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ABSTRACT

Widely separated by time and cultural heritage as they are, Kālidāsa's Abhijñānaśakuntalā and Shakespeare's Tempest offer valid grounds for comparison. Both are romantic tragicomedies that explore the themes of loss, re-union, and forgiveness. The actions of both plays revolve round noble lovers, both have young and innocent heroines brought up far away from the society of ordinary people, and both are set in remote lands. An even more striking similarity lies in the use that Kālidāsa and Shakespeare make of supernatural elements. Not only do the plays show strange happenings made possible by the supernatural overriding the ordinary laws of nature, but tragedy is averted and a happy conclusion brought about in each play through supernatural agencies. We find on examining the movement of the action of the respective plays that supernatural occurrences provide the impetus for all significant turns of the events in each play. The supernatural is thus the major instrument of plot construction in both plays.

The status of the supernatural is, however, not the same in the plays. The Tempest abounds in spectacular displays on the stage, with supernatural beings performing amazing deeds at Prospero's command. In Abhijñānaśakuntalā on the other hand, the workings of
the supernatural may be marvellous, but no magical events actually take place before the spectator's eyes. The difference between the plays is in fact much deeper. In *The Tempest* the supernatural is entirely under man's control and seems to exist only for the sake of man. By contrast, in *Abhijñānasākuntalā* it is autonomous and represents a scheme of existence, of which human life is only the visible, not the most important, part. *The Tempest* necessarily implies that the supernatural is a power alien, perhaps even inimical, to man who must subdue it and through it subdue nature. *Abhijñānasākuntalā* emphasizes rather the co-existence of man, nature, and the supernatural. *Abhijñānasākuntalā*, therefore, has a breadth of vision that implies a metaphysical sense of the unity of existence, which is lacking in *The Tempest*. But through its anthropocentric perspective *The Tempest* focusses attention upon man as a creature responsible for his own fate, and thus achieves greater dramatic tension in the presentation of human action than we find in *Abhijñānasākuntalā*. 
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Chapter I

THE TEMPEST AND SAKUNTALĀ: A CASE FOR COMPARISON

Over a century ago, Sir Monier Williams, the Indologist, called Kālidāsa "the Shakespeare of India" in the preface to his edition of Sākuntalā, published in 1876. Since then, in the East as well as in the West, Kālidāsa and Shakespeare have often been compared as the foremost literary figures of their respective cultures. From this comparison critics have been frequently led to the comparison of the Elizabethan and the Sanskritic cultures and even to broader comparative views of East and West.

Of all their works, Kālidāsa's Sākuntalā and Shakespeare's Tempest seem to be particularly well-suited for comparison. Both are romantic dramas built around the theme of reconciliation; both portray young and noble lovers who fall in love at first sight; both have innocent heroines who are brought up far away from the society of ordinary people; both are set in secluded areas away from royal courts which, however, provide in both cases many of the motivating factors. Equally interesting and, from the point of view of cultural history, significant is the fact that both plays show supernatural agencies at work.

Several critics have tried to sharpen the comparison between Kālidāsa and Shakespeare by evaluating particular aspects
of their literary practice and achievement. Among such studies, Rabindranath Tagore's remains the most perceptive. It has the further interest of being quite specifically concerned with *The Tempest* and *Sakuntalā*. For Tagore, the most important grounds for comparison are, first, the common theme of reconciliation, and next, the innocence of the young heroines. Tagore's comments are essentially directed at the ethical and aesthetic impact of the plays. As he does not address himself to elements of structure or problems of stagecraft, he is silent on the presence of the supernatural, which I shall attempt in this study to identify as one of the major structural components of each play.

As Tagore sees it, and in this he differs from some of the previous comparativists, the two dramas belong to cultures mutually so exclusive that their ultimate effects and the messages they bear remain wholly different. In *Sakuntalā* there is a harmonious blend of the world of nature with the human world, and parallels for human qualities and even for social relationships are found in nature. Nature in *The Tempest*, says Tagore, is not in tune with human beings and is frequently hostile. In Tagore's view, Shakespeare shows in *The Tempest* man's efforts to subdue nature. Furthermore, the essential difference between Kālidāsa and Shakespeare is, for Tagore, the difference in their approaches to human relationships. He believes that Kālidāsa shows his characters achieving peace through self-examination and self-restraint; on the other
hand, Shakespeare shows, at least in *The Tempest*, people struggling with external forces and conquering them in order to impose their will on human and natural environments. Tagore believes that the refusal of Śakuntalā by Duṣyanta, their separation and the repentance of the king are inevitable results of their impulsive actions at the beginning of the play. Ferdinand's suffering, on the contrary, says Tagore, is merely physical, as Prospero only wanted to test Ferdinand's love for Miranda. Tagore perceives in Śakuntalā the serenity of selfless love and renunciation which gives it a sublime tone. He finds by contrast a much greater play of passions in *The Tempest*, which he sees also as a celebration of man's conquest over nature through intelligence rather than man's oneness with the universal soul.

Several critics of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare have taken note of the supernatural in their works. Mayadhara Mansinha, author of a detailed comparison, comes to the conclusion that the supernatural and the natural both exist in Śakuntalā on the same plane and that supernatural elements "do not influence the destinies of the characters at all." He argues that Shakespeare, on the other hand, uses the supernatural as a projection of the psychological forces controlling human destiny. He thinks that Shakespeare believed in the existence and the power of providence but did not see any need to involve God or providence directly in the petty problems of the human world.
Mansinha is right in saying that nature and the supernatural exist in *Sakuntalā* on the same plane and that the supernatural has not been given any psychological significance by Kālidāsa. But his claim that supernatural elements do not influence the destinies of the characters at all seems strangely neglectful of the text, for the tragedy that over­takes *Sakuntalā* and Duṣyanta is a consequence of the curse of Durvāsas. At the same time, we also see that the destiny of the characters is shaped by the general design of the gods, which is revealed at the end of the seventh act of *Sakuntalā*, a design that leads to the re-union of the lovers. As mentioned above, Mansinha also believes that in Shakespeare supernatural happenings are symbolizations of psychological forces and factors. This view, taken from Walter Raleigh, leads Mansinha into speculations about Shakespeare's belief in God. From this point on, his comparison of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare becomes a theological essay and loses its relevance for the present study.

Commenting on the supernatural in Sanskrit drama in general, M.M. Sharma argues that the use of the supernatural is directed at creating a sense of wonder and a measure of surprise in the spectator. He reminds us that, according to Sanskrit literary theoreticians, dramatic poetry was expected to generate an awareness of either heroism or of romantic passion supported by feelings of wonder, this last being indispensable. Sharma tells us that the supernatural was used
by Kālidāsa and others to create this sense of the marvellous. In another article, Sharma discusses the supernatural and the wonderful and, by some strange logic, concludes that when an unnatural event is explained as the working of the extraordinary power of a sage, as in the case of Kaṇva's acquiring garments and jewellery for Śakuntalā when she sets out for Duṣyanta's kingdom, it ceases to be supernatural.

A.L. Basham compares Śakuntalā with Shakespeare's idyllic comedies. To him Kaṇva's hermitage appears similar to the forest of Arden. Like many of Shakespeare's plots, that of Śakuntalā, Basham notes, depends much on chance and on the supernatural. Basham does not, however, elaborate on his comment.

Sylvain Lévi, the nineteenth century French scholar of Sanskrit drama, says, "Le merveilleux qui pénètre tout le sujet menaçait d'affaiblir le jeu des passions humaines et de diminuer l'intérêt; Kālidāsa l'a réduit à un rôle secondaire et presque effacé, excepté au dénouement où la théorie et le goût sont d'accord pour en admettre l'emploi; ... Les dieux n'interviennent que pour dénouer l'action." If we think of the audience of Kālidāsa's time, it is doubtful whether they would have thought of the supernatural as something that diminished or enfeebled the interest of the play; as Bēvāhi himself points out, "L'artifice, que risque de paraître puéril à notre goût trop raffiné, ne choquait pas la vraisemblance dans l'Inde." Lévi relegates the supernatural to only a secondary role in Śakuntalā because his interest
lies primarily in theme and poetic quality, not in plot-structure. When he does mention plot he admits that the supernatural is used in *Sakuntalā* to unravel the plot. If that is so, then it is difficult to understand what could be of more primary importance in the structure of a play than the unfolding of plot. Lévi's disparagement of the supernatural is evidently a product of his critical taste which, in the passage cited above, he terms as "notre goùt trop raffiné." Perhaps he discounts the supernatural in *Sakuntalā* also because *Sakuntalā* does not highlight as *The Tempest* does, magic and strange happenings. But Lévi's observation is nevertheless a tacit admission of the importance of the supernatural in *Sakuntalā*.

The brief survey I have made above suggests that, though several critics have accepted the necessity for comparative studies of Shakespeare and Kālidāsa, no one has yet compared their methods of plot handling, one of the fundamentals of dramatic technique. In the present study, my aim is to examine the use that Kālidāsa and Shakespeare make of supernatural elements in plot construction, and for this purpose *Sakuntalā* and *The Tempest* seem particularly suited, for the reasons I have given at the beginning of this chapter. I shall also attempt to show how extensively the supernatural influences the course of human action in *Sakuntalā* and that, although Kālidāsa and Shakespeare differed in their understanding of man's relationship with the supernatural, they nevertheless
admitted man's closeness to it. The term 'supernatural' is interpreted here in the broadest manner possible. It includes such obvious phenomena as supernatural beings -- gods or spirits --, magical appearances and disappearances, the exercise of fantastic powers by men, and less obvious elements such as the powers of premonition or prognostication.

The present study may usefully begin by noting some obvious points about the place and function of the supernatural in the plays under consideration. The supernatural is perceived more immediately in The Tempest than in Sakuntalā. As against Prospero's magic, which is always evident, the supernatural in Sakuntalā seems always to work in the background. Furthermore, the supernatural in The Tempest is subservient to Prospero, who uses it at will. On the other hand, Sakuntalā portrays a force that is at once autonomous and yet inextricably linked with humanity. If the action of The Tempest arises out of Prospero's design, that of Sakuntalā is the unmistakable work of higher beings, the gods, who guide human life according to their own inscrutable purpose. Structurally, however, the supernatural has closely similar functions in the two plays insofar as it brings about significant events and correlates them. A major portion of this study will, for this reason, be directed at discovering the significant points at which the use of supernatural events turns the plot in a particular direction.
Related to this analysis would be my second task of examining the terms in which the spectator perceives the workings of the supernatural forces. The Tempest is explicit about supernatural happenings and shows them throughout. In Sakuntalā the supernatural is neither so visible nor so immediately effective. Again, in The Tempest we always have the guiding figure of Prospero occupying the stage virtually in the role of providence. No such focal point of power is available in Sakuntalā which acquaints us with the supernatural more by implication than by direct demonstration. Prospero's purpose is revealed in the first act of The Tempest, but the divine design in Sakuntalā is withheld from human understanding till the end of the play. The major difference between the Sanskrit and the English play in handling the supernatural is obvious enough. In The Tempest, the supernatural is a tool in man's hands. Sakuntalā, on the other hand, is full of ambiguities. Kanva certainly has powers as great as Prospero's and so evidently has Durvasas. Yet, as Durvasas' inability to revoke his curse shows, the supernatural is an abstract force independent of man, guiding man's destiny. We learn from Anasuya's report that Durvasas had said: "Tado me bañan añnahā bhabidum nārihadi" ["My words cannot be otherwise"] (Act IV, 'Viṣkambhaka,' that is, the introductory scene). This represents a conception of the supernatural that is clearly different from
what we find in *The Tempest*.

However, although the status of the supernatural varies in the two plays, there is a functional similarity between them, because in each play key events arise out of the workings of supernatural forces which also bring about the final situation of reconciliation. The supernatural thus becomes in these plays a component of the dramatic action through the operation of which tragedy is averted and a happy future ensured. The aim of this study is to examine the precise nature and function of this agency in the framework of the plays.
Chapter II

ABHIJÑĀNASĀKUNTALĀ

Kālidāsa has been traditionally regarded as the greatest of Sanskrit poets. Many works have been attributed to him, some of which have been found to be spurious. However, six works are definitely by him. They are: Meghadūta, Raghuvamśa, and Kumārasambhava, three long poetical pieces; and Abhijnānasākuntalā, Vikramorvasīya, and Mālavikāgni-mitra, three romantic dramas. Of these, Meghadūta, a long lyrical love poem, and Abhijnānasākuntalā have been regarded for centuries as the most perfect of all literary works in Sanskrit. Sanskrit critical literature is full of encomiums to Kālidāsa. A well-known epigram tells us that

Kāvyēṣu nāṭakam ramyam tatra ramyā Śakuntalā. [Of all forms of poetry, drama is the most pleasing, and among dramas Śakuntalā pleases best.]

The Western world came to know Śakuntalā through the translation of Sir William Jones in 1789. Since then Śakuntalā has been translated into almost all European languages. Goethe was full of praise for Śakuntalā:

Willst du die Blüthe des frühen die Früchte des späteren Jahres. 
Willst du, was reizt und entzückt, 
Willst du was sättigt und nährt. 
Willst du den Himmel, die Erde, mit einem Namen begreifen, 
Nenn'ich, Sakuntala, Dic, und so ist Alles gesagt.
If in one word of blooms of early and fruits of riper years, Of excitement and enchantment I should tell, Of fulfillment and content, of Heaven and earth; Then will I but say "Sakuntala" and have said all.\(^4\)

According to Heinrich Heine, Goethe was actually influenced by the prologue to \(\text{Sakuntal\(\)\(\)}\) in conceiving the form of the "Vorspiel auf dem Theatre" in \(\text{Faust}\).\(^5\) Ruben, a Kālidāsa critic of recent times, tries to find "the general human content within" \(\text{Sakuntal\(\)\(\)}\) and remarks "How poor we would remain if we confined ourselves to our German and European culture."\(^6\) Professor Ryder compares Kālidāsa with "Sophocles, Virgil and Milton," and notes that "we know that Kālidāsa is a great poet, because the world has not been able to leave him alone."\(^7\)

However, These critical appreciations are without exception directed to the aesthetic appeal, inner meaning or philosophy of life found in \(\text{Sakuntal\(\)\(\)}\). Tagore and Goethe were overwhelmed by the aesthetic appeal of the play. Ruben's interest lies in discovering Kālidāsa's philosophy of life.\(^8\) Kālidāsa's love of nature and his portrayal of the relationship between man and nature have attracted other critics.\(^9\) Many critics have been charmed by the lyricism in Kālidāsa.\(^10\) The closest that critics have come to the study of technique is in the attempt to see how \(\text{it}\) conforms to the conventions prescribed for drama in theoretical texts of the school of Bharata. This is the purpose that runs through the
studies by M.R. Kale and B. Bhattacharya. Kale itemizes supernatural occurrences without examining their structural function in the play, while Bhattacharya notes the correspondence between *Sakuntalā* and precepts of Sanskrit dramatic theory.

Sanskrit writers on literary theory consider drama to be a form of poetry. In their view drama had the function not only of entertaining but of elevating the human mind, although they admitted that entertainment was indispensable. This approach to drama has been so generally influential that most modern critics writing on *Sakuntalā* are interested in the philosophical content of the play to the exclusion of studies of form and structure, and confine themselves to thematic study. While thematic analyses have done much to enhance our understanding of Kālidāsa's thought, they tell us nothing about the play as a dramatic structure. The present attempt to analyse plot development by studying the function of the supernatural elements in the play is therefore aimed at understanding Kālidāsa's craftsmanship. However, before we do so, it will be useful to note the context of dramatic theory and practice in Sanskrit literature.

In its theoretical orientation classical Indian drama, especially the later drama, is dominated by the *Nātyaśāstra* of Bharata. Written in the second century A.D., it is the earliest available treatise on Sanskrit dramaturgy.
Bharata defines drama as:

\[
\text{Hanābhāvopasampannam nānāvasthāntāratmakam}
\text{lokavṛtānukaraṇam nāṭyaṁ etan mayā kṛtam.}
\]

\[\text{(NS. I. 111-12)}\]

[The drama as I have devised it, is the imitation of the actions and conduct of people, rich in various emotions and depicting different stages (in their development).]

Later writers on drama follow Bharata closely. They emphasize on the one hand the mimetic nature of drama, and on the other hand see it as an instrument of depicting the evolution of emotional states. Concerning the goal of drama, the Sanskrit theorists suggest that it should be joy and the elevation of the mind. The influence of the concept of joy as the only fitting end of drama can be judged in the light of the remarkable fact that so far as we know, there is no tragic drama in Sanskrit. Whatever its subject, a Sanskrit play in order to be considered satisfactory was expected to end in happiness. An important consequence is that Sanskrit dramatic theory always views plot development in terms of the progress of the action towards the happy ending, and carefully notes the factors obstructing or furthering the dénouement.

Drama (--- the Sanskrit term is 'rūpaka' ---) can be of ten different kinds and our play belongs to the first of these categories, a 'nāṭaka.' Rūpaka, or drama in general, should begin with a set of preliminaries called the 'pūrvārāṅga.' Those preliminaries consist of songs and dances to
propitiate gods and to entertain the audience. These have no bearing on the action of the play. Then the drama proper begins with a 'nāndī,' or, a benediction, which is followed by a 'prastāvanā,' an introduction to the play and to the playwright or sometimes to the hero. The play proper is divided into acts, each act being introduced by preludes and containing interludes. The unities of time, place and action are observed within single acts, though not through the entire play. A play always ends with a 'bharatavākyā,' or a closing benediction. This general format is found in every kind of drama, even the one-act play.

According to the theory of Sanskrit dramaturgy, the plot and the 'rasa,' the sentiment evoked, are the chief constituents of a play. Plots may be of two kinds, primary and secondary. These divisions correspond to main and subplots in Western dramatic theory. The main plot of a Sanskrit play may be based on a legendary theme, or it may be a fiction, or a mixture of the two. It is divided into five parts joined by 'samādhīs.' 'Samādhi,' literally meaning a juncture, is a term that denotes the links in the chain of the dramatic action, and indicates points in the development of the action which divide the action into the successive stages of its development. The 'samādhīs' are thus transitional points in the action that lead into the next stage of the action. The five 'samādhīs' are, 'mukha-samādhi,' 'pratimukha-samādhi,' 'garbha-samādhi,' 'avamarśa-samādhi,'
and 'nirvahaṇa-samdhi.' These points introduce respectively what would be known in Western terminology as the exposition, the progression, the catastasis, the falling action, and the conclusion. The 'samdhis' help us further to classify the movement and the nature of the action in minute detail by marking out 'arthapraṇātis' and 'avasthās,' that is, the essential elements of the plot and various stages in the development of the plot. Five 'arthapraṇātis' are recognized: 'bīja,' the seed of the action, 'bindu,' the sign of continuity (literally, a drop), 'patāka,' the episode, 'prakāra,' the incident, and 'kārya,' the purpose to be fulfilled. The meanings of some of these terms are not as clear to us as we might wish them to be but the general intention of the Sanskrit theorists of the drama is plainly to identify the structural elements of drama. The action has five 'avasthās': 'ārambha,' the beginning, 'yatna,' the effort, 'prāptiyāśā,' the prospect of success, 'niyatāpti,' certainty of success, and 'phalāgama,' the attainment of the result. We may note that this is the logical way to analyze any purposeful action, whether the action is set in real life or in the imagination. That the Sanskrit theorists recommend this analytical approach to dramatic action suggests that they always based their theories on Bharata's dictum that drama is the imitation of the actions and conduct of men.

The divisions of the action are further divided into many smaller units which are far too complicated and not
quite relevant to our present study. For easier comprehension of the stages of the action, a table is given below showing the relationship between the 'samdhis,' the 'arthaprakṛtis,' and the 'avasthas':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samdhi</th>
<th>Arthaprakṛti</th>
<th>Avastha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mukha</td>
<td>Bīja</td>
<td>Ārambha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratimukha</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Yatna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbha</td>
<td>Patākā</td>
<td>Prāptyāśā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avamarsa</td>
<td>Prakarī</td>
<td>Niyatāpti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirvahaṇa</td>
<td>Kārya</td>
<td>Phalāgama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sanskrit plays were always divided into acts, with the obvious exception of short, one-act plays. Playwrights were expected to use any or all of five different types of preambles to the acts, known as 'arthopakśepakas.' The five types of 'arthopakśepakas' are: 'viśkambhaka,' the explanatory scene; 'cūlikā,' some behind the scene revelation; 'pravesāka,' an introductory scene; 'aṅkāvatāra,' a scene supplying the transition from an act to the following one; and 'aṅkamukha,' the preface to an act. It is not quite clear how, precisely, the functions of these scenes vary and it is possible that the distinction between them is partly a matter of emphasis. A 'viśkambhaka,' for instance, might easily present some behind the scene revelation, and thus perform the function of a 'cūlika'; similarly, an 'aṅkamukha' may, like a 'pravesāka,' introduce an act. It would seem, then, that in classical Sanskrit drama the choice of any
'arthopakṣepaka' in particular depended on a dramatist's individual preference. In *Sakuntalā* Kālidāsa uses 'viskambha' and 'pravesaka.'

Four styles, called 'vr̥ttis,' of dramatic representation are recommended by writers on drama. These are, 'bhāratī,' 'sātvatī,' 'ārabhāṭī,' and 'kaiśikī.' 'Bhāratī,' the verbal part of representation, is suitable for all kinds of action. 'Sātvatī' is the heroic mode. 'Ārabhāṭī' suits the depiction of energetic action. 'Kaiśikī' is a graceful style fit for romantic and erotic plots.

The *Nāṭyasāstra* also formulates the law of character portrayal, and other treatises have followed its lead. According to the *Nāṭyasāstra*, a hero can be conceived in many ways but in the main he should have an impressive character, and should be graceful in manners, self-possessed, steady, grave, noble, full of spirit, and sportive. A royal hero should in addition be strong, intelligent and a lover of truth, courageous, and should have control over his senses. A heroine can be 'uttamā,' a person of grave refinement, 'madhyamā,' an average person, or 'adhamā,' a coarse woman. According to the *Nāṭyasāstra*, 'uttamā' is patient and dignified, 'madhyamā' has some faults, while an 'adhamā' heroine is a disreputable or sinful person. Later theorists suggest many subdivisions of these basic character-types, but we may disregard here their over-precise classification which leads only to confusion.
In discussing drama, Bharata and his successors not only mention structural features but also examine the aesthetic impact of drama. The concept central to their theories is that of 'rasa,' which is probably the most complex in the field of Sanskrit aesthetics and also perhaps the most controversial so far as its interpretation goes. Usually translated as "aesthetic emotion," a phrase that distinguishes it from ordinary emotion, 'rasa' is the vital element in any poetic or dramatic composition and its presentation. According to Bharata, who propounded the theory of 'rasa,' a drama has no meaning unless it arouses the audience to an aesthetic appreciation of emotions. A dramatist's achievement is therefore to be judged by his handling of emotions. In other words, 'rasa' is the soul of the play.

The tradition established by Bharata identifies eight aesthetic emotions as proper to drama. These are the 'rasas' of eroticism, comedy, pathos, heroism, anger, fear, disgust, and wonder. The dramatist is expected gradually to build up one principal emotion which must be supported, diversified and enriched by other subsidiary feelings. One of the points Bharata makes is particularly relevant to Śakuntalā. He tells us that the dénouement of a play should always convey to the spectator the 'adbhuta rasa,' that is, a sense of wonder:

sarveśāṁ kāvyānāṁ nānārasabhāvavayuktyuktānam
nirvahāḥe kartavyo nityāṁ hi raso'adbhumtas tajñaiḥ

(NS. XX. 46-7)
Replete with different emotions, all poetry necessarily terminates by arousing a sense of wonder.

Judged in this light, *Sākuntalā* appears to exemplify Bharata's views, as the following outline of its plot will show, an outline that will also help us in tracing the development of the action through the many turns of events.

King Duṣyanta of Hastināpura comes to the sage Kaṇva's hermitage during a hunting excursion. The sage is not at home, but the king meets his foster daughter, *Sākuntalā*, the child of the nymph Menakā. *Sākuntalā* is watering the plants along with two girl companions when she is frightened by a bee. The gallant king saves her from the bee and, struck by her beauty, falls in love with her. With due modesty, *Sākuntalā* returns his love.

Duṣyanta prolongs his stay in the hermitage under the pretext of defending it from wild animals and demons. Burning with love for each other, Duṣyanta and *Sākuntalā* marry secretly.

The king has to return to the capital and as the sign of his troth-plighting leaves his signet ring with *Sākuntalā*, who is to follow him later. Kaṇva is still away and *Sākuntalā* is day-dreaming. Meanwhile, the irascible hermit Durvāsas visits the hermitage, and, imagining that *Sākuntalā*, who is lost in thoughts of Duṣyanta, wishes to slight him by not paying attention, pronounces a curse on her to the effect that she will be forgotten by the person
whose thoughts so occupy her. When Śakuntalā's friend plead for her, Durvāsas relents enough to say that her loved one will remember her only when he catches sight of some token, an ornament he may have given her. Śakuntalā is kept ignorant of the curse by her two friends, who wish to spare her anxiety.

Kaṇva now returns, approves of what has happened in his absence, and sends Śakuntalā to her husband's place with an escort of his disciples. When Śakuntalā is presented to Duṣyanta, he fails to recognize her as his wife in spite of her reminders. The ring, which might have aided recognition, has been lost in a river by Śakuntalā. Duṣyanta rejects her but is concerned enough to arrange for her stay at the house of his priest. In her plight, Śakuntalā is pitied by her mother, Menakā, and taken away to the hermitage of Kāśyapa where she gives birth to a son.

In the meantime, a fisherman finds the king's ring inside a fish and while attempting to sell it he is caught by two police officers. He is brought before the king under suspicion of having stolen it. But the king's memory is restored on seeing the ring, and the fisherman gets a reward.

Duṣyanta is now repentant and blames himself for his heartless conduct towards Śakuntalā. When he is called to fight for the gods against demons, he willingly goes to the war. While returning to earth after the battle in heaven,
Duṣyanta happens to visit the hermitage of the divine sage Kāśyapa. There he watches a boy playing with a lion cub and discovers that he is his own son, Bharata. He is re-united with Śakuntalā, and Kāśyapa frees him of his guilt by telling him the story of the curse.

The source of this story is the Mahābhārata, one of the two great epics of India. We find a similar story in the Padmapurāṇa, another Sanskrit work of a later date than our play. Kālidāsa borrowed the legendary theme from the Mahābhārata, and in doing so he followed a convention of the 'nāṭaka' genre, (for Śakuntalā is the type of drama termed 'nāṭaka' in the Nāṭyasāstra), which was required to be based on classical legends. But Kālidāsa adapted the legend to his own purposes, keeping intact only the outline of the story. The story found in the epic is fairly simple: King Duṣyanta, losing his way while on a hunting expedition, reaches Kanva's hermitage, meets Śakuntalā alone, learns from her own mouth her descent, impatiently proposes the 'gāndharva' marriage, accepts her condition that her son alone would be his successor, marries her, leaves for his palace, and later, being afraid of public censure, rejects her when she arrives with their son nine years later. The intervention of a voice from heaven brings about their re-union.

This version of the story has been elaborated upon by Kālidāsa. He has invented the episodes of Durvāsas'
curse, the giving and losing of the ring, Menaka's wafting away of Śakuntalā, the fisherman's recovery of the ring, the reawakening of the king's memory and his repentance, Indra's invitation to the king to fight for the gods, the subsequent visit of the king to Hemakūṭa (Kāśyapa's hermitage), and his re-union with Śakuntalā. An important addition is the episode of the ring, as acknowledged in the title of the play. Kālidāsa might have found the motif of the ring in folk-lore or in Buddhist tales. To use the words of Ruben, it is "a well-known legend of a man wandering far from his homeland who learns to love a maiden, hurries home and leaves a token ring with her so that she can identify herself or her coming child to him later on." 24

Apart from inventing new episodes, Kālidāsa has developed the story also by adding new characters and introducing supernatural elements. The story in the Mahābhārata has only four characters — Duṣyanta, Śakuntalā, Kaṇva and Bharata. Kālidāsa has surrounded these four personages with thirty-two new characters, some of them major ones, indispensable to the action of the play. The two friends of the heroine are Kālidāsa's creation and most necessary, for it is through Śakuntalā's conversation with them that we understand her feelings. The portrayal of Śakuntalā is of course a major achievement. The bare outline of the character, as we find it in the epic, is filled out in the drama with passion, and
yet, in doing so Kālidāsa conforms to the advice of the 
Nātyasāstra concerning the characterization of the heroine.
Even in her playfulness Sākuntalā has the innocence of a 
young girl and yet in her trials she displays -- despite her 
conventional feminine deference to her husband -- an uncompro-
mising self-respect that marks her out as a mature individual 
fully deserving the homage she finally wins. Unlike the 
character in the Mahābhārata version she does not make the 
king promise to give her son the throne. After the king's 
rejection she shows a moving self-restraint in conformity with 
her self-respect, and bursts into anger only once when she 
says:

āṇajja, attaṇo hiaañumāneṇa pekkhasi
[‘Ignoble man, do you judge by the measure 
of your own heart?’]

(Act V, p. 119)

But she does not rail at Duṣyanta or shower him with advice 
on a king's duty as does the heroine of the legend found in 
the Mahābhārata. This deviation is Kālidāsa's sole respon-
sibility. Kālidāsa also invents the two disciples of Kaṇva, 
the hermits Sārṅgarava and Sāradvata, who are given opposite 
but complementary characteristics. One is calm and self-
possessed while the other is an angry, impatient ascetic of 
the type often found among sages in Sanskrit literature. The 
motherly matron of the hermitage, Gautamī, is also Kālidāsa's 
invention and in his hands the sage Kaṇva, master of the 
hermitage, becomes a loving, considerate father while retaining
his status as a sage blessed with prescience and other powers. The jester, while he affords the audience frequent comic relief, is more than a clown, for the king regards him as his closest friend. This character is another creation of Kalidāsa and common to all his plays. Duśyanta's character is elevated and the thoughtless, selfish and opportunist king of the legend in the Mahābhārata becomes a noble, dutiful, righteous and self-controlled individual, fully living up to the ideal prescribed in the treatises on drama, the type known as the 'dhirodātta' hero. Yet, Kalidāsa does not entirely spare Duśyanta a critical look, because at the beginning of the fifth act there is the clear suggestion that Duśyanta is capable of betraying a woman's love, for we hear Hamsapadikā, one of his queens, bewailing in a song his loss of interest in her. But Duśyanta is equally clearly absolved of betraying Śakuntalā, as Kalidāsa is most careful to attribute Duśyanta's total loss of memory to the curse of Durvāsas. Duśyanta's rejection of Śakuntalā is thus prevented from being a wilful betrayal. Here we see how Kalidāsa uses the supernatural instrument of Durvāsas' curse to modify character as well as to decide the course of the play's action.

It is not difficult to fit the play to the model of plot structure suggested by the Sanskrit writers. Śakuntalā follows the prescribed rules of dramaturgy on general lines,
though not in minor points. Kale accounts for these minor deviations by suggesting that the rules might not have gained the authority nor reached the level of elaboration at Kālidāsa's time that they did later. It should be evident from the account of dramaturgical writings given earlier in this chapter that plot structure is conceived in Sanskrit drama as a series of significant incidents out of which fresh turns of action are derived. Šakuntalā has seven acts, with an action spread over six years. The play prefaces the plot proper by the customary benediction, the 'nāndī.' Then follows the introduction to the play and the playwright by the stage-manager, the 'sutradhāra,' in the prologue, the 'prastāvanā.'

At the end of the prologue the king enters. His entry is the 'mukhasamdhi' which signals the beginning of the exposition. The beginning of the progression, the 'pratimukha-samdhi,' occurs when the king tells the jester how captivating he finds Šakuntala. The 'garbha-samdhi,' the beginning of the catastasis, occurs in the fourth act, indicated by the curse of Durvāsas. The 'avamarsa-samdhi,' heralding the falling action begins with the rejection of Šakuntala by Duṣṭyanta. The 'nirvahana-samdhi' introducing the conclusion begins with the invitation of Indra to Duṣṭyanta, which eventually leads to the happy re-union.

The two main characters, Šakuntalā and Duṣṭyanta, are brought together in the expository part of the play where they fall in love. In Sanskrit dramaturgy this part
is thought of as the inception of the play's action and known as the stage called 'ārambha.' The next stage of the development, the 'yatna' or the endeavour, begins when the king explains to the jester that he has been recognized by some ascetics of the hermitage. The 'prāptyāśā' or the prospect of success comes about in the third act when Śakuntalā returns the king's love. The certain attainment of the desired end or 'niyatāpti' is thwarted by Durvāsas' curse. The attainment of the desired object or 'phalāgama' is shown by the re-union of the lovers.

The seed or the 'bīja' known as the first essential element of the plot, classified as an 'arthaprakṛti,' is sown when an ascetic pronounces the blessing that Duṣyanta would have a fine son. 'Bindu,' a drop, is a critical point at which the action takes a decisive turn, cementing two distinct segments of action. It is exemplified by the dilemma of the king who is torn between his duties in the royal household and the need to protect the hermitage from demons, and chooses the latter. The curse of Durvāsas is the episode or 'patākā' that marks the turning point in the destinies of the lovers. The rejection of Śakuntalā is the 'prakarī,' that is, the significant incident that marks the falling action of the play. The final issue of the action or the 'kārya' is the re-union of the lovers. The play ends with the conventional benediction or 'bharatavākya.'
This is the basic structure of the play in terms of Sanskrit dramatic theory. The main 'rasa' that pervades the play is erotic, which is mingled with comic, pathetic, and heroic 'rasas.' All of these combine at the conclusion of the play to make the audience marvel at the wonderful turns of events in the lives of the protagonists.

For our present study, this sense of the wonderful, the 'ādbhuta rasa,' is the most relevant since the function of the supernatural has been traditionally seen as one of producing a sense of wonder. While there can be no doubt that a supernatural event in a play is a powerful source of wonder, and that it does achieve this effect in Śakuntalā, it also proves to be an effective means of influencing plot-development. Kālidāsa has used some supernatural element or other in every single act. In the very first act the birth of Śakuntalā is narrated and we find that she is the daughter of a nymph (Act I, p. 22). A hint of the supernatural is given in the second and the third act by reports of demons threatening the hermitage. This introduction of the demons provides the occasion for the king to be invited by the hermits for their protection. The hermits say:

 tatrabhavatah Kaṇvasya maharṣer asaṃnidhyād
 rakṣamsi na īstivighnam utpādayanti tat
 katipayarātram sārathidvītīyena bhavatā
 sanathikriyatāṃ āśrama iti. 

(Act II, p. 46)

[ The powers of evil disturb our pious life in the absence of the hermit-father. We
therefore ask that you will remain a few nights with your charioteer to protect the hermitage.]

(Ryder, p. 23)

(ākāśe): rājan!
sāyantane sāvanakarmanī sampravṛtte
vedim hūtāsanavatīṁ pāritaḥ prakīrṇāṁ
chāyās' caranti bahūdhaḥ bhayaṁ ādadhanāṁ
saṁdhīyāpayodakapīṣaḥ piśitāsanānām.

[ (a voice from heaven): O King!
The flames rise heavenward from the evening altar;
And round the sacrifices, blazing high,
Flesh-eating demons stalk, like red cloud-masses,
And cast colossal shadows on the sky.]

(Ryder, p. 38)

In the third act Gautama brings in charmed water to give
Śākuntalā relief from her ailment, saying,

imīna dabbhodayeṇa ṇīrābāḍham ebba de sarīram
bhabissādi.

[ This darbha water will cure your body completely of suffering.]

The fourth act begins with the curse of Durvāsas
which initiates the tragic part of the action. The power of
the curse is clearly explained:

vicintayanti yam ananyamanāsa
tapodhanāṁ vetyā na māṁ upasthitam
smarīṣyatī tvām na sa bodhito'pi śan
kathāṁ pramattāṁ prathamaṁ kṛtam īva.

[ He, of whom thinking single-mindedly you fail to recognize the presence of such a hermit as myself, will not remember you even on being reminded, as a drunkard forgets his past words.]

In the same act we are told of the divine power of Kaṇva by
which he becomes aware of Śākuntalā's marriage (although why
he does not know anything about the curse remains a mystery).
A voice from heaven tells him about the marriage (Act IV, p. 80). Through the divine power of Kaṇva bridal garments and jewellery are acquired from a tree (Act IV, p. 85). We also hear a voice, reported to be the guardian deity of the hermitage, bidding farewell to Sakuntalā. Gautamī exclaims,

\[ \text{jāde nādijanasinīiddhāhim ānuṇṇādagamanāsi taboṣaṇadebaḍāhīm.} \] (Act IV, p. 90)

[ My child, the deities of the hermitage, who are as affectionate as kinsmen, bid you farewell.]

At the beginning of the fifth act there is a suggestion of premonition in the king's heart. The king says,

\[ \text{tac cetasā smarati nūnam abodhapūrvam bhāvasthirāṇī jananāntarasauhrdāṇī.} \] (Act V, p. 103)

[ There must be recollections
Of things not seen on earth,
Deep nature's predilections,
Loves earlier than birth.]

(Ryder, p. 53)

At the end of this act Sakuntalā's mother, the nymph Menakā, wafts her away from the kingdom of Duṣyanta who has repudiated her, an action clearly identifiable as a supernatural one:

\[ \text{strīsamsthānam cāpsaratīrttham ārād utkṣipyainām jyotirēkam jaḍāma.} \] (Act V, p. 124)

[ Before our eyes a heavenly light
In woman's form, but shining bright,
Seized her and vanished straight.]

(Ryder, p. 61)

In the sixth act the nymph Sānumatī comes to the garden of the king and stays invisible -- "tirakkharinī-

---
padicchaṇṇā" (Act VI, p. 132) -- throughout the act before returning to heaven. Mātali, the charioteer of the king of the gods, comes at the end of this act to ask Duṣyanta for help and takes him to heaven. In the last act the king is taken to Hemakūṭa, the heavenly abode of the parents of the gods, by Mātali, where he is re-united with Śakuntalā and finds that he is the father of a fine son as the hermit's blessing at the beginning of the play had promised. The supernatural influence is most heavily underscored, and deliberately so, when it is revealed that the whole chain of events had been designed by the gods, as Sānumatī says:

\[
\text{sudam maē saundalam samassāsantīe mahenda-jaṇaṇie muhādojaṇṇābhāossuā debā ebba taha anūcithissaanti jaha aiēna dhammapadiniṁ bhāttā ahiṇandissadi tti.'}
\]

(Act VI, pp.161-2)

[ I heard the mother of the gods consoling Śakuntala. She said that the gods, impatient for the sacrifice, would soon cause him to welcome his true wife.]

(Ryder, p. 77)

Meditation or 'prāṇidhāna,' invisibility or 'tiraskariniṁ,' and a voice from heaven, are all supernatural elements used by Kālidāsa. It is hard to support the view of Sylvain Lévi that the use of the supernatural in a Sanskrit drama has a secondary role, when we find so many uses of it in Śakuntalā at every stage of its progression.²⁸

An important point to note is that although in the play nature, human beings, and supernatural forces exist on the same plane, conventions of Sanskrit drama preclude
supernatural occurrences on the stage although supernatural beings do appear.\textsuperscript{29} Supernatural occurrences, such as the jester being beaten by the invisible Mātali, or Šakuntalā being wafted away by her mother, are never actually shown but reported. Yet, Kālidāsa makes sure that the audience understands the extent of supernatural intervention, for every such report precedes some radical turn of events. While such reports prepare the spectator for the next unit of action and stimulate his imagination rather than his sight and hearing, they also help the spectator to recognize the design of human life as presented in the play. In using the technique of reporting events rather than showing them Sanskrit drama is therefore very similar to the Greek drama where also marvellous or fearful incidents are reported rather than presented on the stage. For instance, Clytemnestra’s reporting of Agamemnon’s murder both gains in intensity of imaginative response for not being shown in gory detail and clarifies the design of passion in the play. Again, the report of Oedipus’ death in \textit{Oedipus at Colonus} stimulates the sense of wonder at its marvellous nature and also emphasizes the vision of human life being shaped by the gods. In Šakuntalā too, the report of miraculous happenings intensify the awareness of vast powers at work precisely because by placing those events beyond the
vision of the audience an appeal is made to the imagination. The audience is thus constantly reminded of forces greater than man moulding his life, as we find when we look closely at the chain of events.

The awareness of the supernatural is gradually built, beginning with the king's premonition as he first enters the hermitage that some happy future lies in store for him. He exclaims,

śāntaṁ idāṁ āśramapadāṁ sphurati ca bāhu
kutāḥ phalam āhāsyā
thavā bhavitavyānāṁ dvāraṁi bhavanti sarvatra.

(Act I. p. 10)

[A tranquil spot is this hermitage
Yet my arm trembles.
What success can this portend?
However, everywhere there are doors to destiny.]

We too become aware that something is going to happen.

Soon after he meets the girls of the hermitage and falls in love with Sakuntalā. When her friends recount the circumstances of her birth, he is thrilled to find that she is the daughter of a king and a nymph, which means that she is a girl whom he can marry without violating custom.

Sakuntalā's connection with the nymph does not have any immediate bearing on the development of the plot, but later, in the fifth act, the significance to plot-development of Sakuntalā's supernatural origin becomes clear when her mother spirits her away to the protection of a heavenly abode. Her connection with her mother is carefully retained as found in the Mahābhārata story. This kind of happening
seems to have been quite acceptable to the audience, especially if the plot was derived from some legend. Even today an Indian audience, like any other audience, seems quite willing to suspend disbelief in such happenings in literature if the context is one of myths and legends.

In the second act it transpires that the king has had the opportunity to prolong his stay at the hermitage to protect it from demons. Thus the interference of demons, another intrusion of the supernatural, leads to the union of the lovers by providing an occasion for the king's continued presence. In the third act the king and Śakuntalā are united. The demons continue to be a nuisance in the hermitage but prove to be a boon to the lovers.

The main event in the fourth act is the curse of Durvāsas which turns the action to tragic directions. This is what creates the principal tension in the plot by placing in jeopardy the course of true love which so far has had a smooth course. It leaves the audience in suspense about the outcome of the plot and brings about, for the first time, the conflict of motives in the play. This exercise of Durvāsas' supernatural power is thus clearly identifiable as the mainspring of tragi-comic action here. On the one hand, it causes the tribulations, first of Śakuntalā, then of the king, taking the play to the verge of tragedy. On the other hand, by attributing Dusyanta's lapse of memory
powers beyond his control rather than to his own perfidy -- as in the Mahābhārata story -- Durvāsas’ makes the renewal of the king's love and Sakuntalā's re-union with him not only possible but expected. Another factor that keeps alive hopes of eventual happiness is the wholehearted sanction that the marriage between Duṣyanta and Sakuntalā receives from the great sage Kanva and also from the guardian spirits of the woods.

The fifth act begins with a hint of supernatural powers at work when we find the king troubled by an uneasy premonition which prepares the ground for the tragic encounter between himself and Sakuntalā. Then follows one of the most powerful examples of supernatural intervention in the play. This is the action of Sakuntalā's mother, Menakā, who rescues her from humiliation by literally spiriting her away, which is perfect example of deus ex machina. This is not shown on the stage since dramatic theory prohibited the actual presentation of magical occurrences, possibly because of the limited mechanical resources of the stage.

In the sixth act the nymph Sānumatī, a friend of Menakā, comes to observe the repentant king. Sānumatī's soliloquy makes us aware of the presence of the supernatural at every stage. We learn that the gods have a special design in mind for re-uniting Sakuntalā and Duṣyanta (Act VI, pp. 161-2). This phase of the action is most skilfully
handled. When Sānumatī departs, her comments on the king's condition as well as our own observation convince us of his anguish. He has become incapable of action and passes his time mourning his loss. From this despondent mood he is soon aroused to one of heroic anger when he hears somebody offstage beating the jester. The assailant is Mātali, the charioteer of Indra. The jester's cries arouse the king's anger at the presumptuous person who dares to touch the king's friend. This incident helps to lift the king out of his melancholy and reawakens his sense of kingly duty and prerogatives. Mātali is thus instrumental not so much in providing comic relief as in curing the king of despondency and inaction by administering a shock. As the king arises to rush to his friend's help, Mātali lets the jester go, and coming in, communicates to the king Indra's request for assistance in overcoming rebellious demons. In his new mood Duṣyanta accepts this invitation as he might never have done in his previous mood of sorrow.

With this business of the gods claiming the king's attention, the play's action enters its last phase. Because of this call upon his services the king leaves the palace, goes to battle with demons, and on his way back is brought by Mātali to the semi-celestial hermitage of Kāsyapa. It is at this hermitage that Sakuntalā and her child have been settled by her celestial mother. The meeting between
Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā therefore takes on the appearance of an event arranged by forces above them.

We see then that at every stage of its progress, the action of Śakuntalā is shaped by some supernatural agency or other. In the beginning, Duṣyanta has the opportunity to court Śakuntalā because he stays in the hermitage to protect it from demons. Their love is broken by Durvāsas' curse, which however, contains its waiver as well, so that both the lapse of memory and its subsequent recovery are seen as consequences of Durvāsas' exercise of superhuman powers. Menakā's action in spiriting away Śakuntalā is again not merely a marvellous piece of magic but calculated by the dramatist as a trial of the king's love, for it is the hopelessness of regaining Śakuntalā that plunges Duṣyanta into grief. Finally, we not only see Mātali maneuvering Duṣyanta towards re-union with Śakuntalā, we are categorically told that all this is taking place according to a divine design.

The supernatural has therefore several functions in the play. At its most obvious it moulds the action of the play, influencing the motivation of the characters and providing occasions for their actions. It also produces a powerful sense of wonder. But we must also note that it helps to place the actions that we see and the world in which they occur, into a framework of existence that
accommodates both the natural and the supernatural as complementary states of existence rather than alien and unrelated phenomena. The supernatural presence in Śakuntalā is thus never seen as an intrusion into human life but as an integral part of it.
Chapter III

THE TEMPEST

So much has been written on The Tempest that it seems difficult to arrive at any unified and comprehensive view of the play. Even the general observation that it is a romantic comedy has to be tempered by the fact that in contrast with Shakespeare's other plays The Tempest conforms to the neo-classical doctrine of construction in its main lines. This reservation is particularly helpful in the context of the present study in comparison because Śakuntalā too is known as a romantic drama that follows the rules prevailing in a classical literature.

Coleridge was the first to point out that the unity of The Tempest should be understood as an organic principle, as that seen in "the growth of trees," rather than as a mechanical conformity to prescriptive rules. He argued that it is as a structure of the imagination rather than that of obvious external events that the play must be judged. His insistence on the imaginative meaning of the play has led to a great deal of freedom in its interpretation which has been largely allegorical and symbolical. The most influential interpretation is G. Wilson Knight's, who regards
the play, like all Shakespeare's last plays, as a myth of the regeneration of life. He calls tempests a poetical symbol of the destructive forces in life, and music the symbol of regeneration and immortality, these being the opposed motifs in a pattern of loss and restoration. Caroline Spurgeon's analysis of Shakespeare's imagery has further facilitated symbolical interpretations. By showing the correlation between images of storm and the theme of destruction, and between images of music and the theme of reconciliation, Spurgeon suggests that Shakespeare carefully builds The Tempest as a structure of opposed themes. Spurgeon's analysis and classification of images therefore lends support to the view that the play as a whole is a symbol of the fundamental opposition between chaos and order. D.G. James sees The Tempest as a myth through which Shakespeare unifies his conflicting experiences of life into a statement of almost religious belief in the regeneration of life and power. Another influential critic, E.M.W. Tillyard, suggests that The Tempest, along with other plays from Shakespeare's final period, completes his entire dramatic pattern, serving as a final celebration of rebirth, which is only implied in the tragedies. Northrop Frye is yet another critic who discovers the structures of myth dominating the poetic structure of The Tempest. Frank Kermode, who offers one of the most balanced and comprehensive views of the play,
finds that the play formulates one of man's universal historic experiences, that of the opposition between art and nature. Man's perception of that conflict and efforts to resolve it help him to understand the nobility and virtue that he possesses and which ultimately helps him to discover his connection with the abstract metaphysical powers of good.\footnote{This philosophical meaning of The Tempest explains the tragi-comic form of the play and the importance of Prospero's power while suggesting the reality of a merciful providence.} A different line of criticism had been initiated by Edward Dowden whose approach was biographical and who argued that Shakespeare's plays were expressions of his changing attitudes through life, suggesting that tragedies show Shakespeare "in the depths" of despair from which he rose to the "heights" of a serene belief in the triumph of good over evil in the last comedies.\footnote{This was challenged by Lytton Strachey who asserted that the final plays actually show weariness and an attempt to withdraw from the problems of life into poetical dreams.} But the idea of Shakespeare's serenity was strongly restated by Morton Luce who claimed that the last plays should be regarded as more of a recreation and show a growing indifference to his dramatic business.\footnote{However, the validity of explaining the last plays mainly with reference to Shakespeare's personal mood is debatable,}
as the findings of the historical school of critics show. E.E. Stoll deplored the excesses of allegorical criticism and the habit of treating *The Tempest* as a biography. He also demonstrated the necessity of considering the plays as artifacts conforming to current literary conventions and stage-conditions.¹¹ A great deal of light has been thrown on these matters by Allardyce Nicoll and Enid Welsford.¹² The masque-element is particularly worth noting. As in a masque, the characters in *The Tempest* are shown in the grip of spells and then freed from enchantment. Furthermore, Prospero has the function of a masque-presenter who manipulates the characters. However, Kermode has rightly pointed out that the unfolding of the plot proceeds in accordance with the scheme of development recommended in neo-classical theory.¹³ Support for this point of view comes from Bernard Knox, who provides a most penetrating study of *The Tempest*, demonstrating how deeply rooted the play is in the comic tradition of Plautus.¹⁴

The sense of wonder aroused by Prospero's magic has been frequently examined, as for instance by Knox, Kermode, and Joan Hartwig.¹⁵ Shakespeare's conception of the supernatural has been studied by W.C. Curry,¹⁶ but what he has done is more to formulate Shakespeare's metaphysical thought than to see the use of the supernatural as an instrument of playmaking. C.J. Sisson has shown in what light
Shakespeare's audience would have viewed Prospero's magic, but has not traced its effect on the unfolding of the action. It is therefore necessary here to analyze the sequence of action in *The Tempest* in detail so that we may see how the course of events is affected by the supernatural. This will provide us with a basis of comparing the structure of *The Tempest* with that of *Sakuntala* insofar as each depicts a journey from loss to restoration which is guided by the supernatural.

Two points should, however, be noted which may keep our perspective on *The Tempest* quite clear, first, the popular demand for lavishly mounted entertainment that no doubt influenced Shakespeare, and second, his use of source materials. In the theatre for which Shakespeare was writing, lavish spectacle on the stage had come into demand. The first performance of *The Tempest* was in 1611 at the Blackfriars theatre which was known for productions influenced by the elaborate style of entertainments at the royal court. *The Tempest* not only accommodates spectacle but also makes extensive use of music. This is why its masque-like characteristics are so apparent. This was no doubt a response to the popular demand for spectacular shows, but it must also be recognized that in *The Tempest* this element helps Shakespeare to substitute for the ordinary laws of nature the special laws of the supernatural. This is also facilitated
by setting the play in a strange, remote island in an enchanted corner of the world where, according to the travellers' tales known to Shakespeare, anything might happen.

In Shakespeare's times, many such tales were in circulation, and travel literature in general was popular. The tales of the New World in particular fascinated Shakespeare and his contemporaries with reports of lands that were marvellously rich but also harboured many dangers.¹⁸ There is no precise literary source for the plot, although some elements in it can be traced back to European works, chiefly certain "scenarios" of the Italian commedia dell'arte, and a contemporary German comedy, as well as two romances of the time.¹⁹ But none of the evidence for borrowing is conclusive and the elements supposedly borrowed, such as the magician king, the log-bearing prince, or spirit slaves, belong to the common stock of folk-literature. Shakespeare might have known these stories and he probably used contemporary pamphlets or accounts of the New World to sharpen his picture of the enchanted island,²⁰ but he was not working on an already existing plot as Kalidasa was in Sakuntalā.

This argues all the more strongly that every component of The Tempest is used according to Shakespeare's own particular purpose. That he used supernatural elements to create a sense of wonder is obvious. But that he used the
supernatural also as a means of shaping the action of the play is what the following analysis aims at demonstrating.

The play opens with a storm which seems at the time to be a natural phenomenon. As it grows in intensity, so does suspense in the theatre regarding the fate of the voyagers. But as soon as the second scene opens, we find from Miranda that the storm had been caused by Prospero's art, and Prospero reassures her that "There's no harm done" (I.ii.15). The whole occasion of the play is thus ascribed to supernatural forces at work which, at the same time, are unambiguously shown to be under human control. Prospero's reassurance leads into his lengthy account of past events, which ends with the announcement that he plans some kind of vengeance upon his enemies. How this is to be done is at once explained, again by invoking the supernatural, the embodiment of which we now see for the first time as Ariel enters. Prospero's conversation with Ariel at once demonstrates the extent of his power, for not only are we told that everything that happens on and around this island happens by Prospero's will and design, but also that he has total authority over supernatural forces. Though Ariel has great powers, Prospero easily subdues him. This confrontation between man and spirit at once strengthens the sense of Prospero's commanding position and hints that Ariel is his slave only for the time being. It seems that the supernatural
powers can be used by man but not permanently and that they have their own independent existence.

Halfway through this scene we have a mild demonstration of Prospero's powers when he puts Miranda to sleep (I.ii.185-6), so that he may discuss his plans more freely with Ariel. That discussion bears even better testimony to the potency of Prospero's magic, for we are given the history of his triumph over Sycorax and his domination over Ariel and other spirits. At the same time, Shakespeare proves that these claims of Prospero's are not mere boasts, by showing his total authority over Ariel.

By the end of this scene more evidence of Prospero's power is available. We are introduced to Caliban who is shown as a dangerous creature, though whether he is a beast or half-demon is doubtful. However, it is clear that this monster would have destroyed Prospero and Miranda -- he once tried to ravish Miranda (I.ii.349-53) -- had it not been for Prospero's magic. Caliban says this in an aside as he leaves the stage and it is evident that he knows the great value of Prospero's magic:

\[
\text{his Art is of such pow'r,} \\
\text{It would control my dam's god, Setebos} \\
(I.ii.374-5)
\]

His exit is followed by Ariel's entrance leading in Ferdinand who promptly falls in love with Miranda and she with him. Then Prospero puts Ferdinand to the test
When Ferdinand draws his sword he is "charmed from moving" (stage-direction). Again we have proof not only of Prospero's great power but that this power is what brings about events in the play. In this scene we have been told that Prospero has caused the tempest to get his enemies within his power and we have been shown how complete his command is over spirits, monsters and men. We also understand that Ferdinand is brought in by Prospero's wishes, which clears the way for Ferdinand and Miranda to fall in love, this in turn eventually becoming the event that signifies reconciliation and restoration. This is brought about supernaturally just as the shipwreck is.

In the next act again, we find events being controlled by Prospero's magic. The first hint comes when Gonzalo remarks, and keeps repeating, that their garments are cleaner, glossier, and fresher than before (II.i.59-62, 66, 92-4, 99). Prospero's control over them is revealed very soon when they are all put to sleep by Ariel save Antonio and Sebastian. The spell cast upon the sleepers is an obvious mechanism to separate Antonio and Sebastian and so prepare the ground for their intrigue. But the intrigue is kept in check equally well by having Ariel awaken Alonso and his courtiers just as the two conspirators draw their swords to
kill them. Ariel connects the event firmly with Prospero's power:

My master through his Art forsees danger
That you, his friend, are in; and sends me forth,—
For else his project dies, -- to keep them living.

(II.i.292-4)

With Ariel's awakening of the threatened king and his courtiers, the process of their re-education is initiated, leading to a complete sequence of action. Here again we find supernatural powers carrying out Prospero's design and in this way forming the action of the play.

The first scene of Act III portrays the growing love between Ferdinand and Miranda, culminating in their virtual betrothal. Miranda asks,

My husband, then?

and Ferdinand answers,

Ay, with a heart as willing
As bondage e'er of freedom: here's my hand

(III.i.87-9)

This is one place where Prospero's magic does not enter, for, having used magic to bring them together, he must let their hearts work independently to come together, because forced love cannot be deep and true like love that grows naturally. That is why, instead of using his powers, Prospero invokes divine blessings:

Heavens rain grace
On that which breeds between them.

(III.i.75-6)
The supernatural is, however, very much present in the rest of the act. In Act III, scene ii we find Ariel eavesdropping upon Caliban's conspiracy with Stephano and Trinculo. This is a new source of danger to Prospero and Miranda and it is one of the units of action not brought about by Prospero's magic, which is natural because this action signifies animal nature straining against civilization. But the supernatural powers of Prospero again prove to be his defense against such dangers, for Ariel reassures us, "This I will tell my master" (III.ii.113).

The next and final scene of this act is one that shows supernatural intervention at its most energetic. There is "solemn and strange music," and "strange shapes" bring in a banquet. The banquet is later whisked away to the accompaniment of thunder and lightning, and Ariel in the shape of a harpy chides the king and his followers, arousing in their minds a recognition of their guilt. The physical action of this scene is most carefully devised. The movements of the spirits bringing in the banquet and taking it away are choreographed to induce a sense of fantasy. The whole incident takes on the appearance of a moral masque. That all this is happening by Prospero's magic is indicated by the fact the stage-direction places him "on the top" of the stage. The highly stylized movements of the spirits, their dance, their music, combine to present the banquet
as a ritual of chastisement and purification. Alonso and his courtiers are taken through temptation followed by mockery until the meaning of their chastisement is revealed by Ariel who also tells them that the way to cleanse themselves from sin is

nothing but heart-sorrow
And a clear life ensuing.  

(III.iii.81-2)

The action leading to the moral regeneration of Alonso and Sebastian is thus shown to be wholly guided by supernatural agencies which act as a stern but sure instructor.

In Act IV we see the wedding-masque celebrating the betrothal of Ferdinand and Miranda, and Prospero's blessings on them. This does not necessarily further the unfolding of the action. This presentation by

Spirits, which by mine Art
I have from their confine call'd to enact
My present fancies.  

(IV.i.120-22)

provides the strongest formulation of the shaping power of art and the imagination, and explains the significance of "true love" (IV.i.84, 133). This masque thus becomes the central symbol of the richness of a life in harmony with nature and heaven.

More relevant to the present study, however, is the less pleasant conclusion of this scene where Prospero punishes Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo. The dangers are averted effectively by Prospero's power and the action can
move on to the fulfilment of his scheme, that is, the repentance of his enemies through which reconciliation will come. This is the project that occupies the last act of the play, which begins with a brief account of what has been going on elsewhere. The function of Prospero's magic is reiterated when Ariel recounts how the three culprits, Alonso, Sebastian, and Antonio, "cannot budge till you release" (V.i.11). A few lines later, Prospero himself gives a summary of what his powers have achieved for him. This is similar to what the chorus does in scene viii of *Doctor Faustus* but Prospero also announces his intention to abjure magic which he calls "rough" (V.i.50). However, before he does so, it helps him to chastise his enemies and bring the king, the most powerful of them, to penitence -- we are not so sure of Antonio and Sebastian -- and to wind up his project as he had wished, in forgiveness and happy re-union.

When we look at the progress of the plot, we find that it is very clearly composed of three lines of action. The two most important are, first, the chastisement and re-education of Prospero's enemies, and second, the union of Ferdinand and Miranda. The third is the foiling of Caliban's vicious plots. At its beginning the action seems to have the potentialities of a revenge-plot because Prospero recounts the treachery of his enemies in Act I,
scene ii, and rejoices that he has them in his power. But soon his expected vengeance is revealed as the correction of his enemies and his reconciliation with them. This reunion is to be cemented by the marriage of Ferdinand and Miranda. As we have seen, the first two lines of action are shaped by Prospero's magic. At every critical moment the plot gains impetus from this supernatural agency which we may therefore see as the instrument of plot-motivation. Prospero's enemies are shipwrecked by his magic; he brings Ferdinand and Miranda by using Ariel and his music; by his magic he keeps his enemies alive, safe and sound but troubled in spirit; finally, he holds them prisoner by his magic and admonishes them, thus effecting the penitence of his most powerful enemy. In the same way, it is Prospero's magic that saves him and Miranda from Caliban, who is motivated by his desire for revenge. But Caliban's plan is foiled because Prospero exerts total control over all things in the island by means of his magic.

The supernatural is therefore of prime importance in the plot-structure of The Tempest. Although it does not act independently but as an instrument subordinate to man, it remains the one element in the play most accountable for the events. But we must further note that the working of supernatural forces also helps to reveal character in the play. When the incident of the banquet (Act III, scene iii)
reveals to the shipwrecked party the cause of their troubles, the revelation immediately succeeds in overwhelming Alonso with remorse, but leaves Antonio and Sebastian unaffected. The same pattern of responses is reiterated later when by Prospero's magic the party is brought before his cell (Act V, scene i). Alonso accepts the supernatural chastisement as due justice, which proves that his nature is essentially virtuous and had been only temporarily affected by sin. On the contrary, sin has wholly perverted Antonio and Sebastian who accept Prospero's rebukes and the reconciliation between him and Alonso merely as a matter of expediency.

The supernatural, then, reveals character in The Tempest by placing individuals in crises and consequently generating particular responses. It is also evident that by spelling out for Alonso and his group what is right and what is wrong, the supernatural serves to reinforce the moral dimensions of the play. Both Prospero, in his capacity as the prime mover of the action, and Ariel, as his agent, insist that there is a moral order in the universe and that the workings of the supernatural can bring to man an awareness of that order. The fundamental contradiction between good and evil is symbolized at the beginning of the play by Prospero's account of the battle between himself and Sycorax. However, since Sycorax too had possessed supernatural powers, the play suggests that supernatural powers in themselves are
neither good nor evil, but function according to the purpose -- virtuous or sinful -- of the user. These are inconceivably vast powers, quite alien to the world of man and only occasionally perceived or acquired by man. By their use the ordinary laws of nature are suspended and strange events made possible. Their presence makes the world of The Tempest magical and fantastic, unlike the world of Šakuntalā where the supernatural is an accepted part of the natural scheme of existence. Yet, the supernatural is present as a structural element as clearly in The Tempest as in Šakuntalā. In the next part of this study we shall examine at what points these plays use the supernatural similarly and, equally, how they differ in their use and what these differences in approach tell us about the plays.
Chapter IV

CONCLUSION

Analysis of the plot development of The Tempest and Šakuntalā shows clearly that in both plays supernatural forces have important structural functions. In both we find that these forces not only bring about specific events but generally guide the course of the action, strengthening in both plays a movement towards forgiveness and re-union, although the plot-patterns are different. It is a complex movement in Šakuntalā because in that play the action begins with the union of lovers and moves on to separation and loss, and only then to reconciliation. The Tempest does not deal with such a problem of loss as that in Šakuntalā, because Miranda's separation from Ferdinand is both brief and merely a stratagem of her father's. The problem is in a sense deeper, being that of a world fractured by ambition and treachery. It begins with the grievous wrong done against Prospero and Miranda, and gradually works out the process of reconciliation and forgiveness. By emphasizing Prospero's suffering at the beginning, The Tempest creates a sharp focus on the tragic potentiality of its central situation, which depicts a wronged man getting all his
enemies in his power. As I have observed in Chapter III, in the first act Prospero seems to be preparing his vengeance. However, his power is so great and so absolute that he can do better than destroy his enemies; he can reform them and turn them into friends. The tragic possibilities of the play are thus turned into a comic resolution. There is no shadow of revenge in \( \textit{Sakuntal\=a} \), but that play too is overcast by a tragic loss. It is only at the end that tragedy is averted when the king's lapsed memory comes back to him and he finds his wife and child. In both plays this transformation of a potentially tragic situation into a happy one comes about through the workings of supernatural powers.

This similarity cannot, however, disguise the different ways in which supernatural agencies work in the plays. \( \textit{Sakuntal\=a} \) reveals the workings of supernatural powers as part of a grand design that covers the world of man and of nature as well as that of the supernatural. But in \textit{The Tempest} we see the supernatural under human control as an instrument of human purpose rather than as some great force above man controlling man's destiny. No doubt in both plays supernatural forces are used as part of the mechanics of plot-construction in order to produce convenient turnabouts of the action. But the status of the supernatural as an entity by itself is viewed in entirely different
lights and, consequently, viewed differently in its relationship with mankind. By comparing the use of supernatural elements in these plays, we may therefore add to our understanding not only the respective dramatic techniques of Kālidāsa and Shakespeare, but also of their ways of looking at human action and its place in the scheme of existence.

The presence of the supernatural is much less obtrusive in Śakuntalā than in The Tempest. The unearthly music, thunder and lightning, and the various spirits of The Tempest, have no parallel in Śakuntalā. But as we have seen in Chapter II, the action of Śakuntalā is constantly influenced by unseen forces. The crucial moments of action which come at the juncture of its consecutive phases, show how vital supernatural influence proves to be. The menace of demons provides the occasion for King Duṣyanta's prolonged stay at Kanva's hermitage. Durvāsas' curse causes Duṣyanta to forget and repudiate Śakuntalā, while, equally, it is the limit put on his curse by Durvāsas that allows Duṣyanta to remember everything when he is shown Śakuntalā's lost ring. The menace of demons provides for the second time the occasion for Duṣyanta to go to battle against them and thus to be brought to Kāśyapa's hermitage where Śakuntalā has been living with their child. No startling magic proclaims the supernatural in the play but its influence is unquestionable.
By contrast, The Tempest plays upon the miraculous aspects of the supernatural. Our sense of wonder is aroused when, after seeing the raging storm in the first scene of the play, we learn in the second that that vast commotion had been the work of Prospero's superhuman powers. This sense further strengthens almost into a fantasy as the end of this, the second scene, introduces us to the ethereal Ariel and the monstrous Caliban. Prospero's own powers too are at once demonstrated, not only by the obedience he extracts from his spirit-slaves but also, perhaps more vividly, by his ability to charm Ferdinand into immobility. The episodes of the vanishing banquet, Ariel's whispered warning that saves Alonso's life, the masque of Juno and Ceres, and the punishment of Stephano, Trinculo, and Caliban, serve to highlight the startling enchantment that envelops the lives of the people in the play. It is because these incidents are so obviously marvellous that they succeed in proving the potency of Prospero's magic. As soon as he reveals his plan to Miranda in Act I, scene ii, we realize that all that happens in the play is brought about by Prospero's supernatural powers which enable him not only to control other men but to set aside the very laws of nature themselves.

This supersession of nature, which is a major feature of The Tempest, is only hinted at in Sakuntalā. The Sanskrit
play does contain strange happenings that do not fall within our ordinary experience of natural events. The trees of Kanva's hermitage give Sakuntalā rich garments and jewellery when she goes to Duṣyanta's court. Sakuntalā is teleported from Duṣyanta's kingdom by her mother. Sānumatī the nymph, and Mātali the heavenly charioteer, move about invisibly. Strange happenings are, however, always reported rather than actually seen. As we have noted in our discussion, in Chapter II, of the Sanskrit and the Greek convention of reporting startling or violent events rather than presenting them on the stage, reports of miraculous occurrences have the advantage of stimulating the sense of mystery. But verbal reports lack the visual impact in the theatre that the strange events in The Tempest have. A very important aspect of Prospero's magic is that by its help he rules the elements. A sense of conflict between nature and man lies implicit in Prospero's ability to raise the storm and then to calm the waters by commanding a strange and solemn music to be played. It is only when Prospero has succeeded in guaranteeing a happy ending through the betrothal of Miranda and Ferdinand that we are shown, in the masque of Juno and Ceres, that nature can bless man with her bounty. But man has to strive hard to achieve this harmony with nature and has to impose order upon nature. This sense of conflict is entirely absent from Sakuntalā. In Sakuntalā man and nature
co-exist harmoniously in a scheme of existence determined by supernatural powers. There is no instance in Šakuntalā of a man controlling nature and overriding its laws as there is in The Tempest. Man's relationship with nature is clearly shown by events in Kaṇva's hermitage when Šakuntalā leaves for Duṣyanta's court. We are told that when Kaṇva sent his disciple to bring flowers from the woods, the trees gave him rich garments and jewellery instead. The harmony between man and nature is further demonstrated a little later when we find that Kaṇva addresses the trees of the forest as Šakuntalā's "companions of the forest," and asks them to bid her farewell.

This incident suggests that Šakuntalā offers a view of existence that is completely different from that of The Tempest. In Šakuntalā man does not rule nature but lives in harmony with it. Life in it is not anthropocentric as it is in The Tempest, where Prospero controls supernatural beings and through them controls nature. The opposition between man and nature and between man and the supernatural is quite plain in The Tempest. The storm with which the play begins is a totally convincing proof of Prospero's triumph over nature. His dealings with Aриel and Caliban soon show that these are his slaves, not associates, and unwilling slaves at that. This again is a feature of The Tempest exclusively. The supernatural world is so alien
to that of man that no co-existence is envisaged. In the rare cases of these worlds coming together, the relationship is forced, fraught with tension and a sense of menace. By contrast, Sakuntalā places man and supernatural beings at separate but close levels of existence and presents them as complementary parts of the same universe. Duṣyanata, for instance, is asked by Indra, the king of the gods, to fight demons on behalf of the gods. Communication between men and spirits or gods is frequent and the supernatural presence is ubiquitous. Some spirits, such as the demons that Duṣyanta drives away, are feared by man, but the supernatural is represented in the play oftner as the force that guides human life according to some divine plan that man cannot fully understand. In Act VI Sānumatī reveals that there is such a plan for the resolution of the tragic separation of Duṣyanta and Sakuntalā. This view of man's relationship with the supernatural is contradictory to that present in The Tempest where the supernatural is an instrument in man's hand. Prospero's mastery over the supernatural celebrates man's supremacy in his universe. He assumes the role of providence and controls the events absolutely. Sakuntalā has no parallel to this. The one instance of a human being using supernatural powers to shape events is the vital incident of Durvāsas placing Sakuntalā under a curse. But even here human power is demonstrably limited,
for when he relents at the pleas of Śakuntalā's friend Anasūyā, he admits that he is unable to retract his curse which once pronounced, has a power entirely its own.

Understanding the relationships of man with the supernatural respectively in Śakuntalā and The Tempest helps us to point to a basic difference in the conception of the supernatural in the plays. In Śakuntalā, the supernatural actually intervenes in human life for some undisclosed purpose. Śakuntalā presents the supernatural sphere as a separate but never alien plane of existence, as proved by the facts that Indra, the king of gods, asks for the help of Duṣyanta, a mere mortal, and that Duṣyanta is shown in the last act as returning from heaven. This last event, like all others in the play, seems engineered by unseen forces. Events thus gain significance as units in a vast scheme of existence, related at a deeper level than that of immediate purpose. Even chance events, such as the loss and recovery of Śakuntalā's ring seem not to be arbitrary but planned events. The universe of the play therefore stretches far beyond the senses of the audience into that of metaphysical contemplation.

In comparison, the world of The Tempest has closer boundaries. The vast map of existence implied in Śakuntalā is undiscovered in The Tempest, which confines the action most categorically in the world of man. It does not explore even by implication the separate level of being on which the
supernatural exists. But by disregarding a larger scheme of existence *The Tempest* gives infinitely greater urgency to human passions and motives than there is in *Sakuntalā*. The focus in *The Tempest* is on man's responsibility for himself, and the supernatural is in consequence regarded as a convenient instrument. Even while the play acknowledges the marvellous power of the supernatural, it reminds us of man's greatness by insistently stressing that man harnesses these powers through his own effort. This is why Prospero's books are such important symbols of his power. Quite obviously, this glorification of man and the relegation of the supernatural to a secondary importance is entirely foreign to the vision of life we have in *Sakuntalā* which rests upon a perception of the fundamental unity of the human and the supernatural worlds.

In the preceding pages we have seen how, despite the basic difference in the conception of the supernatural and its relationship with man, both plays utilize supernatural means to solve problems of plot-development. The function of the supernatural is explicit in *The Tempest* while in *Sakuntalā* it is for the most part implied. This difference in handling the supernatural as a structural element is undoubtedly related to the different philosophies underlying the plays, for the explicit function of the supernatural in *The Tempest* serves to highlight human
achievement, while the elliptical influence of the supern-
natural in Šakuntalā on human affairs suggests a larger
frame of reference containing human action. The comparison
between the two plays therefore convincingly suggests that
both Kālidāsa and Shakespeare used the supernatural for
more purposes than one. While as practical playwrights
they found the supernatural as an ideal tool of plot-
construction, they also found it useful in formulating
specific conceptions of man's place in the world. That
despite their similar thematic interest they used the tool
differently, argues a fundamental difference of world-view,
almost certainly reflecting opposite cultural identities.
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