'FOR EVER WILT THOU LOVE, AND SHE BE FAIR': KĀLIDĀSA'S VISION OF THE IDEAL MARRIAGE

Virpi Hämeen-Anttila

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

When we examine a text belonging to a literary tradition in which the genres, the themes, the subject matter and its treatment, the style and the imagery are all controlled by conventions, it can be difficult to say anything definite about the author's personal opinion of the things about which he writes. The situation is even more complicated when the society and especially the social class that the author considers his public are such that seem to make any breach with conformity unthinkable. Add to this the fact that our knowledge about the life of the author consists of nothing but legends and anecdotes. This is more or less the case with the most famous poet and playwright of classical India, Kālidāsa.

It may also be argued that the possible ideological content of Kālidāsa's works is not worth investigating, since even if we could get hold of the author's honest convictions, they do not represent the reality of the contemporary Indian society as such but only the limited and self-righteous viewpoint of the upper classes.[1] It is often pointed out that at Kālidāsa's time, i.e. in the 5th century AD[2], the audience of the literature proper (*kāvya*) was by necessity quite small. To appreciate the *kāvya*,

---

1 Here I do not share the opinion that the physical author's opinions and intentions are not relevant to the interpretation of his/her works, but retain the less modern idea of the existence of the author's personal view of the world that can and should be found behind the text, in the sense of Wayne C. Booth's 'implied author' presented in *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago 1961). The role of 'the author' in the classical Indian context is discussed in more detail in my forthcoming Ph.D. thesis, dealing with the Sanskrit versions of the Pañcatantra.

2 Kālidāsa's date is not certain. Both external and internal evidence suggest that he lived between AD 390-470. It is very likely that he worked under the patronage of one (or two) of the kings of the Gupta renaissance. The kings that come into question are Candragupta II Vikramāditya, who reigned AD 375-415 and is traditionally associated with Kālidāsa (the latter having been one of his 'Nine Jewels'), Kumāragupta (AD 415-454), who was a great patron of poets and a poet himself, and Skandagupta (AD 454 - ca. 467). It has been suggested that Kumārasaṃbhava has been written to commemorate either the birth of Kumāragupta or the birth of Skandagupta. See e.g. Macdonell 1971: 268-275; Winternitz 1963: 41-49; Krishnamachariar 1970: 99-113; Miller 1984: 9-12.

not only the mastery of the literary language, Sanskrit, was required; one should also be versed in the literary sources and antecedents as well as the technical subtleties of the so-called *kāvya* style.[3] To ensure an audience and livelihood, the poets aspired to the patronage of princely courts. Many were themselves nobles or even kings.

So, what are we talking about when we talk about Kālidāsa's vision of the ideal marriage?

To begin with, one can say that the immediate audience of the classical literature written in Sanskrit may have been limited, but its influence spread far and wide. The new vernacular literatures that came into existence after the turn of the millennium adopted many of the old ideals and, above all, continued to recycle the earlier themes and subjects. In the Dravidian South and in some parts of Southeast Asia these as good as overwhelmed the indigenous tradition. One should also keep in mind the long-lasting and fruitful interchange between the 'Little' and the 'Great' traditions in India. The *kāvya* borrowed motifs and structures from folk literature and fed them back, not in the least by way of drama, which was not only a highly esteemed but also an immensely popular form of art, the performances taking place during religious festivals. There was room for social satire and even protest.[4]

One should naturally be careful when using literature as a testimony of 'wie es eigentlich gewesen'. Whereas naive readers tend to accept every statement in a literary work as presenting the author's firm opinions about how things are or how they should be, more sophisticated literary analysts occasionally forget to pay attention to the temporal and cultural distance and tend to see humour, irony and criticism in such phrases, characters and turns of plot that strike the modern reader as being humorous or critical. Is, for example, the portrayal of King Agnivarṇa in Kālidāsa's Raghuvaṃśa meant to be taken as 'concealed criticism'[5] or is the king's corruptness described because the poet did not want to oppose the tradition of the Purāṇas and The Great Epic which his audience knew only too well? What are we to think about the 'frivolous' king Agnimitra in Mālavikāgnimitra?[6] Does Kālidāsa include some passage that makes us feel deep sympathy for the character only to show how accurately and elaborately he can describe human feelings? Or is something that we regard as a novel and original viewpoint only a device to create variation in an otherwise monotonous structure? Is a humorous scene in a play meant to criticize or only to pick up an occasional laugh from the less discerning part of the audience?

There is no end to such questions, and in my opinion, for students of Indian literature they are more formidable than to most others. One is faced everywhere

3 See e.g. Lienhard 1984: 31-42.

4 See e.g. Warder 1989: 200ff.

5 Lienhard 1984: 176.

6 See Warder 1977: 128-129.

with the usual Indian practice of fondly accumulating all kinds of material to make up a wildly incongruous whole. But the situation is not hopeless. One thing to bear in mind is that the fastidious theorists of the *kāvya* placed one virtue above others: the power of language to suggest (*vakrokti*). Multiple meanings and effects were deliberately sought. Therefore, it is quite possible that the author is, at the same time, *both* conforming and criticizing.[7]

The double identity of classical literature, common in its inspiration and influence, elitist in the outlook of its practitioners and supporters, makes it, to my mind, doubly interesting as an object of research. It gives evidence of the tensions between different classes, most of all between the priestly class and the nobility, as well as the means by which the writers built bridges across the social and ideological gaps to create a coherent view. As to this last point, Kālidāsa can be said to epitomize not only the culture of his era and his country but the dilemmas of the artist in general, for reasons I shall soon return to.

Lastly, it should be stressed that while the classical Indian author had to follow strict rules in respect to his sources (i.e. traditional myths and tales) and technique, he had a free hand elsewhere. He could retell such tales that he found pleasing and choose a general theme that attracted him; he could select a viewpoint, and from the repertoire of traditional ways of treating his subject he could pick the one that best suited his disposition and aptitude. He could make changes to the plot and modify the characters where he thought a change was needed.

By paying attention to these optional elements in texts, some conclusions can certainly be made in regard to Kālidāsa's ideas about marriage and family.

For an author, choosing love as one's theme has been as self-evident in India as in the West. The majority of lyric poems in anthologies deal with love, and romantic episodes abound in longer narrative works. The authorities of Indian aesthetics considered the erotic (*śṛṅgāra*) to be the most important of the eight (or nine) aesthetic moods (*rasa*). But no Indian author has ever treated this theme as profoundly and extensively as Kālidāsa, and unique is the way in which he allows the warm romantic glow of sensual love to embrace the matrimonial state and the family, the institutions which have in India belonged to the realm of 'duty'. Take for example Bhāravi and Māgha, two poets whose long elaborate court epics (*mahākāvyas*) have been granted the highest place in the Indian canon beside Kālidāsa's two epic works. Bhāravi and Māgha chose heroic subjects to match the prestige and magnificence of the literary form they used. Bhāravi's *mahākāvya*, Kirātārjunīya ('Arjuna and the mountain man'), describes a mythical duel between two heroes, one of whom is the god Śiva in disguise. Māgha's work even bears a warlike title: Śiśupālavadha ('The slaying of Śiśupāla'). But Kālidāsa, when tackling his first

7 It should be remembered that, while a poet may not have wanted to lose his patron (or his head) by criticizing or ridiculing him, criticism against a rival prince and his actual or mythical ancestors was not out of place.

court epic, chooses the courtship and marriage of Śiva and Pārvatī as his subject and names his epic Kumārasaṃbhava, 'The birth of Kumāra'.

Kālidāsa was the most versatile author of classical India, but whichever genre he chose, his themes were the same. The most memorable episode in his other *mahākāvya*, Raghuvaṃśa, is the love story of King Aja and his wife Indumatī. Kālidāsa wrote three plays, all dealing with love and marriage. He composed an exquisite long poem, Meghadūta ('The Cloud Messenger'), about love and longing. In this poem all things, nature and its phenomena, plants and animals, mythical and human beings, are seen through a lover's eyes and breathe sensuality.

KĀLIDĀSA'S BACKGROUND AND POSITION

In Indian literary history Kālidāsa occupies a position that is both central and intermediate. He is supposed to have lived in the fifth century, in the heyday of the classical culture, in the city of Ujjayinī which was the intellectual and commercial centre of Western India, and, from the time of Candragupta II onwards, the capital of the Gupta Empire. A product of a refined tradition, Kālidāsa surpassed everyone that had come before him, as he succeeded in combining almost all the virtues of the *kāvya* style[8]. For those coming after, he was the supreme model to be followed.

What should we then say about Kālidāsa's ideological stance? It is frequently claimed that Kālidāsa's view of the society was that of a solid conformist, that he was a proponent of the static, inflexibly patterned and patriarchal view put forward by the canonical writings of the priestly *brāhmaṇa* class, their *dharmaśāstras* and the didactic parts of the Great Epic Mahābhārata.[9] He was too well educated to be anything but a *brāhmaṇa* himself. Many Western critics have noted, somewhat disparagingly, that Kālidāsa never questions the authority of the *śāstras* he quotes, and that he relishes describing brahmanical rituals with the accuracy of a religious textbook.

Secondly, it is obvious that Kālidāsa was to his royal patron's taste. To all appearances he was successful, a man of the world who knew people and travelled widely.[10] To obtain and to retain such a position one had to tread softly. Thus Kāli-

8 These were the choice of a suitable subject, perfect command of the grammar and its complicated syntax, long compounds and other peculiarities, the skillful use of metres, the display of erudition, the ability to evoke appropriate aesthetic sentiments and responses, and elegant diction. Kālidāsa was quoted by the authorities of Indian poetics as the most illustrious example of the clear, precise and mellifluous style called *vaidarbhī*. Its alternative was the heavy, obscure and ornatic *gauḍī*. See e.g. Keith 1920: 338-344, 375-386; Dimock et al. 1974: 115-143.

9 Thus e.g. Warder 1977: 131, commenting on Raghuvaṃśa. Keith (1924: 160) states that the excellence of Kālidāsa's poetical skills 'must not blind us to the narrow range imposed on Kālidāsa's interests by his unfeigned devotion to the Brahmanical creed of his time'.

10 Kālidāsa's knowledge of various Indian sceneries is evident e.g. in the itinerary of Meghadūta and the description of Raghu's conquests in Raghuvaṃśa.

dāsa is an easy target for the distrust which the modern Western intellectual feels towards a colleague who is too friendly with the high and mighty.[11] The myth of the struggling artist dies hard: it is safer to appreciate Rembrandt than Rubens.

However, things are not that simple. Kālidāsa was no ordinary conformist. As a poet he managed to be both archetypal and original. He created a style of his own, but it was immediately recognized as a synthetic, pan-Indian style. This is probably due to his ability to fuse two poetic traditions, those of the Sanskrit poetry of the North and the vernacular poetry of Mahārāṣṭra (which in turn was indebted to the aesthetics of Tamil poetry).[12]

His view of the world had an equally personal stamp. His thinking was modified by the fact that he was a worshipper of Śiva and Śiva's spouse, the Goddess. Not only does Kālidāsa pay homage to Śiva in the benedictions of his plays but his conception of the nature and the universe is Śaivic.[13] In each one of his works, the human (or semi-human) lovers revive the universal drama first developed in Kumārasaṃbhava.

Śaivism, even in its most orthodox form, preserves a streak of unorthodoxy, rising from the nature of its object of worship. For Śiva is the paradoxical god, an ascetic and *yogeśvara* ('the lord of yoga') but also a family man and the paragon of virility.[14] As the dancing god, playful and horrific at the same time, he is well suited to be the tutelary deity of creative artists. His partner, the Great Goddess, is equally ambiguous. She is the eternal feminine, a part of Śiva as his *śakti* (active power), born first as Satī, then as Pārvatī, worshipped as the young warlike Durgā and the hideous all-powerful Kālī. The popular cult of the Goddess is sensual to the extreme. This may well explain the eroticism of Kālidāsa's writing, as well as the presence of active, full-blooded women in his works.

11 Nathan (1976: 4) speaks about the victory of the 'adversary' tradition of the Western literature, which has made it difficult to understand poets like Kālidāsa.

12 See Hart 1975: 174-179, 255-256. This, as well as the extent to which the Indian literary theory was based on texts and not vice versa, is not taken into account by e.g. Heifetz who criticizes scholars of seeing too much 'indirectness' in Kālidāsa's writing (Heifetz 1985: 15). Ujjayinī where Kālidāsa worked was situated in Malwa, which is the frontier area between the northern and the southern India. It was attached to the Gupta Empire by Candragupta II after AD 390. Kālidāsa may have been born even further in the south, i.e. in Dasapura (see Krishnamachariar 1970: 99). Other suggestions for the home region of Kālidāsa are Kashmir and Vidarbha (Berar).

13 See Miller 1984: 7-8. Kālidāsa's relation to Śiva and the Goddess is made apparent by his name, even if one does not believe the legend attached to it.

14 Śiva's virility, visually symbolized by the ithyphallic penis, is nevertheless not to be understood as lecherousness but a yogic transformation of sexual urge, by the retention of the semen, toward freedom and bliss. See Kramrisch 1981: 164-165. According to the Mahābhārata (13.83.41-47) and Śiva Purāṇa (2.4.1.24, 2.4.2.1-11) Śiva, while making love to his newly-wedded wife Pārvatī for a thousand years, held the semen within him, thus acquiring an immense amount of *tejas* (fiery energy), and only at the request of the gods let the semen fall, to be swallowed by Agni. This does not preclude the fact that Śiva is quite capable of feeling superhuman lust, love and longing.

Śiva's different features are not contradictions in the Western sense but rather correlative opposites, as e.g. O'Flaherty has pointed out.[15] Śiva can be an ascetic householder because ascetism (*tapas*) and desire (*kāma*) are only different forms of heat.[16] Śiva himself, being all things to all men, is the mediating principle between the opposites and tensions in the world. The ultimate answer to the problem of Śiva's (and the world's) contradictions is emotional and irrational, i.e. *bhakti*, the bond of love between the god and the worshipper that does away with all rational barriers.[17]

Śiva is described as being androgynous (*ardhanārīśvara*). In him the cosmic principles of Sāṃkhya-Yoga, *puruṣa* (spirit) and *prakṛti* (matter)[18], are combined. Tantrism allocates these principles to Śiva and the Goddess respectively, and thus the sexual union symbolizes the regained cosmic harmony.

Sex was an essential part of the philosophy of the Śaiva and Śākta systems, but it was also a science (*śāstra*) the study of which was considered essential for a poet. Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra (ca. AD 300) was to remain the standard textbook for the next thousand years, and it is also Kālidāsa's primary source of *kāmaśāstra*. The tone of this treatise is practical and tolerant. Vātsyāyana professes to recommend the brahmanical view but makes it clear that things do not always work like that in real life. His prescriptions are mostly based on common sense, decency and moderation. For him emotions come first. 'Love is the goal of the marriage union', he says, 'and although the *gāndharva* marriage[19] is not the most recommended, it remains the best. [For] marriage can bring many joys and sorrows.'[20]

Another textbook that was known to Kālidāsa was Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, the most famous Indian treatise on politics and administration[21] (ca. AD 300). Kauṭilya's work discusses profit (*artha*) as distinct from duty (*dharma*), summing up the attitudes of the nobility and demonstrating the distance between the Indian

15 O'Flaherty 1973.

16 O'Flaherty 1973: 35. O'Flaherty (1973: 76-77) also mentions that both are ways to achieve immortality: by *tapas* one is released from rebirth, by begetting children he lives on in their bodies.

17 O'Flaherty 1973: 36-39. According O'Flaherty (1973: 39), *bhakti* as an inherent tendency in the cult of Śiva is much older than the concept itself. See also Gonda 1970: 22.

18 These terms have a slightly different content in various philosophic systems. Here the meanings of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga are used as they are most relevant to Śaivism, Śaktism and Tantrism.

19 A 'marriage' by common consent of the partners, i.e. without the consent of the parents and without religious ceremonies. In literature these kinds of romantic liaisons are usual. Vātsyāyana recommends them as a ruse to force the girl's parents to give their consent to a (real) marriage.

20 Kāmasūtra 3.29-30 (translation by A. Daniélou). The last sentence means that love strengthens the bond of the partners, which in its turn makes the sorrows inherent in human life easier to bear.

21 The proper study of this branch of knowledge was also a part of a poet's education.

reality and the brahmanical ideal. The brahmanical doctrine of the *varṇas* and their duties is accepted for the sake of the good life and common prosperity (Arthaśāstra 1.3.14-17). The king can use ruthless means to consolidate his power, for a firm monarchy is essential for the state to prosper, but here also, as in the Kāmasūtra, decency prevails. The king must be just.[22] And

> in the happiness of the subjects lies the happiness of the king, and in what is beneficial to the subjects [lies] his own benefit. What is dear to himself is not beneficial to the king, but what is dear to his subjects is beneficial (to him).[23]

The precept of moderation and tolerance is equally applied to the questions concerning marriage and divorce, family and offspring.

These influences went into the making of the intellectual atmosphere within which Kālidāsa worked. We have all kinds of evidence about the harmony and comfort of the reign of the Guptas.[24] The devotional religion flowered, after finding a new mode of expression in the Purāṇas. Social mobility accelerated.[25] It is possible that Kālidāsa lived during the happiest period in Indian history. This must be kept in mind when one is tempted to call his views too idealistic.

What Kālidāsa sets out to do with his art is in accord with the spirit of his age. He wishes to mediate and reconcile. Though a devoted Śaiva, he could praise Viṣṇu (a long eulogy in the tenth canto of Raghuvaṃśa) and Brahmā (Kumārasaṃbhava 2.4ff.) and show sympathy for Buddhism[26]. His polished talent and his erudition, the manner that Ingalls calls 'courtly fluency' that 'makes it too easy to lie'[27], were counterbalanced by his religious views and his exceptionally deep love of nature.

Indeed, such sensibility to nature as Kālidāsa displayed was something unique in the classical Sanskrit literature. It has been suggested that here too he was influenced by the Dravidian aesthetic theory which cultivated a more emotional and

---

22 'For, the (king), severe with the Rod [i.e. disciplinary measures], becomes a source of terror to beings. The (king), mild with the Rod, is despised. The (king), just with the Rod, is honoured.' (Arthaśāstra 1.4.8-10. Translation by R. P. Kangle.) This work, as well as the Kāmasūtra, cites frequently other authorities and gives their different opinions on the subject under discussion.

23 Arthaśāstra 1.19.34. Translation by R. P. Kangle.

24 Most notable is the account of the Chinese pilgrim Faxian, dealing with the years AD 399-414 (James Legge (tr.), *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms*. Oxford 1886.)

25 See Stein 1998: 98-100. Among the three upper *varṇas*, i.e. *brāhmaṇas*, *kṣatriyas* and *vaiśyas*, upward mobility increased. On the other hand, the status of the inhabitants outside the Gupta heartland deteriorated.

26 Ingalls 1976: 24. Religious toleration was typical of the Gupta regime. The emperors were Vaiṣṇavas of the Bhāgavata sect, but Śaivism was widespread and Buddhism still thriving. Kumāragupta appears to have worshipped privately Śaivitic Kumāra Skanda (see Miller 1984: 12). This period as whole and Kālidāsa as its representative are examples of what Gonda calls the 'inclusivism' of Hinduism (see Gonda 1970: 95).

27 Ingalls 1976: 22.

less urban attitude towards nature.[28] The sensual descriptions of the Indian landscape found in Kumārasaṃbhava and Meghadūta are justly famous. In Abhijñānaśākuntala we find Kālidāsa's earthly paradise, namely Kaṇva's hermitage, where trees and flowers blossom, wild animals roam in peace and the heroine of the play declares that she loves a vine climbing on a mango tree as if she were her sister. This arcadia is compared unfavourably to the city. Watching it, one of the pupils of Kaṇva says: 'as if I were a free man watching a prisoner, I watch this city mired in pleasures' (Śak° 5.11)[29].

Kālidāsa's picture of Kaṇva's retreat is not a fashionable literary idyll but a symbol of his striving towards a synthesis, a way to reconcile *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa*. There was an old solution, formulated in the brahmanical doctrine of the four stages of life, either as alternatives or following each other (the student, the householder, the hermit, the ascetic). Kālidāsa sees nevertheless a deeper significance in his ideal *āśrama*. It is essentially not a place but a state of mind that combines the 'stages'. This is connected with Kālidāsa's attempt to reconcile the romantic tradition of courtly love and the dharmic and brahmanical idea of marriage and family.

It is certain that Kālidāsa's vision was attractive to his aristocratic audience which wanted its pill of *dharma* with a lot of sugar. But it is not likely that Kālidāsa was only pandering to his patrons' wishes. Remembering his Śaiva background, one can propose that a wedding of outwardly opposite poles was for him the only way by which reality is made understandable and emotionally and intellectually satisfying.

RITUAL AND ROMANCE

Kālidāsa's ideas of human affection and human bonds were a part of a larger scheme. This scheme was one of recurrence and repetitive patterns that enclose each other in diminishing scale. The idea has, of course, been inherent in the religious ritual from the Vedic times. The ritual space is the cosmos, the administrators of the ritual become gods. In a more private *pūjā*, the devotee is transformed into the god s/he is worshipping.[30] Similarly, some parts of the Brahmanic *saṃskāra* of the wedding, especially the recitation of Vedic verses[31] and the showing of the Pole Star[32], refer to the divine precedents of this rite. Many cultures include in their mar-

28 Thus G. L. Hart, according to Ingalls 1976: 23.

29 Quotations from Abhijñānaśākuntala are taken from the B. Stoler Miller's English translation. For the sake of clarity, the references in brackets are also to this translation.

30 Many of the Śaiva rites and most of Śākta and Tantra rites emphasize this point.

31 Ṛgveda 10.85, a marriage hymn celebrating the mythical union of Soma and Sūryā, the daughter of Savitṛ

riage ceremonies the idea that the bridal pair repeat the action of mythical forebears and/or gods. Kālidāsa's Śaivic world view, combined with the fact that he treats the subject of love and marriage very profoundly and earnestly, not at all as a stock topic or material for a light comedy[33], may imply that his ideal was the internalization of the wedding ritual, so that the example of the primeval pair, Śiva and the Goddess, would become reality in the minds of the initiated.

The genre of the drama, in which Kālidāsa excelled, has a ritual dimension.[34] Many theorists trace its origin to ritualistic practices.[35] The earliest Indian treatise on dramaturgy, the Bhāratīya Nāṭyaśāstra (before AD 500) states that the drama – being the representation of the true state of the three worlds – deserves to be called a sacrifice (NŚ 5.108), and tells about the divine origin of the art of dramaturgy (especially the first chapter of the NŚ). The famous Kashmiri Śaiva philosopher and literary critic Abhinavagupta (10th c. AD) repeats this view.[36] It is reasonable to presume that Kālidāsa was the one writer of dramas who took the idea of the drama as a ritual seriously. He was in many ways very conscious of the medium he was using. Every one of his three dramas presents a scene in which a play or a dance is being rehearsed (or a performance is discussed), with the author's comments embedded in the text. In Vikramorvaśīya, Kālidāsa makes a straight reference to the legendary origin of the drama: the play within the play is directed by Bharata and performed in the palace of the god Indra.[37]

The heroes of all of Kālidāsa's dramas are kings. An Indian king was a person who was an icon of a deity and an important ritual figure on the one hand[38] and a householder on the other. Therefore all that Kālidāsa says about the supreme deity (Śiva) and about the king is applicable to the ordinary householder. The same is true about their consorts. And it must be emphasized that this model is not the same as the typical brahmanical one, which is that of Rāma and Sītā.

Kālidāsa's heroines are no meek and obedient Sītās. How could they be, if they are in any way to resemble their model, the Great Goddess? In fact they can be more active characters than the men who seem just to sit and wait to get impressed

---

32 Other stars, especially Alcor which symbolizes the faithful Arundhatī, may also be pointed at (see Parpola 1994: 240-246).

33 This applies even to Mālavikāgnimitra which is the lightest of his dramas.

34 The ritualistic aspect is reinforced by the (aesthetic) rules governing the characterization in dramas (and in poetry in general). The characters are not individuals but types (or *leitmotifs*; Heifetz 1985: 8).

35 See e.g. Keith 1924: 36-49.

36 See Byrski 1974: 3-18, 93-100.

37 The most famous Western example of this is 'the play within a play' in Hamlet. Kālidāsa's persistent use of this kind of inclusion highlights his affiliation with the ideas of the Nāṭyaśāstra. It may also be noted that the device suits perfectly Kālidāsa's general scheme of 'repetitive patterns'.

38 See e.g. Flood 1996: 67-69.

by them. They hark back to the witty, independent and self-reliant heroines of the Great Epic, Kuntī, Draupadī and Sāvitrī. In Kumārasaṃbhava, Pārvatī (or Umā as she is usually called) sets out to win the favour of the reluctant Śiva. She turns a deaf ear to the advice of those who are near to her, exposes herself to the fierce elements and practices penance to be Śiva's equal. In Abhijñānaśākuntala, Śakuntalā protects her rights as a wife and the rights of her son like an angry lioness.

It is notable that in Kālidāsa's plays important female characters may outnumber the males. Mālavikāgnimitra is full of dynamic women. The heroine Mālavikā is complemented by the nun Kauśikī, the two queens and their maid-servants. More often than rivals, Kālidāsa's women are accomplices and friends. In Abhijñānaśākuntala, Kālidāsa describes sympathetically the close friendship between Śakuntalā and her two female friends, Anasūyā and Priyamvadā, without the usual male condemnation and suspicion about female company breeding discontent towards men and wantonness in behaviour.

While being strong and active, Kālidāsa's women do not forget the proper conduct of the wife, *pativratā*. They are very devoted to their husbands and husbands-to-be. When separated from her lover, Śakuntalā thinks about him all the time. Rati, in Kumārasaṃbhava, is beside herself with grief after the death of her husband Kāma and wants to perish on a funeral pyre. But it must be kept in mind that here two ideals merge. The behaviour that the *dharmaśāstras* expect of a woman whose husband is dead or absent and the behaviour that the Kāmasūtra and the lyrical poets assign to a love-sick person immersed in longing are rather similar.

Many of Kālidāsa's ideas about marriage and the relationship of the spouses indeed belong to the domain of courtly love. This must not be misunderstood as superficiality. Ardent love and the distress of separation were a crucial part of the myth of the divine love affair of Śiva and Pārvatī, a point which I shall discuss later. In the centuries that followed Kālidāsa, the devotional religion sprung up as *bhakti*, in which the relation of the god and the worshipper was expressed in the context of a passionate and sometimes excruciatingly painful love story. The link between the earlier tradition of courtly love and the new devotionalism was most explicit in the cult of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā developed by the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas.[39]

Kālidāsa did not write *muktakas* (short lyric poems), but he composed a multiple-stanza lyric poem that may be regarded as a string of *muktakas*, and he has much in common with the warm, intimate spirit of the writers of short lyrical poetry, especially Amaru. Amaru favoured a female point of view, because a woman was supposed to have a far wider range of erotic feelings than a man. In the brahmanical society a woman's only goal in life was love which led to marriage and giving birth to children. Thus, sex (*kāma*) was a woman's duty (*strīdharma*), also in the positive sense, as her right to sexual satisfaction was hardly ever questioned, not even

39 See e.g. Flood 1996: 128-147.

by the strictest brahmanic authorities.[40] Kālidāsa exploits both the female and male points of view when describing the causes and effects of love. His heroes can be even more tender and sensitive than the heroines. Bitter and impatient outbursts against women, so typical of the literary personae of another famous lyrical poet, Bhartṛhari, are totally foreign to Kālidāsa.

Love in Kālidāsa's works follows the romantic pattern of lyrical poets and the Kāmasūtra. The feeling of love is predestined and marked with omens. Fate weds the two protagonists and all that the others can do is to approve the inevitable.[41] But even though people fall in love at first sight, Kālidāsa takes great pains to show that the proper feeling needs some time to develop, hinting thereby that true love is not based on sexual attraction only. Kālidāsa acknowledges the ten stages of love listed by the Kāmasūtra, which include absentmindedness, loss of appetite, fatigue, sleeplessness, sickness and so on, and finally loss of life, if the relationship is not consummated or if the pair is cruelly separated for a longer time. For Kālidāsa, love is not a trifle but a matter of life and death.

> If such emotions touch even one who is self-controlled [i.e. Śiva], how must they excite another man who is not his own master?[42]

In Kālidāsa's imagery nature and love are intertwined. Love and sex are equally inseparable. Love must have intercourse as its end, and Kālidāsa devotes Canto VIII in Kumārasaṃbhava to the depiction of the sensual joys of the newly-wedded Śiva and Pārvatī.[43]

But, as much as love is the force that keeps the world going, love itself must undergo changes to stay alive. Twists and turns in 'the plot of love' are also needed for the sake of art, for conflict breeds action and without action there is no drama. In the Indian aesthetic theory, all these twists are named and classified. The most important is love-in-separation (*viprayoga*). Union is followed by separation, separation by an anticipation of reunion and then comes the actual reunion. By this suspense love is made stronger and sweeter.

---

40 Biardeau (1989: 50) states that *kāma* was a traditional art which was handed down from one woman to another. Treatises on *kāmaśāstra* were meant for women also. Vātsyāyana (Kāmasūtra 1.3.2-12) recommends the reading of manuals of love for all women.

41 Thus the female companions of Śakuntalā guess that Śakuntalā's foster-father Kaṇva will give his consent to the union of the lovers, because 'if fate accomplished it so quickly, Father Kaṇva will not object.' (Śak° 4, entr'acte). Lovers should trust to their feelings, for instincts prove to be right. King Duśyanta senses that Śakuntalā is a suitable match for him (that is, of the same social class as he) even though she looks like a female ascetic (Śak° 1.19). A marriage to a *brāhmaṇa* girl would be out of the question (*pratiloma*).

42 Kumārasaṃbhava 6.95b. Translation by O'Flaherty.

43 This canto has been frowned upon as indecent by some critics. Mammaṭa (11th c.) said that it is improper to describe the love life of one's elders. Accordingly the canto has been dropped from many manuscripts. See Winternitz 1963: 61, n. 1.

Kālidāsa is the master illustrator of *viprayoga* and his Meghadūta is the uncontested masterwork of this mood, an elegiac message of a hundred and eleven stanzas for a beloved far away. It is remarkable that Kālidāsa's sufferers are mostly men: the forlorn *yakṣa* in Meghadūta, King Duśyanta in Abhijñānaśākuntala – he has forbidden the spring festival[44] because he is pining for his lost love –, King Purūravas in Vikramorvaśīya – he goes positively mad because of the loss of his wife –, King Aja in Raghuvaṃśa – he grieves uncontrollably for his dead wife Indumatī and soon follows her by starving himself to death.[45]

Kālidāsa uses old myths and stories as his raw material but alters them considerably to make them suit his views of a successful relationship (and a successful plot). One feature that had to be altered in any case, at least when composing dramas, were unhappy endings. These were considered inauspicious, and they were also at odds with the concepts of *karma* and *dharma*.

The changes Kālidāsa makes tend all in the same direction. He adds suspense to the action, as well as dramatic incidents and sub-plots, but these are not mere structural amendments. They give support to the comprehensive alterations made in the characterization.

This is best exemplified by Abhijñānaśākuntala. In the story of Śakuntalā, as it is told in the Ādiparvan of the Great Epic, King Duśyanta rejects Śakuntalā and their son because he fears public opinion. Only at the command of a heavenly voice is he ready to receive them. Similarly, Śakuntalā seems to be trading off her virginity for the promise of her son being recognized as the crown prince. Such characterization, although certainly realistic, is totally unsuited to Kālidāsa's purposes. His ideal woman has too much self-respect to be an opportunist. His ideal man is too noble to break his promise and shy away from responsibility. He is indeed too noble even to sacrifice his beloved to appease public opinion. Ingalls (1976: 22), when speaking of Kālidāsa's characterization of Rāma in Raghuvaṃśa, draws attention to the fact that Kālidāsa, usually so unbridled when describing men in love, is curiously silent about Rāma's feelings towards Sītā. According to Ingalls, this means that Kālidāsa does not believe that Rāma's love is real because he is capable of abandoning Sītā. Such a deviation from the traditional elevated picture of Rāma and even more, from the traditional brahmanical teaching about a king's (or a householder's) communal *dharma* always overriding his conjugal *dharma*, is really astonishing.

---

44 Spring (i.e. the rainy season) is associated with love. In Kumārasaṃbhava (3.21-43) the love-god Kāma sets out to attack Śiva with Spring as his helper.

45 But not before his son is old enough to succeed him. – Lovers' trysts (*saṃbhoga*) are also prominent in all of Kālidāsa's works, jealousy (*māna*) is displayed in the dramas (this feeling is suitable for heroines but not for the heroes), and love that is not yet consummated conquering obstacles (*ayoga*) is illustrated in Kumārasaṃbhava and provides for much of the plot in the dramas. The best example that Kālidāsa gives of 'happy recognition in the end' is Act VIII of Abhijñānaśākuntala where a husband, a wife and their son meet.

CONFLICT AND HARMONY

As some scholars have pointed out[46], in Kālidāsa's works *dharma* is frequently juxtaposed with *kāma*. They are first shown to be in apparent conflict which threatens the well-being and social status of the protagonists. Then a solution is found and *dharma* and *kāma* are reconciled. The ideal equilibrium is achieved, when *kāma* is tempered by *dharma* and *dharma* enlivened by *kāma*.[47]

The conflict can take the form of a curse. The curse is always provoked by an excess of *kāma*. The *yakṣa* in Meghadūta has neglected his duty towards his master because of his love for his wife and is sentenced to spend a year in exile. Śakuntalā fails to show proper hospitality to an ascetic because she is dreaming about her lover, and the ascetic makes the lover forget her. Urvaśī misbehaves, first because her love makes her absent-minded, then because she is jealous, and a curse strikes her two times. These curses have two purposes. Thematically, they are proper punishments for overheated passion, and structurally, they create necessary obstacles and explain away some incongruities in the original plots. King Duśyanta appears to treat Śakuntalā cruelly when he rejects her. But the audience of the drama knows the truth: it is the curse that makes the king forget. All the time he acts very justly. He cannot be unfaithful to his other lawfully wedded wives by accepting as his wife a woman whom he thinks he has never set his eyes on.[48]

Another source of conflict is polygamy. This problem is present in all of Kālidāsa's plays, whereas the superhuman heroes of Meghadūta and Kumārasaṃbhava are shown to be monogamous. The conflict is generated by Kālidāsa's own convictions. For him love is a deep and strong feeling which always leads to marriage, and very obviously he thinks that marital love at its best is monogamous. But the plays have a courtly setting, kings have usually more than one wife, and Kālidāsa either does not want to be too idealistic or feels obliged to follow the traditional models in constructing his plots.

The existence of the other wives works very much like a curse. It adds dramatic tension to the play and highlights the struggle between *dharma* and *kāma*. This obstacle is nevertheless for Kālidāsa much more difficult to clear away. He does not question the prevailing practice; that would be unrealistic, and unwise. But his hero has to be a perfect specimen of the dramatic type *dhīrodātta*, firm and noble, one who possesses the sublime qualities without any blemish. And even though male infidelity was never an issue in ancient India, Kālidāsa is bothered about the idea of his hero having many wives and falling out of love with some of them.

---

46 See e.g. Miller 1984: 29-37.

47 Miller 1984: 36.

48 Even Kālidāsa cannot explain all away: a divine intervention is needed to avoid the most tragic consequences of the curse. Śakuntalā, rejected both by her husband-lover and by her family – a very dismal fate for an Indian woman – is spared from this humiliation by a divine nymph who flies away with her.

Kālidāsa solves the knotty problem by attacking it from all sides. First he shows that the hero's love for the heroine is pure and sincere. His grief, when he believes that he has lost his beloved, is also convincingly depicted. The hero is thus faithful in the sense that he loves only one woman at a time. When Śakuntalā says that the king Duśyanta 'must be anxious to return to his palace', he declares that his wounded heart would be hurt anew if she believed that he loves anybody else but her (Śak° 3.22). The king's new love combines the domains of *dharma* and *kāma*, while his other wives belong exclusively to the domain of *dharma*. The hero does not neglect them except in the emotional sense. He is sorry for the fact that he no longer loves them and admits that their accusations are well grounded. In this way he is at least partly absolved of his guilt.[49]

In Kālidāsa's plays the other wives are never demonized. Their jealousy is shown to be natural and justified. When the new love is promoted to the rank of wife, the matter of jealousy is settled. Kālidāsa is here content with the brahmanical view which expects the wives to be friends with each other. A troublemaker is simply not a good wife.

A final justification for polygamy is the lack of a son. This is the case in Vikramorvaśīya and Abhijñānaśākuntala. In the latter play, which is the most coherent and sublime of Kālidāsa's dramas, the son born of the wedlock of *dharma* and *kāma* is Bharata, the forefather of the heroes of the Great Epic who gives his name to India (*Bhāratavarṣa*). In the more light-hearted Mālavikāgnimitra, the hero is not 'elated' (*udātta*), and therefore his amorousness does not need to be defended in moral or emotional terms. *Dharma* and *kāma* are opposed only at a superficial level: the new love is a slave-girl and thus unsuitable to be loved by the hero. Naturally, in the end she is revealed to be a princess.

According to the *dharmaśāstras*, marriage is essential for both men and women. By marrying, a man pays his two debts, to the gods, by performing the necessary rites as a householder, and to the ancestors, by fathering a son who will be able to perform the sacrifices that send the ancestors' souls into heaven. A grown-up woman cannot live on her own, except by being a prostitute. Kālidāsa agrees with all this, and like many of the lawbooks adds a third purpose for marriage, namely sexual fulfilment (*rati*).[50]

Thus a man is not complete without a wife and a family is not a family without a son. But Kālidāsa makes it clear that children are also loved for their own sake. He uses King Duśyanta as his mouthpiece:

---

49 If this sounds like a lame excuse, it should be remembered that as a rule men in ancient India did not need *any* excuses for their polygamy.

50 It may be added here that Kālidāsa is not overtly particular about the timing of the official marriage rites. In Abhijñānaśākuntala it suffices for the king to promise to take Śakuntalā as his wife (i.e. their union is a *gāndharva* marriage for the time being, but it is enough to make her 'his lawful wife' (*dharmapatnī*, Śak° 6.24)). The official ceremony can be performed later. When Śakuntalā comes to the king to be married, she is visibly pregnant.

> lucky are fathers whose laps give refuge to the muddy limbs of adoring little sons when childish smiles show budding teeth and jumbling sounds make charming words (Śak° 7.17).

Kaṇva and Śakuntalā illustrate the ideal loving relationship between a father (though a foster-father) and a daughter. Even when Kaṇva repeats the Indian adage about daughters bringing grief to their parents because they will leave and be given to others, Kālidāsa softens the message with his choice of words:

> If a disciplined ascetic suffers so deeply from love, how do fathers bear the pain of each daughter's parting? (Śak° 4.6)

In addition, it can be noted that in this drama, which sums up many of Kālidāsa's ideas about love, family and the good life, sympathetic hermits and sages such as Kaṇva and Mārīca have wives, but the sour and angry ones are solitary, like Durvāsas. Childless ascetics have a family that consists of their foster-children and male and female disciples. The wives of the ascetics, Gautamī and Aditi, are presented as equal partners to whom their men turn to get a second opinion. The idea of this kind of life enhanced by familial love, lived in nature (or at least near nature), seems to have appealed greatly to Kālidāsa. In Abhijñānaśākuntala (4.20), he associates it with old age: when the son (of Śakuntalā and Duśyanta) is old enough to be a king (a householder), the married couple can retire to the woods to live in peace and happiness.

Here again it can be noted that even though Kālidāsa's views of the sacredness of marriage coincide with the teachings of the *dharmaśāstras*, it is quite possible that he did not base his views on brahmanical convention. One of the central ideas of South Indian literary tradition which may well have influenced Kālidāsa's work was the sacred nature of marriage and its great importance in human life.[51] Both Kālidāsa and early Tamil poets regard sex as the agent as well as the part and parcel of the married state, whereas Kālidāsa's contemporaries and followers who wrote in Sanskrit connected sensual love with adultery. The emotional content that Kālidāsa gave to the austere brahmanical form of marriage and family – all shades of love, friendship, loyalty and tenderness between old, young, men, women, parents, children, in-laws and confidantes – springs from his own genius. The philosophical frame is provided by Kālidāsa's Śaiva faith.

Kālidāsa bases his plots and characters on opposites which he then proceeds to reconcile by the medium of drama. Furthermore, this drama is conceived as a ritual, the goal of which is a synthetic vision of the world. Besides *dharma* and *kāma*, the pairs of opposites include nature and urbanity (Śakuntalā and Duśyanta), the world of men and the world of gods (Purūravas and Urvaśī), the male and the female. Finally we come to a pair of opposites over which the best Indian minds have mulled since the time of the Upaniṣads: action and renunciation.

51 See Hart 1975: 179-180, 252-257.

Kālidāsa's universe is Śiva's universe, and Śiva is both a householder and an ascetic. The myth which tells how the ascetic was turned into a householder is retold in Kumārasaṃbhava. This is one of the oldest and most fundamental myths of India[52], and it was probably important to Kālidāsa for several reasons. As stated above, the union of Śiva and Pārvatī is his model for a perfect marriage. Śakuntalā and Duśyanta are human versions of these two gods. Theirs is a union of two equals who both have rights and duties. Their marriage is based on deep sensual love and has male offspring as its goal.

One of the many seeming paradoxes of this myth, and also of Kumārasaṃbhava, is that the purpose and impetus of its plot, the reason to get the hero and the heroine together, is the birth of a special kind of son who will slay the demon that is harassing the gods. But even though Śiva and Pārvatī are united to beget such a son, all the myths and legends present the actual conception, the birth of this miraculous boy, to be in one way or another unnatural. Śiva's seed is needed, but Pārvatī, the embodiment of the Mother Goddess, is not the mother. Her sister Gaṅgā receives the seed and the Kṛttikās act as the child's foster-parents. A modern scholar can find logical reasons for this. Because Skanda had been from a very early date connected with the Kṛttikās,[53] they had to be incorporated into the later retellings of the myth. But for a believer, such as Kālidāsa, this is no explanation.

In the Purāṇic versions of the myth, Śiva is strongly opposed to having children. He wants to continue his yoga. He does not need a son because he is immortal.[54] The Purāṇas and popular tales also give a nasty and realistic account of the married life of Śiva and Pārvatī. Śiva is morose and unfaithful, Pārvatī nags at Śiva because of his neglect of marital duties and her petit bourgeois parents look down their noses at their unconventional son-in-law.

Perhaps this was the reason why Kālidāsa ended his epic after the wedding-night? He did not want to falsify the myth but neither was he ready to accept it *in extenso*? Maybe not. Kumārasaṃbhava is perfect and complete as it is. Kālidāsa sees Śiva's yogic restraint as a necessary preparation for his marriage and parenthood.[55] And it can be claimed that Śiva's love and longing for Pārvatī, and his making love to Pārvatī, made his seed 'fiery' enough to produce Skanda.

The genealogy of gods in polytheistic systems is a complicated question as such. Usually, when gods are presented in popularizations of Hinduism as being 'sons' or 'daughters' of other deities, different periods of mythologisizing and different layers of religious theory and practice are squeezed violently into one. Indeed, it is common to chain mythical beings to each other in this manner to

52 See Parpola 1994: 218-224.

53 See Parpola 1994: 218-224; O'Flaherty 1973: 103-110.

54 O'Flaherty (1973: 212) refers to a tribal myth in which Śiva kills Pārvatī's children. One is reminded of the Greek Chronos who swallowed his children as soon as they were born.

55 Gonda 1970: 124.

emphasize their priority or subordination. But it is not so easy to find evidence of firmer ties of kinship, of parenting, as it were, between the major gods.

To catch the popular image of a god, we may inspect the material provided by visual arts. Viṣṇu's human characteristics are personated by Kṛṣṇa, the adulterous dream lover who vanishes by the morning. Śiva, in his less god-like form, is both the divine lover and the family man. He sits or stands by his wife who holds his hand or snuggles against him. At the Kailāsanāth temple at Ellūrā, Śiva is shown to combine work and play, his cosy and divine features. He is sitting with Pārvatī in an elegant and comfortable pose, but at the same time he keeps the demon Rāvaṇa imprisoned inside Mount Kailāsa with a touch of his big toe. In miniatures Śiva is often depicted 'picnicking' in nature with his wife and two singular sons, the elephant-headed Gaṇeśa and the six-headed Skanda. The mood of these tableaux is homely and affectionate, and the background scenery calls to mind the *āśrama* of Kaṇva. Perhaps this was one of Kālidāsa's visions of an ideal marriage. The love that binds Śiva and Pārvatī to their unnatural children may be as firm and tender as Kaṇva's affection towards her foster-daughter Śakuntalā. Parenting is loving, not genetics.

Lastly, does the original myth of Kālidāsa's ideal lovers cast doubt on the permanence of their alliance? Not really. Pārvatī has always been contained within the *ardhanārīśvara* as the Goddess, and they shall be reunited time after time. *Viprayoga* is not far from yoga. The penance practised by Pārvatī to win the heart of Śiva, as it is described by Kālidāsa, is both yoga and *viprayoga*, a torment that purifies and sweetens the love. In the same way, the recurrence of death and rebirth, separation and meeting, discord and reconciliation is an essential part of the relationship of Śiva and The Goddess-Satī-Pārvatī,[56] just as we must accept the losses and separations that we suffer in human relationships, to appreciate more the moments of joy. 'Even when love seems hopeless, mutual longing keeps passion alive.' (Śak° 2.1)

BEAUTY AND TRUTH

Kālidāsa's solution to the dilemma of 'the inner conflict of tradition'[57], i.e. action versus renunciation, might well be Śaivic: both ways. In Kaṇva's hermitage the lifestyles of a householder and a *vānaprastha*, a forest-dweller, are reconciled.[58] Kālidāsa is too much in love with the sensual world to renounce it altogether. Still, there is an element of renunciation in his vision because his love for the beauty of

56 See Kramrisch 1981: 234.

57 See Heesterman 1985: 7-9

58 If Kālidāsa had conformed to the brahmanical world view as single-mindedly as earlier European commentators seem to suggest, his descriptions of Kaṇva's hermitage and the yogic penance of Śiva and Pārvatī would have been somewhat out of place (see Kane 1974: 424-425).

the world of the senses merges with his love for the transcendent. He loves the ritual for its aesthetic dimension and its cosmic content, he loves a beautiful woman because she is nature and the Goddess, he loves Śiva for his being a householder and for his being an ascetic, and he loves the world because he loves Śiva. In one moment he is the moderate advocate of *dharma*, and in the next he is the mystic who sees beauty and harmony in that hubbub which we call life.

Bhartṛhari has written:

> surely the moon does not rise in her face,
> or a pair of lotuses rest in her eyes,
> or gold compose her body's flesh.
> Yet, duped by poet's hyperbole, even a sage,
> a pondering man, worships a body of woman –
> a mere concoction of skin and flesh and bones.[59]

Kālidāsa, who was a poet, a sage and a pondering man, would have smiled in answer.

REFERENCES

1. Works by Kālidāsa

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS:

Abhijñānaśākuntala

– M. R. Kale (ed. & tr.), *The Abhijñānaśākuntalam of Kālidāsa*. 10th ed. Delhi 1990 (reprint).

Kumārasaṃbhava

– M. R. Kale (ed. & tr.), *The Kumārasaṃbhava of Kālidāsa*. Cantos I-VIII. 7th ed. Delhi 1986 (reprint).

Mālavikāgnimitra

– M. R. Kale (ed. & tr.), *Mālavikāgnimitram of Kālidāsa*. Revised by J. L. Dave & S. A. Upadhyaya. Delhi 1985 (reprint).

Meghadūta

– M. R. Kale (ed. & tr.), *The Meghadūta of Kālidāsa*. 7th ed. Delhi 1969.

Raghuvaṃśa

– Narayan Ram Acharya (ed.), *The Raghuvaṃśa of Kālidāsa*. Bombay: Niṇayasāgara Press, 1948.

– M. R. Kale (ed. & tr.), *The Raghuvaṃśa of Kālidāsa*. Cantos I-V. Delhi 1991 (reprint).

Vikramorvaśīya

– M. R. Kale (ed. & tr.), *The Vikramorvaśīyam of Kālidāsa*. 11th ed. Delhi 1991 (reprint).

TRANSLATIONS:

Miller, Barbara Stoler (ed.), *Theater of Memory: The Plays of Kālidāsa*. New York 1984.

– Śakuntalā and the Ring of Recollection, translated by Barbara Stoler Miller.

– Urvaśī Won By Valor, translated by David Gitomer

– Mālavikā and Agnimitra, translated by Edwin Gerow.

---

59 Translation by B. Stoler Miller.

2. Other sources

Bharata, Nāṭyaśāstra
– Manomohan Ghosh (tr.), *The Nāṭyaśāstra. A Treatise on Ancient Indian Dramaturgy and Histrionics. Ascribed to Bharata-muni*, I (chapters I-XXVII). Revised 2nd ed. Calcutta 1967.

Bhartrihari and Bilhana
Barbara Stoler Miller (tr.), *The Hermit and the Love-Thief*. Harmondsworth 1990.

BIARDEAU, Madeleine 1989. *Hinduism. The Anthropology of a Civilization*. New Delhi.

BYRSKI, M. Christopher 1974. *Concept of Ancient Indian Theatre*. New Delhi.

DIMOCK, Edward D. et al. 1978. *The Literatures of India. An Introduction*. Chicago.

FLOOD, Gavin 1996. *An Introduction to Hinduism*. Cambridge.

GONDA. Jan 1970. *Viṣṇuism and Śivaism. A Comparison*. London.

HART, George L., III 1975. *The Poems of Ancient Tamil: Their Milieu and Their Sanskrit Counterparts*. Berkeley.

HEESTERMAN, J. C. 1985. *The Inner Conflict of Tradition: An Essay on Indian Ritual, Kingship and Society*. Chicago.

HEIFETZ, Hank 1985. Introduction. In: *The Origin of the Young God. Kālidāsa's Kumārasaṃbhava*: 1–16. Berkeley.

INGALLS, Daniel H. H. 1976. Kālidāsa and the attitudes of the Golden Age. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96(1): 15-26.

KANE, P. V. 1974. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, II.1. Poona.

Kauṭilya, Arthaśāstra
– R. P. Kangle (ed., tr. & study), *The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, I–III. Delhi 1988 (reprint from the 2nd edition: 1970, 1972).

KEITH, Arthur Berriedale 1920. *A History of Sanskrit Literature*. London.

------ 1924. *The Sanskrit Drama in Its Origin, Theory and Practice*. London.

KRAMRISCH, Stella 1981. *The Presence of Śiva*. Princeton.

KRISHNAMACHARIAR, M. 1970. *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*. Delhi (reprint).

LIENHARD, Siegfried 1984. *A History of Classical Poetry. Sanskrit – Pali – Prakrit*. (A History of Indian Literature, 3.1.) Wiesbaden.

MACDONELL, Arthur A. 1971. *History of Sanskrit Literature*. 2nd Indian ed. New Delhi 1971.

MILLER, Barbara Stoler 1984. Kālidāsa's World and His Plays. In: Barbara Stoler Miller (ed.), *Theater of Memory. The Plays of Kālidāsa*: 3-41. New York.

NATHAN, Leonard 1976. Introduction. In: *The Transport of Love. The Meghadūta of Kālidāsa*: 1–13. Berkeley.

O'FLAHERTY, Wendy Doniger 1973. *Asceticism and Eroticism in the Mythology of Śiva*. London.

PARPOLA, Asko 1994. *The Decipherment of the Indus Script*. Cambridge.

Śiva Purāṇa
– *The Śiva Purāṇa*, I-IV. (Ancient Indian Tradition and Mythology.) Delhi 1970.

STEIN, Burton 1998. *A History of India*. (Blackwell History of the World.) Oxford.

Vātsyāyana, Kāmasūtra
– Alain Daniélou (tr.), *The Complete Kāma Sūtra*. Translated by. Rochester, Vt. 1994.

WARDER, A. K. 1977. *Indian Kāvya Literature*, III: *The Early Medieval Period*. Delhi.

------ 1989. *Indian Kāvya Literature*, I: *Literary Criticism*. Revised ed. Delhi.

WINTERNITZ, Moriz 1963. *History of Indian Literature*, III.1. Translated by S. Jha. Delhi.