected from various texts but my intention is to show how an encompassing analytical approach can produce an interesting work for research. The model taken in the approach brings out the similarities and differences in the metaphoric language by two different writers of two different languages. It is a truism, of course, that no method can guarantee an interpretation. At most, it can assure an open, articulate, and transferable kind of analytic procedure. Though it may not yield significant results when applied to Wordsworth’s and Kālidāsa’s poems, yet the quoted examples co-operates with the method because there is harmony between the curious impersonality of these ‘descriptives’ or ‘nature’ poems and the desired impersonality of structural-semantic analysis.

Though metaphors and similes are not a mode of language but a mode of thought yet the way these have been employed in the description of Nature by both Wordsworth and Kālidāsa in their works is an endearing job to show as to how these communicative structures interact to provide an intricate piece of poetry. The study
also shows the vast visions of the poets in relation to language and literature and this motivated the investigation of the connection between language structure and language processing.

As discussed earlier, linguistic function of metaphors and similes is to explain and generate meanings whereas conceptual function is to embody ideas, communicative function is to convey a message, and interpretative function is to enjoy appreciation. And I have compared the Oriental and the Occidental view-point in this regard. The results are interesting not only for the reader of language, but also for the reader of literature; not only for the reader of English language, but also for the reader of Sanskrit language; not only for the reader of the West, but also for the reader of the East exhibiting how visions of a writer can work wonders in comparison to the other one while writing a piece of poetry on the same topic i.e. Nature.

None can deny this fact that the more suggestive the poetry is, the more it is beautiful and it is also an established fact that associations and implications make the poem subtle and beautiful. But in order to be effective, associations must be generally comprehensible. When a reader fails to appreciate a poem fully, it is because some of the associations are not affecting him or associations have become unfamiliar with the passage of time. Both Wordsworth and Kalidāsa have different ways of looking at the objects of Nature. Nevertheless, the selected examples show that nowhere does Nature unfold so readily its inaccessible beauty as it does in the works of Wordsworth and Kalidāsa.

To start with, Wordsworth depicts the romantic and sensuous aspect of Nature in the first simile “Her eyes as stars of Twilight fair” in Chapter 3.3.1. He identifies eyes with natural object “stars”. The fourth example of Kalidāsa “Adarah kisalayaragah . . .” in Chapter 4.3.1 also gives a typically romantic and sensuous simile. Both the examples have ‘sight’ and ‘sensory’ experience in common. Both the poets exhibit their wealth of observation and imagination, sense of propriety and proportion, originality of conception and grasp of the essential points of comparison. The striking feature is not only the exquisite charm of the similes but the poetic eye of
both the poets perceive even in commonplace things a rare beauty which, being
hidden from ordinary sight, remains unheeded by us.

Besides, to whom are not familiar the stars, the twigs, the branches of the
creeper, the flowers? But it is left to both these poets to combine them with a beautiful
whole and connect it with the eyes of Mary Hutchinson or Anne Vallete (in respect of
Wordsworth) and with the lips, arms and youth of Šakuntalā when she was standing
in the garden (in respect of Kālidāsa). At the outset, both the similes seem to be
similar as far as similarity of comparison is concerned. But the depth of insight of
Kālidāsa is perceptible in the word “latāsanāthaḥ”, the primary meaning of which is
“with the husband” and secondary meaning is “along with or with the support of”.
This gives a metonymic tint to the simile. Kālidāsa has depicted saffron tree (Kesar
Vṛksa) as husband (Dusyanta) and creeper (latā) as wife (Šakuntalā) because there
is a proverb in Sanskrit that creepers, women and poets do not shine unless they have
the support of a tree, a husband and a king respectively. Here, to speak stylistically,
one word works as a qualisign and generate new meanings.

Again, Wordsworth makes a deliberate comparison of Moral Truth (example
iv) with the natural object “water-lily”. In this simile the attributes (being fixed at root
and floating at top) of the water-lily are transposed on an abstract idea. Therefore,
there is a comparison of the abstract with the concrete. Nevertheless, it projects the
keen pictorial power of the poet. The first example culled from Kālidāsa in Chapter
4.3.1 also takes land-lotus as an object of comparison for the eyes of Yaksini. He also
develops the simile on the attribute of the land-lotus making it picturesque. The
grammatical as well as semantic cohesion is accurate and appropriate in Kālidāsa
whereas in Wordsworth, the choice of the subject weakens the semantic juncture. The
pragmatic congruity is compromised to prolixity. Here, he loses control over
language.

Another object “cloud” is commonly found in both the poets. Kālidāsa invests
it with celestial quality and with divinity. The cloud is the subject and is compared
with Lord Viṣṇu (God) in the second example of 4.3.1. Mythologically rich and
loaded with the cultural values of India, a simile is thus produced. In Wordsworth,
‘cloud’ is an object of comparison for the subject “the old Man” (example, ii). Though the poet has tried to invest the old man with a universal appeal yet certainly it is not so rich in its association as it is in Kālidāsa. I will like to add here that even in the famous poem “I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud”, the poet compares himself with the cloud. But as Wordsworth has himself has said that scenes alone cannot make poetry, it is the feeling (imagination) which animates and empowers the creative sensibility. Therefore, though the object ‘cloud’ platforms itself as a universal icon in Wordsworth, yet the depth of import is not the same as in Kālidāsa.

Further, Wordsworth presents the moon as a child couched in a rocking cradle in the metaphor “The moon in splendour . . .” (example, iv) whereas Kālidāsa also compares a child’s growth (Pārvatī) with the crescent moon gaining splendour day by day (example, iii). Though both the poets take the moon as an object of Nature for depiction yet the identification made by Wordsworth between the moon and a child and the comparison made by Kālidāsa between the growth of Pārvatī as a child and the growth of the crescent moon (of Śuklapakṣa) is an adequate proof for the newness of meanings given logically. But this newness in the meaning in respect of Kālidāsa is the potentiality of using the word in a manner that it, with its own light, illumines the waves of new meanings like eternal word and eternal meaning. Stylistically seen, the power solidarity of the words of Kālidāsa is much more than Wordsworth. Wordsworth does touch suggestion in this metaphor but his words do not ring continuously like a bell with its vibration in continuum. In Kālidāsa, the object becomes profoundly suggestive and the reverberation (dhvani) is continuous.

It is also remarkable that both the poets have an ear for the sounds of Nature. In Wordsworth, the simile “my boat went heaving . . . a swan” (example, iii), “swan” is the object of comparison which is also traceable in a metaphor from Kālidāsa (example, i) in 4.3.2. Whereas in metaphoric structure selected from Wordsworth, the attributes of a swan are transferred to a boat and implicitly as well as metaphorically to the boy (Wordsworth), but in Kālidāsa swans themselves become ornaments along with their attributes and their cry becomes a suggestion of the yearning of lovers. The precision of connotation, therefore, varies in Wordsworth and Kālidāsa. The word
“heaving” is metaphoric but it permeates till the level of connotation (lakṣaṇā) and even the verb “dip”, which works in the context to connect concomitant absolutes and affectives, gets polarized and do not reach plurisignation. On the contrary, in Kālidāsa, words like “raśanā” and “nalinyāḥ” become plurisign and hold multivalent meaning. Hence, there is a progression from the level of connotation to the level of suggestion.

I have also taken a musical metaphor for illustration. Wordsworth in “The cataracts . . .” (example, i) identifies the cataracts with musicians. This example also manifests the case of personification. The language shows connotative fullness and tensive aliveness. The metaphor is impregnate with delightful imagery and suggestion. Similarly, Kālidāsa transforms the Himalaya as a dext musician (example, ii). In Kālidāsa, it again suggests the cultural values and ethics with subtlety whereas in Wordsworth, this note is missing though the expression is subtle and finely developed.

Additionally, it cannot be overlooked that Wordsworth’s supervening memory meddles in and becomes the tissue of his nature poetry. In the metaphor “a sky . . .” (example, ii), it is the poet’s mind and his poetic creativity which are the subject of comparison with the objects of Nature. But metaphor from Kālidāsa (example, iii) shows that Nature is a fine lady who adorns herself and this too is done by natural objects. Hence, Nature in Kālidāsa is all pervasive, in every word, in every line of his poetry.

This shows that the description of Nature of both these writers is quite different and opposite. Wordsworth does not write poetry with the view – ‘art for art’s sake’ but uses it purely as a defense reaction to strange sympathies and apocalyptic stirrings. It is here that his views of Nature germinate. Nature’s touch, sounds, sights etc. keeps Wordsworth from falling into void. As a result, Nature becomes the second best, a substitute heaven; and the object of Wordsworth’s nature poems is not Nature but the “one dear Presence” lost yet perhaps recoverable. In Kālidāsa, love of nature is a spiritual passion. Nature represents the divine-harmony, divine-rhythm and divine-balance.
Therefore, one talks of external beauty, while the other of internal i.e. Wordsworth remains confined to earthly side (external), whereas Kālidāsa is more elaborate and explores the way to spiritualization. Wordsworth sees God in Nature but for Kālidāsa Nature is God herself which is quite glaring from the use of metaphoric language in the cited examples, meaning thereby that Nature paves the way to introspection to inner-self and conveys a message towards spirituality. Inspite of Wordsworth’s famous love of Nature, his attitude to it is transcendental rather sacramental.

Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that while writing a piece of work of art, a writer has to consume himself so that he may be able to illumine his readers. This consummation actually works to bring out excellence in a work of art and in this respect both Kālidāsa and Wordsworth lost no effort and endeavoured much to produce an artistry par excellence. As far their use of language is concerned, there is no doubt that we find filigree piece of art in their writings. The amount of analysis gathered in this study is sufficient to allow reliable conclusions. This comparative study shows some unexpected differences in the stylistic approach employed by Wordsworth and Kālidāsa.

It is noteworthy that generally one resorts to metaphor and simile to fill a semantic void. But Wordsworth often tries to literalize metaphor and simile. When observed minutely with the eye of a stylistician, the fact remains that the ‘naked simplicity’ is resigned for the sake of vividness. To understand Wordsworth’s style, one has to precisely understand the relation between textuality and referentiality. The archaic or trivialized fragments of high style, are naturalized in a way that remains undramatic and even, at times, awkward. The peculiarity of his later style speaks of his ambivalent attraction to Classical figures including personification and metaphor which had remained masked in his diction before.

A single example of Wordsworth’s simile in 3.3.1 demonstrates that he was dext in the art of metaphoric articulation. This simile is an example of Annyonyopamā (simile of multitude) according to Indian Ālanṣkāraśāstra. The “eyes” are compared to “stars of Twilight in line-5. The object of comparison is metaphoric as “of
"Twilight" stands as a genitive link. This brings a double metaphoric content in the simile. He uses the Noun in line-6 to make yet another simile: "Like Twilight’s, too, her dusky hair". Dandin explains this type in his Kavyadarśa “Tavanānamivambio mukham” (II/18) i.e. Like your face is the lotus; like the lotus is your face. Linguistically evaluated, in this simile “Her eyes as stars of Twilight fair”, Wordsworth gives the expression A = B of C whereas in the fourth example of Kālidāsa, the expression is straight and clear-cut A = B. All the sub-tenors and Vehicles also follow this pattern.

Wordsworth uses metaphors and similes of depth and of immanence to describe the act of memory. His favourite genitive link is “of” which he uses for identity proportionately more than other English poets. Wordsworth calls a thing by another name, apologetically, as it were, with explanatory apposition, even when the change is not at all startling. He effects the change with “of” which is pleasingly ambiguous in expressions such as “the leaves/Of a tall ash”, “summit of the waving tree”, “impulse of the breeze” and also “stars of Twilight”.

Copula “to be” is used only for banalities because he does not like using it though it is strong enough to carry any illogicality. A list of other verbs in all the cited examples is as under:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Stand = vi., vt.</td>
<td>Call = vi., vt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hear = vi., vt.</td>
<td>Move = vi., vt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rise = vi., vt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Retain = vt.</td>
<td>Thrive = vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Blow = vi., vt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mock = vi., vt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stand = vi., vt.</td>
<td>Rock = vi., vt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This shows that the verbs can be used as transitive and intransitive and Wordsworth prefers the transitive use which more directly anchors the metaphoric imagery.

He likes the adjectives usually for humanizing and is more fond of the personifying possessive adjectives or pronouns: “Her eyes”, “my oar” “my boat”, “their trumpet”. He has the highest percentage with the indefinite article (even as compared to other English writers): “a cloud”, “a swan”, “a steadfast shape”, “a thing”, “a sky”, “a steady morning”, “a tall ash”, and very much avoids the assumed recognition of the definite article which is evident in the example “a sky that ... morning”. He also makes extended metaphoric structures as: “Moral truth is no mechanical structure ... waves”, “welcome light ... morning” and “The moon ... breeze”. It is interesting to note that he got rid of some auxiliaries which tend to weaken his sentence in general as well as in passivization as in the example “The moon in splendour couched among the leaves...”

Kālidāśa, as the analysis of the selected examples speak of, uses Nominal style since Verbal style in Sanskrit makes use of infinitives. It is noteworthy that Nominalization is a matter of style on the part of Sanskrit writers which it could not be in any language which lacks a true verb. The fundamental distinction between noun and verb is semantic, not formal. This nominal style makes extensive use of compounds. This fondness of compounds mark the literary writers — poets, storytellers, and sometimes dramatists. This nominalization in Sanskrit is possible (a) because of the wealth of suffixes by one or the other of which an abstract noun can be formed from any part of speech, and (b) because “to be” in either meaning, can be elided. Kālidāśa, linguistically seen, has used this style but he has not used cumbrous compounds. His language has lucidity. He neither uses far-fetched conceits nor is his vocabulary obscure and abstruse.

Even when it comes to metre, Wordsworth is sometimes led astray into adopting intricate meters extremely difficult to manage but scarcely musical to the ear, by his love of making a show of his metrical skill. Moreover, on re-reading his work, he detected many a jingle or inharmonious phrases and for the sake of euphony altered ‘betwixt’ to ‘between’, ‘itself’ to ‘herself’, and ‘which’ to ‘that’, whenever it
could be done without confusing the sense. In case of the Prelude, for thirty-five years Wordsworth went back to the Prelude, retouching and revising; whereas Kālidāsa has no such vanity; he is rather keen that both sound and sense must flow together smoothly and in harmony. In that keenness lies his sense of metrical skill. With others metrical skill is tantamount to mechanical skill, with him it is skill in adjusting the flow of sound to the movement of sense. Kālidāsa is very careful to see that his expression has a soft musical flow where the tongue may not stumble; hence he does not fall into the error of using harsh forms to show off his erudition. He does not delight in perplexing his reader. In Kālidāsa, there is nothing expletive, every syllable is replete with sense.

There is no doubt that figurative language operates through the labour of the spirit. And it stands truer for Kālidāsa than it is for Wordsworth. Kālidāsa has elegance of thought and expression, fineness of sentiment and imagination. It is well known that thought in poetry is manifested in two ways – as outer and as inner meaning. The inner meaning of poetry is embodied in its suggestive, figurative language. The inner meaning is closely related to the expression of the moods and attitudes of the poet. These moods and attitudes, in their turn, suggest the vision or the intuitive perception that the poet has sought to embody in the poem. Outer meaning plays a transparent, semi-transparent or opaque role in poetry. It fulfils itself supremely when it becomes a transparent vesture for the inner meaning, while, at the same time spelling out the poet’s philosophy or narration. If it becomes semi-transparent or opaque and starts obscuring the inner meaning of poetry, it becomes a detrimental factor hindering the supreme fulfillment of the poetic process.

In this regard, Wordsworth has inconsistency of style while Kālidāsa has a smooth flow. In Wordsworth, his poetic style rises to highest poetic raptures and at other times he descends to the level of dullness. As Wordsworth advanced in age, his poetic vision and inspiration dulled; his later, more rhetorical, moralistic poems cannot be compared to the lyrics of his youth. Wordsworth himself admits in the Prelude, Book-IV:
“The poet’s soul was with me” (1 – 41)

and also in Peele Castle, that he has lost his poetic power:

“The power is gone, which nothing can restore;
A deep distress hath humanized my soul.” (1 - 35–36)

When inspiration was on the poet, he produced fine poetry but when he wrote just for writing poetry, he produced dull and uninspiring work.

In the second example (Resolution and Independence) of Chapter-3.3.1, Wordsworth is shaping intuitions on the margins of language. Words do not incarnate meaning in the Leech Gatherer’s case; rather, they act as enigmatic signs towards barely graspable significance. The syntax becomes equivocal. Wordsworth tries to create dialogic effects which allow the poet and the reader to explore different perspectives. Nevertheless, the choice of words makes the expression less substantial. So here, language as style hinders the inner meaning and becomes almost opaque. The fourth example (The Excursion) rests on a far-fetched conceit and here language becomes semi-transparent. But in the first example (She was a Phantom of Delight) of 3.3.1 and the third example (The Prelude) of 3.3.2, language becomes almost transparent.

In Kalidāsa, language becomes natural and transparent. He writes in the style called Vaidarbhi, in which, the outer meaning is just a transparent garb. Roman Jacobson in his paper Linguistics and Poetics confirms that Old Indic and Medieval Latin literary theory distinguishes between “two poles of verbal art, labelled in Sanskrit as Pančāli and Vaidarbhi and correspondingly in Latin as ornatus difficilis and ornatus facilis, the latter style evidently being much more difficult to analyze linguistically because in such literary forms verbal devices are unostentatious and language seems nearly a transparent garment” (Weber 31). This stands true for Kalidāsa’s style.

Therefore, it is interesting to note that Wordsworth follows language whereas in the case of Kalidāsa, language follows him. Wordsworth has used the technique of repetition to obtain semantic impregnability and polisemity of words. His word-
pictures sometimes attain sharpness but then again fall back blunt. Wordsworth was aware that he is not so dext with words as with thoughts. He speaks in The Prelude:

```
"I was a better judge of thoughts than words,
    Mislead in estimating words, not only
    By common inexperience of youth,
    But by the trade in classic niceties,
    The dangerous craft of culling term and phrase
    From languages that want the living voice
    To carry meaning to the natural heart;"
```

(Book- VI, L - 106- 114).

Nevertheless, the “subtle intercourse” of spoken language, its submerged metaphors, its quietly syntactic power presents the expansion of the poetic mind beyond its first impression and his manuscript revisions also suggest radical metaphoricity rather than mastery.

Kālidāsa, on the other hand, has a vast repertoire of words and does not use the same word again and the choice is more apt and suggestive. Linguistically evaluated, Kālidāsa chooses his words not only in regard to their literal, indicative and their suggestive senses, but also with an eye to their gender, case-inflexion and number which harmonize with and nourish the implied meaning. The analysis of the selected examples speaks of it. The terseness of expression easily arrests the attention. The lively touch of imagination and feeling which he imparts to the world he describes may often transfigure it, may often elevate and glorify it, but does never misrepresent and distort it. The word-paintings which Kālidāsa has drawn with his enchanting pen are not conventional and stereotyped description but original, strikingly new and forever fresh. They create a complete metamorphosis in linguistic expression.

Another perspective of their similarity and dissimilarity of poetry and as poets is that Kālidāsa is first and foremost an original poet than something else whereas Wordsworth had the effect of Milton, Spencer, Chaucer and Shakespeare and he is a poet by imitation and consequently, less original. Wordsworth is no doubt a great poet but originality is not the same thing as greatness. In some ways the two qualities are
alike and they are most alike when originality comes not from being born original, or
achieving originality, but from having it forced on a man by pressure of what he sets
out to do and the obstacles to be overcome. Wordsworth kept revising his poetic work
(in order to make it more perfect) thereby defeating his own theory and strengthening
the idea that he made himself a poet and was not a born genius. To cite some
examples from the Prelude:

i) The feeble statement:

"Where good and evil never have that name,
That which they ought to have, but wrong prevails.
And vice at home."

(Book-IX, 1 - 352-354)

is strengthened to:

" Where good and evil never have that name,
And thirst for bloody spoils abroad is paired
With vice at home."

ii) The delicate simplicity of:

" Lay listening to the wild flower and the grass,
As they gave out their whispers to the wind

(Book-VI, 1 - 221-222)

was rejected, giving place to:

" Catching from tufts of grass and hare-bell flowers
Their faintest whisper from the passing breeze,"

Therefore, both greatness and originality were forced on Wordsworth because he
wished to be both a Teacher and a Poet, and because of the inherent tension between
these two aims, between the kinds of teaching and the kinds of poetry established in
the time upon which he fell. By their nature, these tensions could be resolved only by
originality, and by their acuteness they ensured that this originality would bear the
marks of greatness.

Kālidāsa is such a poet who serves as the basic modal for the Sanskrit
Kāvyāśāstra. He remoulded the tastes of the people towards cosmic and universal
delight in his literature. He evolved his ideas, symbols and spiritual values from the
riches of the past and colour, fragrance and character from the synthesized philosophies and religions of his age. Aesthetic delicacy and sublimity of Indian mind are at their peak in Kālidāsa. In him, language flows like water of a spring. In his similes and metaphors neither Nature is misrepresented, nor persons belittled, nor objects turned to mockery. The similes and metaphors in the cited examples do accurately reflect the aptness and appropriateness of the occasion. He never makes fishes talk like whales or whales like fishes rather these reveal his poetic genius and have earned him the fame that in this field he is a past master and remains unsurpassed (Upumā Kālidāsasya).

The eye of Kālidāsa carries with it everywhere the strong traces of its widely read Vedas, Upamishads, Philosophies, Rhetorics, Politics, Kamasutra etc. Like a cut diamond formed into reflecting and refracting facets, the language is so chiselled and moulded so as to express and suggest a richness of sense like a river sparkling in the sun is conceived as a pearl-necklace and a black cloud hanging over its surface as its central gem of glossy blue colour. To use Jakobson’s term Kālidāsa’s similes and metaphors have ‘palpability’ (1967, 302) of the sign i. e. density of aesthetic meaning which is achieved by metaphoric iconicity. Therefore his similes and metaphors increase the volume of perception of readers.

The root of the basic difference, nevertheless, lies in the vision of both the poets. Vision is the intuitive perception. It is the raison d’etre of poetry. Poetry without vision can be clever, even brilliant. But it begins and ends as an intellectual activity, a glimpse of the cerebral cortex. There is poetry of wit, of the intellect, and there is poetry conceived in the soul. The poetry of wit is also one of the kinds of poetry and we can enjoy it. But what moves us and elevates us is the poetry conceived in the soul, which comes as heart-easing utterance, and prepares us for a new and unexpected revelation of Reality based on metaphoric language.

The poetry of the Romantics is full of visionary gleams. Some passages in Wordsworth’s Prelude, Coleridge’s ‘Kubla Khan’, Shelley’s ‘The Question’, Keats’ ‘Sleep and Poetry’ – all these and similar poems draw, not only their inspiration but
also their imagery from the Higher Mind. There are five kinds of poetic vision as described by Sir Aurobindo (qtd. in Gokak, Ch.IV):

1. Insight: It is to see into the springs of human character, the principles that govern human activity and the artistry of circumstances, eg: Chaucer’s Doctor of Physics in ‘The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales’.

2. The intimacy of vision. It is direct soul-utterance. Whether it is sadness, enthusiasm, or delight, it wells out from the depths of being and is the product of what Sri Aurobindo calls “a psychic inspiration”.

3. Illumination: It is to apprehend the many facet nature of his theme, or to capture the essence of it in the most vivid image on image, eg. Shelley’s ‘Ode to a Skylark’.

4. Poetic intensity: It is the intuitive identity that the vision establishes with the archetype or basic principle underlying objects, eg. Wordsworth’s ‘Simpleton Pass’ or Keats’ meditation on ‘Grecian Urn’.

5. Vastness of Vision: It is the result of the poet’s intuitive identity – with a whole aspect of cosmos, infinity or eternity, eg. Milton’s Second Book of ‘Paradise Lost’.

Wordsworth achieved this vastness of vision while describing the bust of Newton installed in the hall in St. John’s College Cambridge in ‘The Prelude’:

“ The marble index of the mind for ever
     Voyaging through strange sea of thought, alone.”

In the fleeting moments of his vision, the poet’s vision penetrates very deep and far, and the degree of his penetration is measured by the range of the poet’s thought or intelligence. The mind must rise above the realm of existence to the realm of Being, and this can only be achieved by vision. Though Wordsworth achieved the vastness of vision, the saga of his life did not let him rise above existence into the realm of Being whereas Kālidāsa could rise above existence into the realm of Being. Therefore, Wordsworth’s style, poetry and philosophy leads him to Dualism whereas Kālidāsa’s style, poetry and philosophy leads him to Monism. Apart from the
Ramayana and Mahabharata, very few poets could rise to this level of achievement. Kalidasa did achieve it after these epics.

The concept of comparison of language as well as vision can be clear from the concept of motion in a vehicle involving both source and target. The ride of roller-coaster and air travel can easily exhibit the difference between the two. Wordsworth is like a roller-coaster and Kalidasa is like an air travel involving the specific value of the quality of travel though both endeavoured to reach the motto of Satyam Shivam Sundaram.

To conclude, it can be said that the great poet is the man who possesses an intuitive mastery of the rules that are obligatory within his own poetic tradition and language, but who also can manipulate these rules in accordance with his own artistic intentions and who can surpass the limits prescribed by his tradition. The above comparative study as well as the whole work produced by Wordsworth and Kalidasa undoubtedly exhibit that Wordsworth is bound to write poetry within his own set restrictions whereas Kalidasa manipulated the rules in accordance with his own artistic intentions. He did not glorify language rather language itself was glorified. Even the noted grammarian Pāṇini describes his flaw, if any, as an exception in the corresponding rule and not as a fault.

In Kālidāsa language seems to function in a constructive way creating new reality more in line with the alamkrota iti alamkāra much more than Wordsworth. The metaphoricity of Kālidāsa is both "emphatic" (irreplaceable) as well as "resonant" (rich in its implications) because its form of reference is intentional (that is, specific to a concrete situation and context). Herein, the language fulfils a "creative-cognitive" function: it expresses novel cognitive content that would otherwise be impossible to formulate and thus leads to an emergence of new meaning. Herein, language bridges the gaps between experience and thought, between imagination and concept and between the new and the known. The synthetic power in Kālidāsa, being the iconicity of the language, selectively evokes sensory perceptions and integrates them into meaningful constellations. Conceptualization of experience
and the linkage of new to prior experience have come together more in Kālidāsa than in Wordsworth.

Again, though it is the common broad consideration of writing on Nature, of course, which establishes the deeper similarity between the two poets yet the manner of seeing nature and the manner of describing it is not, after all, the central theme of both these poets. The central theme is the contrast between the quality of viewing Nature as it is and in idioms of thought, feeling and language. The description of Nature in Kālidāsa is natural whereas in Wordsworth it is “naked” and “barren”. The imagination of Kālidāsa surpasses the limits of time, space and place, the mind’s eye and the cosmos itself and in Wordsworth, it does not go beyond the world itself for he sees God in Nature whereas for Kālidāsa Nature is God itself.

It will not be out of place to say that both the writers had competence, which includes both linguistic knowledge and ability for its use, but the performance is different and distinguished. Wordsworth’s poetry records the crisis of thought and feeling, a hanging between all the time to justify the theory of poetry and the poetic language with a futile effort as he was writing for parāntah sukhāya whereas Kālidāsa’s poetry reveals the cardinal and kernal element of Satyam, Śivam, Sundaram as he was writing for saśvāntah sukahāya. Nevertheless, let it be left to the enlightened connoisseurs to establish the supremacy of excellence of Wordsworth over Kālidāsa or the vice-versa as both of them are not of an Age but for all Ages, and not for one nation but for all Nations.