Kuntaka lays stress on the use of an appropriate word by the poet to convey the intended sense. As an illustration he quotes from Kālidāsa's *Kumāra*.

"Now two have become pitiable by your craze for union with one whom only skulls adorn; first comes the shining digit of the moon and then yourself, the moon-light for the eyes of the entire world."

He explains — In this stanza Kālidāsa has used the term 'Kapālin' to denote Lord Śiva, in fact there are so many words denoting him. What is the propriety of using the name 'Kapālin', which certainly does not convey an auspicious sense as conveyed by names like Śiva, Śaṅkara and so on? To understand the propriety, one must consider the intention of the poet here. He wants to point out the absolute impropriety of Pārvatī desiring marriage with Lord Śiva. Hence he uses the name 'Kapālin' which on its very hearing is capable of creating disgust in the mind of the listener. Because 'Kapālin' means one who wears human skulls on his body as ornaments. The very audition of the word 'skull'
creates abhorrence in the mind. What to say of thinking of marrying such a person always wearing the skulls?^4

According to some 'Finākinaḥ' has been used instead of 'Kapālinah', including the great commentator Mallinātha. But here, in this context between the two names, the name 'Kapālin' alone can convey the intended sense of the poet. 5

The words 'Saṁpratī' (now) and 'Dvayaṁ' (two) are also meaningful. Uptil now, only the moon's shining digit had earned the infamy of wrong attachment towards 'Kapālin'; but now Pārvatī has desired to give company to the moon in such wrong and unworthy attachment. Thus the poet intends to ridicule her craving to unite with Lord Śiva. 6

The word 'Prarthana'7 ('craze or straining to fulfil the desire') is also noteworthy. If Pārvatī had to marry that 'skull-adorned' Lord by some accident or due to some unavoidable circumstances, no blame would have come to her. But one is shocked to witness that she has herself forced to marry him. Further, there are two 'Ca' s (and) used and they hint at the excessive charm of both Pārvatī and the moon's digit.8 Moreover the poet has used the word 'Kalāvān' to denote the moon and the adjective 'Kantimatī' to qualify his Kalā or digit. Hence the use of the Matup Pratyaya or
the possessive termination conveys the excellence of the both, which would not have been possible by any other synonymous words.\textsuperscript{9}

This verse has been taken by Mammaţa and Visvanātha as an instance of the fault of Akramatā\textsuperscript{10} (irregular in syntax). And also Mammaţa has quoted this for the fault of Avimṛṣṭavidheyaṁśa. This is quoted for Nyūnapadatā in the Alankāracūḍāmanī. R.R.Deshpande opines this may be an instance of Parikālaṅkāra.\textsuperscript{11}

In Sāhityamāṁśa also mentioned for the instance of though there are lots of synonyms of that word, the particular word gives special meaning and beauty to that situation.\textsuperscript{12}

Each word from this Śloka is meaningful. Here Śiva's character is very funny. Because he criticizes himself infront of Pārvatī. No doubt people will criticize others but not themselves. But still in order to test Pārvatī, Śiva is doing the same. This is the extra-ordinary style of Kālidāsa.

Kuntaka has one variety of Vakratā or poetic beauty arising due to Puruṣa-vāicitrya or use of meaningful 'person' of grammatical usage.\textsuperscript{13} That is instead of using 'I' and
'We' of the first person and 'Thou' and 'You' of the second person, the poets make use of the Pratipadika or noun. As one of the examples, Kuntaka quotes from the Kumāra:

"This person wishes to ask you a question, O foremost one in penance! You may make a reply in case it is not secret."

Here the actual sense is "I am very much desirous of asking you the question". But the poet has used 'This person' instead of 'I' to highlight the disinterestedness of the speaker.

Śiva in the disguise of a Brahmaśarīṇi approaches Pārvatī and says "I wish to ask you a question, if it is not a secret you may reply." This is quite natural. Since he had come to test Pārvatī he did not want to disclose his identity. This shows his expertness. The vocative 'Tápodhane' is suitable, as he approaches her while she was practicing penance.

While elaborating the constituent elements of the Sukumāramārga or elegant style Kuntaka mentions 'Ayatnavihiitasvalpamanohārīvibhūṣaṇaḥ' as one such element. It means that in this style the figures of speech may be less
in number, but are attractive due to their being brought in without effort. As an example the following verse\textsuperscript{20} from the \textit{Kumāra} is quoted:

"The palāśa flowers glowing so red and curved like the crescent moon, as they had not fully opened, shone like the nail-imprints of Spring as it were on the bosoms of the sylvan goddesses during their first intimate union."

Kuntaka remarks that in this stanza even though the words, 'curved like crescent moon', 'excessively red' and 'who have been itself united' have been used due to their loveliness only as simple descriptions of their nature, there arises without any effort the delightful figure of speech due to the words 'as if they were the nail-marks', and thus the whole stanza becomes delightful.\textsuperscript{21}

This same verse is quoted as an instance of perspicuous beauty in relation to an \textit{Alāṅkāra} or figure of speech.\textsuperscript{22} And also this is cited in the third chapter as an illustration of, subjects that are usually devoid of all \textit{Rasas}, but are being infused with \textit{Rasas}.\textsuperscript{23}

In his commentary Mallinātha observes that there are two figures of speech in this verse. They are \textit{Jātisvarūpaṭprekṣā}
and *Samāsokti*. Appayya Dīkṣita has quoted this as an instance of *Svārupotpreatā*. And R.R. Deshpande also agrees. In his works *Aucityavicāracarca* and *Suvṛttatilaka*, Kṣemendra has quoted this verse in order to show the propriety in sentiment and in the description of the spring season, for the use of the metre of *Upaśīti*.

The fact that Kālidāsa fancies the red and curved palāśa buds to be the lover’s nail-marks on the damsel nourishes the erotic sentiment.

Another constituent element of this elegant style is 'Bhāvasvabhāvaprādhānyanyakṣṭāhāvyakauśalāh.' It means that in this style, the striking appeal of the essential nature of things as revealed in the creative mind of the poet is itself so effective that all the technical artistry displayed in other poems fall into insignificance when compared to it. And Kuntaka quotes two verses from the *Kumāra*:

"The couples revealed their love by their actions."

And

"As the stag tickled the hind with his horn, her eyes were closing in rapture at his touch."
Here, in the former verse, the poet simply states that on the advent of the spring all the couples began to exhibit their innermost love towards each other by their actions themselves. 32

This is the best example of Svabhāvokti. Even here the poet describes the spring season. The arrival of the Love-god is very influential. The poet has used the word 'couples' as the god of love was not alone, he was accompanied by Rati. Though the feelings of love are always present between the couples.

In the next stanza the poet describes, as an instance, the love exhibited through action by a black antelope which scratched with its horns its mate which had its eyes closed by the pleasures of the touch. 33

In his Daśarūpaka, Dhanaḍjaya has quoted this for Kālavibhāva. 34
Kuntaka defines the Prasādagūa belonging to the Sukumāramārga as follows:

"The excellence called 'perspicuity' is that which brings out the poet's intent without any effort on the reader's part, which conveys the meaning in an instant as it were, and which is concerned with sentiments and artful speech." \(^{35}\)

As an example he quotes a stanza \(^{36}\) from the Kumāra:

"As the snowy winter drew to an end, the lips of the nymphs became ever so clear, the complexion of their faces shone all the brighter and now perspiration stepped in amid the painted designs on their faces."

We have here all the conditions like uncompounded usage and so forth. It is also quite clear that the beauty of the face primarily caused by the various painted designs is further embellished as it were by the appearance of perspiration drops looking just like pearls. \(^{37}\)
The poet here wants to indicate that the winter season has come to an end, and there is an arrival of the summer season. This he explains with the help of the description of the faces of the Nymphs.

In winter season the lips and limbs become rough. So, the ladies used to make up some kind of wax to their lips and cheeks. When the winter season came to an end they become clear and smooth and then beads of sweat appeared.

Kuntaka has a variety of Vakratā or poetic beauty named Samvrtivakratā which is described as follows:

"In order to achieve excellence of expression, when the subject of description is screened as it were by the use of pronouns and so forth, we have what is designated as 'beauty of concealment.'"

In this 'beauty of concealment' there are several varieties. One of them occurs when an extremely tender subject by the device of concealment, Kuntaka quotes from the Kumāra.

"Seeing the marks of endearment (on her person) in the mirror and at the same time catching sight of her
lover's image sitting behind beside her, what reactions did Pārvatī not show out of bashfulness?"

Here, the resultant actions of Pārvatī are not specifically described. But the very question 'what actions did she not show?' is sufficient to impress upon the reader her manifold actions which cannot be described in words, but can be felt and enjoyed by a Rasika or connoisseur.

And also Kālidāsa used the similar stanza in Raghuvaṃśa. Hemacandra has cited this verse for the example of Vṛīḍā, in his Kāvyānuśāsana.

In the same Samaṃvatīvāraka there is another variety. When some faulty or defective subject is concealed from stating it because it is not fit to be uttered like a great sin. And Kuntaka quotes from the Kumāra.

"Stop him O maid! This urchin seems like talking again; his upper lip is throbbing already. Not only he who slanders the great, but also he who listens to him becomes a sinner."

Here the poet suggests that finding fault with Lord Śiva or abusing him is a great sin and this has been
Kuntaka begins his third chapter to deal with the Vākyavakrāta or poetic beauty in respect of sentences and defines it as:

"When the subject-matter is described in a way conducive to beauty by virtue of its own infinite natural charm and by means of exclusively artistic expressions, we may take it as an instance of creative beauty relating to content." 46

In his explanation Kuntaka states that in cases wherein there occurs the description of the natural charm of the subject-matter, there will be no need of Alāṅkāras like Upamā. Because the use of Alāṅkāras will spoil the extremely delicate natural beauty. This contention seems to go against his vehement opposition to recognise Svabhāvokti as an Alāṅkāra. Hence Kuntaka feels it necessary to explain his position satisfactorily. He contends:

"Writing poetry is not some thing which has to be done per force as if it were an inescapable necessity, because the whole activity is taken up here for definition only in the context of delight to the connoisseurs. What is more, if the subject-matter is not endowed with surpassing
excellences, any addition of a figure of speech will fail to add beauty to it in the same way as a portrait painted on an improper canvas. Therefore it must be conceded that the content described should be full of exquisitely beautiful natural traits. When it is such, then only it deserves to be adorned, according to the rules of propriety, by figures of speech like metaphor. The difference is only this—when the emphasis of the poet is on the natural beauty of the content, mostly metaphor and such other figures of speech cease to be of help. Either the natural delicacy of the context or the clarity in the development of sentiments etc. come to be obscured thereby. Thus we might conclude this subject by stating that in almost all respects the content adorned is comparable to a graceful damsel. Indeed she does not stand in need of excessive ornaments at times like bathing, ascetic life during separation from husband and the end of amorous sports. In all such contexts natural beauty itself captures the hearts of the connoisseurs. As an example Kuntaka gives a verse from the Kūmāra:

"With that slender bride face to face, though seated with all beauty-aids, the women commissioned paused a while, with eyes bewitched by her natural grace."
In the above example the poet intends to communicate the exquisite beauty of Pārvatī, a beauty naturally present in her delicate features. He fancies that any addition of an ornament would be obscuring this natural grace of her. It is generally true that when a subject is so described as abounding in natural falicility, any introduction of an adornment inclined to obscure the natural grace would certainly not be helpful. 49

Here indecisiveness of the ladies is described very beautifully by Kālidāsa.

Amṛtānanda yogin and Dhanabhājya have quoted this phrase for Śobhā in Nāyikālankāras. 50

One of Kuntaka's contention in relation to poetic beauty is:

"The secondarily sentient ones and non-sentient ones become sources of delight when they are so described that they promote the rise of sentiments." 51

He explains that the lower creatures should be so described by the poets that they should be capable of contributing to the rise of rasas or sentiments. As an instance he quotes from the Kumāra. 52
"With a throat clear by the mango-shoots, when the he-cuckoo started his sweet song, it turned out to be the order of Cupid to break the rising pride of beloveds."

Here the description of the cooing of the male cuckoo leads to the use of the love sentiment in the listeners and so it acts as an order from the Cupid to give up their pride and to unite with lovers. 53

We can find similar verses in other works of Kālidāsa itself. 54

Kuntaka does not agree to accept 'Preyas' (praise) as an independent Alāṅkāra:

"Nor is 'Preyas' (praise) adornment; for, its opposite, viz., dispraise, also might be an adornment at that rate. And the use of accepted figures of speech (like the simile) along with 'praise' would have to be regarded as a case of two 'merged' or 'mixed' figures; and it should come to have an independent status too like other figures, even in instances not involving praise or eulogy." 55

While explaining his stand he remarks "One and the same thing cannot be both Alāṅkārya (ornamented) and
Alarikaraṇa (ornament) moreover in an action one and the same entity cannot be both the object and the instrument of action. In this context he is confronted with a stanza from the Kumāra.

"Thou knowest Thyself by Thyself Thou dost create Thyself by Thyself; by Thine own act dost Thou Thyself merge once again into Thyself!"

In the considered opinion of Kuntaka, the description of the Lord in this stanza cannot be reconciled properly. Because, the identity between the Lord and his creation is the reality. But the poet has stated them to be distinct depending upon the imagined existence of the creation as distinct from the Lord. Moreover, as the imagined creation or the universe is full of the Lord or as the Lord is full of the universe, the identity between the two is the only reality. Still such descriptions of the Lord are given to highlight His Omnipresence, Omnipotence and Omniscience. Hence without any impropriety, one can state about the Lord that He is both the object and the subject of knowledge and also the object and instrument of an action. As the commentary of Pūmsavānī here the figure of speech is Vyatirekaḥ.
Kuntaka does not accept 'Urjasvin' or 'highspirited' as an independent Ālāṅkāra. According to him, the definition of Urjasvin is laid down by Udbhata as follows:

"Due to excessive rise in passions like love and wrath, when the emotions and sentiments are presented as taking improper courses, we have the figure of speech called 'Urjasvin'."^6

Bhāmaha states:

"'Urjasvin is as follows:

When the snake-arrow came back to Karna and he was begged to shoot it again at Arjuna, Karna laid it aside, saying: "O Śalya, does Karna shoot twice?"^61

Daṇḍin contends:

"Don't have any fear in your heart that I might harm you now; my sword never likes to strike at one who has turned his back."^62

But according to Kuntaka Anaucitya or impropriety cannot heighten the rasa or sentiment. He quotes Ānandavardhana with approval:

"There is no other cause for a breach in sentiment
except indecorum. The highest secret about sentiment is conformity to well-known considerations of decorum or propriety."63

Kuntaka adds:

A slight presentation of indecorum in regard to occasional emotions and sentiments, when the major sentiment is already presented perfectly, is permissible in respect of imperfect beings only; and that too on account of a sudden fit of passion or anger; but it is in no way permissible in respect of characters like the all perfect Śiva as in the example under discussion. A really appropriate Rasa is bound to adduce the feeling of the highest beauty in the mind of a sensitive critic flooding him with a feeling of wonder and admiration even like moonlight which very naturally elicits oozing from the moon-stone (or crystal called Candra-kānta); because it will be replete with all the causal factors like stimulants at their best and endowed with natural charm due to the artistic skill of a creative-genius. In such a poetic context, the idea that the selfsame (all-pervasive) Rasa can suffer the indignity of impropriety with its natural course impeded trivial causes like the sudden rise of passion and become transformed into an adornment is quite unreasonable. That is why even in such contexts master-poets are found to infuse real Rasa on a par with other proper contexts and their procedure is quite commendable."64
As an illustration he quotes from the *Kumāra*:

"Even Śiva filled with longing to unite with Pārvatī soon passed his days in great anguish. Who can resist the pangs of love when they afflict even the Lord of all?"

Anybody can note the difference in the senses of the stanza given above by Udbhaṭa and this verse of Kālidāsa. There is not any impropriety in Śiva loving Pārvatī and becoming passionate. This can be taken as an instance of *Samvṛti—vakratā* of the variety wherein the effects are concealed and not expressed.

According to Mallinātha here we have *Alaṅkāra* named *Arthāpatti* and not *Arthāntaranyāsa* as believed by some. Ruγγaka also quotes this for *Arthāpatti*. Dhanaṅjaya adopts this verse as an instance of *Autsukya* one of the *Vyabhicāribhāvas*, in his Daśarūpaka.

Here in this verse the words *Pasupati* and *Vibhu* evince the might of Śiva. The fact that even Śiva like ordinary mortals, was tormented by carnal passions shows the power of lust.

Kuntaka does not approve the *Rasavadalaṅkāra* as defined and explained by his predecessors. He emphatically states:
"Rasavat is not an ornament because there is nothing palpable apart from it which is adorned by it, and because the literal meaning of that word itself is contradicted."  

This does not mean that he does not at all accept the Rasavadalaṅkāra. On the other hand in his considered opinion Rasavat is Sarvālaṅkārajīvita or the soul of all figures of speech and Kāvyākāsāra or the very essence of poetry.  

Hence he gives his idea of the Rasavat:

"That adornment or figure of speech, which functions like 'Rasa' because it suffuses poetry with 'Rasa', is designated as 'Rasavat' in as much as it causes poetic appeal to connoisseurs."  

In his explanation he states: "Just as Rasa or sentiment produces poetic charm and gives delight to the connoisseurs. So too when the figures of speech like Upama or simile produce the both, they get the designation as 'Rasavadalaṅkāra.'"

Hence according to Kuntaka there is no distinct Rasavadalaṅkāra over and above the Alāṅkāras like Upama and others; but they themselves become Rasavat when they function like Rasas. He adduces an example: If a Kṣatriya acts like a Brāhmin, he is called Brāhmaṇaṅvat 'brahmin-like'. Similarly if an Alāṅkāra functions like a Rasa, it is called Rasavat."
According to Kuntaka this conception of Rasavadalañ-
kārata has an advantage. That is, if there occur other
Alaṅkāras along with Rasavat in a stanza, it does not result
into Samsṛṣṭi or Saṅkara which ordinarily result when there
is the mixture of two or more Alaṅkāras in a stanza. To
illustrate his contention, Kuntaka quotes from the Kumāra.:

"With his ray-fingers, the Moon holds fast the braided
hair of Night and kisses her mouth (face) as it were, her
lotus-eyes closing in ecstasy."

Kuntaka comments, "Here we clearly see the blending
of Rasavat-alāṅkāra with other figures of speech like metaphor.
But the major figure of speech which should be deemed as
Rasavat-alāṅkāra here is poetic fancy (Utprekṣā) instanced
in the line - 'And kisses her mouth as it were.' All the
other figures such as the simile are there only to heighten
the beauty of that Utprekṣā which is Rasavat and they have
no other independent function."

In his Suvṛttaśilaka Kṣemendra has quoted this verse for
the use of Rathoddatta metre in the description of Uddīpana
Vibhāvas. Hemacandra quotes this for Sambhogābhāsa in
Rasābhāsa.
Here the description of the moon-rise that includes the poetic conventions is beautiful.

Further Kuntaka remarks that when the Alankāras act in the manner of the flush of charming love, there also the connoisseurs should apply this same principle and as an illustration he quotes from the Kumāra. 80

"The goddess of Spring with 'Tilaka' (also, name of a tree) on her face, the clinging bees forming her collyrium-smear, adorned her lap, the new mango shoot with rouge (also, love) of the delicate Dawn."

Kuntaka observes, here also the metaphor (Rūpaka) involving the attribution of the behaviour of a lady in love to spring with the assistance of paronomasia should be regarded as Rasavat-alankāra because it closely imitates the behaviour of sentients with Rasa. 81

This has been explained vividly by Prof. Deshpande. 82

In the third chapter Kuntaka deals with 'Atiśayokti' or 'hyperbole' and remarks regarding its role in increasing the poetic beauty:
"Sentiments, natural objects and figures of speech - all of them reach their highest point of artistic beauty when their inherent brightness is so heightened by the element of hyperbole."^{83}

As an illustration he quotes the *Kumāra*.^{84}

"These rays of the rising moon might serve as flowers on your ear; soft like tender barley shoots, you might cut them with your nails."

Kuntaka comments: "Here again, the charm of the rising sentiment is exquisitely manifest. The rays of the rising moon in all their freshness and delicate charm are wonderfully invested here by the poet by a matchless exquisiteness. The lord of Pārvatī (i.e. Śiva) sweetly informs his beloved that the moon rays have acquired the great privilege of serving as an ornamental flower on her ear and to enjoy the rare delight of contact with her lovely cheeks, ears and curly hair. The poet suggests how Śiva was overwhelmed by love at the sight of her lovely moon-face and the rays of the newly rising moon simultaneously."^{85}

Here also the delineation of the rising moon is very attractive. The described subject of this *śloka* is the
suggestion to use the rays of the rising moon, as an ear-ornament. The nature of the moon-rays is their extreme delicateness has been described beautifully. The description which says of the delicate moon rays fit to adorn the heroine's ears suggest her great beauty. 'Apragabha yavasūcikomalā' by this word we can perceive that at that time the barley sprouts were used as ear-ornaments.

While explaining the Upamālankāra Kuntaka observes:

"In the examples of suggested simile, simile is seen to arise even by the implication of the predicate and so on by the more suggestivity of the whole sense wherein we have words that commonly apply to both the subject on hand and the object compared to, very aptly, i.e. conveying nothing more nor less, and very much in association with the highest degree of Rasa or sentiment."

As an illustration he quotes a stanza from the Kumāra:

"Though that king had other progeny, indeed his eyes found joy in only that child; though spring abounds in flowers diverse, bees swarm to the mango alone."
Kuntaka observes "here the idea that though spring has diverse floral wealth, it still has a special liking for the mango—flower, presents a completely similar parallel to the other idea described earlier in the verse. Hence it is right that we should regard it as a pointer to suggested simile. The abundance of flowers in spring is meant to be a parallel of the King's having many children. Thus the main features of the simile are undoubtedly present here. One should not confuse the simile here with Arthāntaranyāsa or a parallel generalisation. For that can arise only when the whole sentence import points to a parallel in another sentence import."^{89}

It is interesting to note that Mallinātha does not mention the Alāṅkāra contained in this verse. Prof. R.R. Deshpande remarks that the stanza has the Drṣṭānta-alāṅkāra.^{90} But as the commentary of Gaṅgādhar Śāstri Bhāraddwaj here is the Pratīvāstūpamālāṅkāra.^{91} Mammaṭa has cited this Śloka in his Kāvyaprakāśa as an instance of Prakṛmbhaṅga a Kāvyadoṣa.^{92}

There are numerous interpretations by various critics on the word Putravatōpi.
In this stanza the figure of speech is Drṣṭānta itself.

According to Kuntaka the Upamānopameya can not be an independent Alāṅkāra. He states: "It can not be considered as an Alāṅkāra because it rejects the existence of any other Upamāna or the third standard of comparison. Over and above the two which have treated as both Upamānas and Upameyas alternately. Because in examples like 'The face is the moon', there is not at all any scope to think of any other Upamāna except the 'moon'. In such cases there is the peculiar mode of expression utilised by the poet due to his imagination. Hence it cannot be treated as an independent Alāṅkāra or figure of speech."93

On the same count, Kuntaka refuses to accept Parivṛtti as an independent Alāṅkāra (Parivṛttirapyanena nyāyena prathannāstīti nirūpyate - p.208). While elaborating his view he quotes among others two stanzas from the Kumāra, as containing the Parivṛtti-alāṅkāra:

"Her hand now withdrawn from the rouge-less lip, and also from the ball reddened by her sandal-smeared breast, with its fingures injured while plucking hard grass, was turned to take delight in telling the rosary-beads."94
And,

"Why, in your youth have you left your ornaments and worn barks which go well with old age?"  

About the first stanza Kuntaka says: "Here only a limb of Gouri is described as undergoing exchange."  

And as relating to the second verse - "At times, several objects themselves may vie with one another in undergoing exchange."

About Parivṛtti A.B. Gajendragadkar observes: "Vinimaya or exchange is the essence of this figure. There is, however, some difference of opinion among rhetoricians as to what exactly constitutes exchange. Ordinarily exchange requires two persons. When one gives to another something that belongs to him and receives from him something else that is his, barter or exchange property takes place. Though Mammaṭa does not say so definitely we infer that this is his idea of exchange as gathered from his illustrations. Jagannātha agrees with Mammaṭa. His definition of Parivṛtti is quite definite on this point. Danḍin, Rudraṭa and Viśveśvara also hold the same view. Vidyādhara (Ekāvalī) and Vidyānātha (Pratāparudrīya) were apparently of the same opinion, as can be seen from their illustrations, although the former says 'Vinimāyah kīṅcinmuktva kasyacīt svīkārah' and the Ratnāpana on the latter remarks 'Kīṅciddatva kasya-ciddādānam vinimāyah'. The opposite view is held by Bhāmaha,
Udbhata, Vāmana, Bhoja, Ruyyaka, Visvanātha. According to them mere Parivartana or Vyatyaya i.e. the giving up of a certain thing and the taking of another is enough to constitute Parivṛtti. It is not necessary that the thing received should have been received from that some one. Bhāmaha further lays down that Parivṛtti should also be accompanied by Arthāntaranyāsa. According to these writers Parivṛtti covers a wider field. As such it will extend not only to those cases which contain a proper exchange and which, therefore, are Parivṛtti according to Mammaṭa, Jagannātha and others, but also to those others were there is a Vinimaya as defined by Ruyyaka and where according to Mammaṭa the figure Parivṛtti would not be present. Another point to note in connection with this figure is that the barter or exchange must not be real, though striking, but must have been poetically imagined.

Mallinātha has not said anything about the Alāṅkāras here. In the verse Visrṣṭarāgāt, Ruyyaka and Viśvanātha have cited this for the Pāryāyālāṅkāra. R.R. Deshpande has also mentioned that here the figure of speech is Pāryāya.

Here Kālidāsa described the distinction between the delicate nature of Pārvatī and later on her austere life.

And in the verse Kimityapāṣyā... here, Ruyyaka also
agreed that the figure of speech is Parivṛtti. But Śobhākaramitra disagrees. He says that here the figure of speech is Paryāya. Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy has said that Nidarsanālankaśra is clearly seen here.

Kuntaka quotes a stanza from the Kumāra as an example of Vibhāvanālankaśra, wherein the beauty lies in the denial of the cause even when the effect results. That verse is:

"She stepped into youth, the successor of childhood, the body's ornament unadded from without, the cause of ebriety without any drinks and the Love-god's dart other than flowers."

In the description of youthful charm of Pārvatī, the poet's intention is not to bring the ordinary and artificial causes but to point out that it was natural even though extraordinary.

Here Mallinātha and R.R. Deshpande have mentioned the Parināmalankaśra (commutation) along with the Vibhāvanā (peculiar causation). Amṛtānanda yogin and Ruūyaka also have adduced this verse for the Vibhāvanā. Critics have given different interpretations of this verse.
There is a controversy about the genuine portion of the Kumāra. The views of the various scholars have been succinctly given by R.D. Karmarkar: "The above arguments, though undoubtedly there is some force in them, are in our opinion, not powerful enough to carry absolute conviction as regards the genuine character of all the Sargas 9-17. The genuine character of the eight Sarga is now a settled fact. Mallinātha comments upon it, as also Dakṣiṇāvarta, Aruṇāgiri and Nārāyaṇa. Aruṇāgiri who has no scruples to comment on the eight Sarga and justifies the step he has taken, does not at all show that he regards the poem as in any way incomplete at the eight Sarga, as also Nārāyaṇa. The special pleading involved in taking 'Sambhava' to mean 'extraordinary greatness' is quite apparent and requires no comment. It is certainly unusual for commentators to ignore large portion of a work on the score that it is of inferior merit. The expression Aśṭādhikāḥ in Viśvanātha's definition of a Mahākāvyā is more in favour of those who regard the Kumāra to contain only eight Sargas. It would be seen that the Sāhityadarpaṇa unlike the Isānasamhitā does not prescribe a maximum number of Sargas for a long poem. It gives only the minimum. The Kumāra, of all the Mahākāvyas extant is the shortest and it might be presumed that Viśvanātha had the Kumāra in his mind when he wrote the definition. But to understand Aśṭādhikāḥ to mean as many as seventeen Sargas, seems to us
to be quite unfair. Another piece of evidence in favour of regarding the Kumāra, as consisting only of the first eight Sargas is the fact that rhetoricians do not seem to be at all aware of any additional Sargas for the poem. Dr. Harichand in his 'Kalidasaet L'Art poetique de L'Inde shows that in all 123 verses are quoted by various writers on rhetorics from the first eight Sargas, while none of them quotes a single verse from the remaining nine cantos. When we take into consideration the fact that the works on rhetorics, ancient and modern, consulted by Dr. Harichand – and the list of works so consulted is well nigh exhaustive – quote verses from each and every canto out of the nineteen cantos of the Raghu., the complete boycott of Sargas 9-17 of the Kumāra could be accounted for only on the supposition that they were not aware of them. One can understand a Sarga or two being ignored but that the whole host of rhetoricians should ignore so completely the Sargas in question, is in explicable except on the above supposition. In order to make the title of the poem more significant, we might perhaps regard Sargas 9 and 10 as genuine as they refer to the extraordinary manner in which Kārtikeya was born. In Vikrama., we have a reference to the Gandhamādana grove on the Kailāsa as being an ideal place for enjoyment. This reference would be all the more appropriated by one who has read the detailed description of such enjoyment in the eighth canto and a part
of the ninth canto of the Kumāra, and is undoubtedly intended by the poet to refer to his Kumāra. The oft-repeated comparison of the kings of the Raghu race in the Raghu to Kumāra Kārtikeya would suggest the possibility of later Sargas being written by Kālidāsa, as the heroism of Kumāra is described only there. In the view of the total ignoring by the rhetoricians of Sargas 9-17, it is very difficult to dogmatise on the present point. 114

But it is interesting to note that no scholar has taken note of the view of Kuntaka who happens to be a very early commentator of Kālidāsa. A study of the V.J. reveals that Kuntaka has quoted only from the first eight cantos of the Kumāra, and not a single stanza from the latter portion of the poem. Moreover in the fourth chapter while dealing with the Prakārana-Vakratā or the poetic beauty of the episodes in a literary composition, he enumerates such episodes from the Kumāra.; and the list does not include even a single episode from the latter cantos. No scholar can ignore Kuntaka's evidence while considering the genuine portion of the Kumāra.

"The several incidents described therein are: Pārvatī's beauty at the advent of youth, her worshipful service to Śiva, Brahma's suggestion regarding the way in which the defeat of gods at the hands of the unassailable demon Tāraka
could be overcome. Though it looked so formidable as crossing an ocean, Cupid, the friend of spring, attempting to assist Indra's cause by shooting his arrow at Śiva, depending entirely on the strength of Pārvatī's beauty and getting burnt down into ashes by the wonderful fire from Śiva's third eye, the lament of Rati overwhelmed by grief, Pārvatī's observance of austerities, her mind perturbed by this sudden blow (of rebuff), description of the conversation between Śiva and Vijayā (the confidante of Pārvatī) who offered him hospitality, request made to the Mountain King (for the hand of Pārvatī) through sages called Citra-Śikhaṇḍins, and finally, the wedding of Pārvatī with Śiva whose heart was overwhelmed by his abounding love for her. All these incidents are mutually connected by an intimate and logical relation, the preceding inevitably leading to the succeeding one in exquisite manner and possessing the highest possible beauty.
NOTES AND REFERENCES

CHAPTER V


2. द्वितीय गत सम्प्रति शोचनियताः
समागमस्त्र्यन्यया कथानिन:।
कला च स शास्त्रित्वेशः कलायतः
रसामस्त्र्य लोकस्य च नेत्रकूमारी॥
- Kumāra. V. 71. Transl. K.K.

3. There are 52 names for Śiva in the Amarakoṭa. (Vide op. cit. p. 7). But it does not mention कथालृक्त, विश्वास and प्रत्येकी.

4. अन परमेश्वरायक्षेत्राद्वितीयया कथानिन इति बीमति रसामस्त्र्यन्यया
विभावाविनासस्य बुधस्यां स्थापत्यस्य प्रधुष्मण: कामपि वाचकस्मातां विद्याति।
-V.1. p.72.

5. (1) Mammata has found fault here -
"इत्यादि पिनाकाश्च पदाढःक्षणेन किमिति कथालृक्तादिना काव्यानुगङ्गतयाः।"
- K.P. of Mammata, p.170.

6. सम्प्रति "द्वितीय" वेदतत्त्वीय रमणीयम् - यदि किल पूर्वेका
तैव द्वितीयनं धिमाति शोचनिया बाता, सम्प्रति पुनर्विदाया
तद्वाकालायाक्षेत्राया विवर्त्त्वस्यायक्षेत्राया विवार्त्त्वस्यायान्वितयेत्।
-V.1. p.74.
And Read:
सम्प्रति ए त्वमयपरेति द्वितीय शोचप्रमिति विष्णुदार्य:। शोचप्रत्य च
निर्लक्ष्यात्मांदिति मात्र:। - Malli.
7. "प्रार्थना" — शब्दोऽध्यात्मकत्वार रमणि: , यथातू नातालीयोऽवेन 
तवसमागमः कदाचिन्न माध्यत्वादः । प्रार्थना पुनःस्विष्टान्तं कौलीन- 
कलसुककारणि । व.ज. प.२४। 

Read:

Here M.A. Karandikar interprets: "समागमप्रार्थनाया" 
this is to be taken with both the moon and Pārvatī. 
The student should mark that the moon had never 
requested Śiva to put him on his head. No such 
reference is available. It was Śiva himself who 
wanted to get rid of the effects of the Hālahala 
poison and putting the moon on the head was one of 
the measures to over come it."— Kumārasambhavam of 
Kālidāsa. Ed. by M.A. Karandikar (M.A.K.) and Shailaja 
Bookseller's Publishing Company, Vitthalbhai Patel 
Road, Bombay-4, p.294.

8. "सा व तर्क य इति द्रयोरप्युभयमानपरस्परलिख्यव्यावहितस्मिन्तिति — 
पादपरस्परवेऽपात्तम् । व.ज. प.२४।

9. "कालयतः" "कान्तिमधुः" इति य मत्तुप्रत्ययेन द्रयोरपि प्रारंभसा 
प्रतीयतं इत्येन प्रत्येकं कविचर्पयथं: शब्दान्तरामिलिताता नोत्तहे ।

व.ज. प.२५-२६

10. (1) "अन्तः तर्क शब्दान्तरमृ चकारोऽयुक्तः:"।
(2) "अन्तः त्वमित्यन्तरमेव चकारोऽयुक्तः:"।
   — S.D. of Viśvanātha. समाप्तिपरिच्छेदः. p.३०४।
11. The verse may be regarded as an instance of परिचा आलकार.

12. "द्वर्य गति... त्रि पिनाकवादि परमेश्वरयाचक शब्दसंहङ्ग सम्बन्धे कपालिन डैति
   बीमतं रसानम्बन विभावाचक: शब्दो जयुपर्साकरत्वेत्र प्रयुम्यान: कागापि
   शोभामापकति!"
   - The Sāhityamāṁsā.

13. Among the three persons in Sanskrit grammar, in the
   First person अकम् pronoun occurs; in the Second person
   युक्मम् and in the Third person तद्, एतद्, बद् pronouns.

14. यत्र प्रत्यक्तापरमाभिव्याशं प्रयु-जते कथयः। काथवैविच्यायं
   युक्ममार्थादि वा प्रयोक्ताये प्रतिपदिकमात्रं निरुक्तन्ति।
   - V.J. p.38-39

15. अर्थ जन: प्रृथुमनास्तपोधने।
   न चेमजस्य प्रतिवकर्तमहि।
   - Kumāra. V. 40. Transl. K.K.

16. अमी प्रृथुमाय इति वक्तव्यः ताटस्थप्रतीत्वमध्यम जन इत्युपत्।
   - V.J. p.34

17. In his interpretation M.A.K. says: "न चेमजस्य" Cf. Nārāyana
   नन्वः प्रृथुमाय सच महाय प्रकाशेन बहुदोषाः। "मन्त्रे तुरक्षितमपिष्क्षया-
   दाप्तपरस्मार इति न्यायात"। p.277.
18. R.R.D. comments:

"The logic about the friendship of the good that it is brought about by exchanging only seven words having been conveyed to the host, the guest proceeds to justify the question he is minded to put to her. There is also another factor prompting him to put the question. It is that he is a twice-born. Of all twice-born ones घायल or घायदूर्य i.e. being over bold is a characteristic (or extra-ordinary inquisitiveness is a trait). Your honour or your respected ladyship I am confident is full of forgiveness (बद्वी क्षमा पत्तया: सा who is extremely forgiving). This is emboldening this person (i.e. the speaker, the brahmacāri referring to himself as a third party) to put a question to you (पार्वती). If it is not secret, you should kindly reply. The skill of the brahmacāri is admirable. He makes out three reasons why he is prompted to put a question to पार्वती:

(1) their friendship which is now an established fact;
(2) his being a brahmaṇa, therefore too inquisitive and
(3) the forgiving nature of पार्वती of which the guest is sure. The host simply cannot say 'no' to the guest." Op.cit., p.264-65.

19. Here Malli. remarks: सहयाद्रितोः
20. बालेन्दुक्रमाण्यखिलकर्मावाद
बहु पवाशान्यतिलोहिताति
सत्यो वतन्त्वन समागताना
नक्षत्राद्वीप वनस्पतीनाय
- कुमार. III.29.
Transl. K.K.

21. अज "बालेन्दुक्रमाणि" श्रद्धालोहिताति "सत्यो वतन्त्वन समागताना"।
इति पदार्था सौकुष्माध्यमम समावाहरणामानांयत्यत्वाय
"नक्षत्राद्वीप" इत्यर्थितथा मनोहारिण्: केशवचिन्ह सम्भावयोद्धिन्तथाने
योगनाम् भवमहानाम् चतुर्वर्तकारितायमापनाते। V.1. p.84


23. पदार्थ नीतिप्रार्थ पदार्थार्थातं तद्विदं सर्वमेकं सरस्तायुपनपते। - V.1. p.

24. अज वतन्त्वम् वनस्पतीहि विशेषणसाधारणायम् यथावदायते: समाकारणम् कर्तव्यसिद्धिति।
"नक्षत्राद्वीप" इति श्रद्धालोहित्यक्षेपस्मिताधिकारति। सा व नातक पंक्तिभावित
समाकारणम् प्रकरणोपपतिकारान्ते। विशेषण सामाध्यप्रस्तुत सम्भवम् समातोत्तितीर्थितः
इति दि नक्षत्रम्। - Malli.

25. "अज पवाशानुपुमानाः" कृत्तकोहिततभवेन संबंधेन स्निविष्टे
सदृश:नक्षत्राद्वीपस्मितावनामुक्तिप्रयास्वयंपर्यङ्गम्।

26. The figure of speech in this verse is उत्तेष्ठा.
27. अस्त नार्तकयां परमेवरत्यां भिलाशश्रृंखलारे वध्यमाणे प्रथमनुद्देशीयम्
‘यिंत्रकुलस्य वसन्तस्य वर्णनाया’ कामकायारोपेण वनस्यारे
ललनान् कुटीलोहितयालाग्नदातिका यंत्रस्त्रीयारोपणक्षणसङ्केतानुसार
परमांश्च चित्रयासत्तां रूपतायाद्वितीयम् ||

Auchitya Vichāra, Charchā (Aucitya) by Mahākavi Sri
Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1933. p.28.


29. Compare:

प्रणयित्तत्त्वाय नक्षत्रं प्रमद्यं मद्यार्पितं लक्ष्यं ||

Raghu IX. 31.

30. इन्त्यनि मार्यं क्रियया विवधः || - Kumāra. III.35.

Transl. K.K.

31. शूकरेण व स्पर्शनिन्दितादि

‘सूक्ष्मकषुप्यत कृपणतारः’ || - Kumāra. III.36.

Transl. K.K.

32. Vide Malli:

“स एव रसस्तेनानुविधम् सम्पूर्णं मार्यं रत्यार्थं शूकरार्थाय
क्रियया कार्यमूलया वेदंतया विवधः || प्रकटीपुष्कः || शूकरार्थेष्टः:
प्रकर्तव्यस्तेत्ययः” ||
33. (1) Compare:

शूद्र ने कृष्णंसरय वामननां कण्ठयमानां मुग्घम्॥ 
- Abhi. Sāk. VI.17.

(2) Read:

"सहपाने कण्ठयमने व कामधिन्द्रायस्वरुपयम्।"
- पृथ्वी के ठीक

34. Vide D.R. of Dhananjaya, p.229,

35. अयोध्याय ज्ञातानां ज्ञात्यासंपर्यायः।

रत्राक्षोत्तं विषय यत्थादान: स कथयते॥ V.J. I.31.


36. हिमवंशाय निगंधधारणा—

मणिपुलीमूलधक्षीनाम्।

स्मरोदनम्: विष पुष्पजननाना।

केव पद्म ज्ञात्यासंपर्यकेशु॥ Kumāra.III.33.

Transl. K.K.

37. आसमस्तराय दिस्मामृतिण विथाते। यदं विनिवर्त्रविशेषाश्चिमत्वाभिवृत्ति।

किमिन वदनानि निर्द्धयुक्ताङ्कारस्वेदनमेश्वरितविधित तदापि तुष्टतर्थाल्य ॥


38. Read—

(1) "तेमन्तः नायोः बिम्ब्वहुसुमधुरस्वक्ष्मेन शीतमयायस्वतीलि लोके प्रसिद्धम्।"
- Malli.

(2) "Women are described as applying a kind of wax-slave to their lips to protect them from the effects of the winter cold. Cf. वृष्णुमयादायल्लोः कर्त्तै &c. Rāghu. IX.32. — M.R.K. op.cit., p.62."
(3) "The verse describes the change brought about in the appearance of the Kimpurusa ladies. In the earlier season, due to extreme cold, the ladies used to apply some soft material to their lower lips (मल्लिनाथ-“हेमन्तुपुष्प नायं विस्मृतेनैः संधूरिर्वृक्ष शीतमयादेशा कालातिति प्रतिष्ठित्।). On their cheeks too they used to have Kumkuma cosmetic applied with the same purpose viz. protection against cold."

R.R.D. op.cit., p.139.

(4) For the similar stanza vide Raghu.: [citation]

39. यश संप्रियस्ते वर्ण वैविद्यम् विवक्षया ।
लक्ष्मी मायादिभि: कैलिचं पोषका संभृतेनितः ॥

40. दर्शने च परिभोगदर्शिनी
पृष्ठ: प्रणाधिनो निषेक्षण: ॥
वीर्य बिम्भमुनिबिम्मतमनः:
काहि काहि न चकार लज्जया ॥
- Kumāra. VIII.11. Transl. K.K. । ।

41. Compare:
दर्शने च परिभोगदर्शिनी निर्मिझ्यमुक्तस्तिधितः ॥
झायना स्वतदमनीया ज्युर्वृत्तिनिमित्युवीस्वाचार सः ॥
- Raghu. XIX.28.
42. Vide -

अकार्यार्जानादेवीत्वा | वैद्य्यार्यिन्द्र अकार्यार्जानांगुरुष्यवित्तकम्-
प्रविष्टार्जानादेवीत्वा | तत् वैद्य्यार्यिन्द्राङ्गुरुष्यवित्तकम्-
विलेखन वर्णार्जानायकीर्ष्यर्जानायकेश्वरात्रिकां दिव्यर्जानात्।

- Hemacandra, p. 220

43. यद्य स्वामिंयन कविविवक्षा तथा केनापहिदोपहिदेश्यन युक्तं दस्तु महा�-
पावकामिव कीर्त्तिनीता, नाहीं तीति सम्पादयों तीत्रित्येत।

V.J. p. 200

44. निवार्यतामालि क्रिम्यपि वद्य:?

पुनार्िविवुष: स्वरितात्तर:।

न केवल यो जमातोपथाते

श्रुणोति तृस्वामधपि ब: स पापाभ।।


45. अत्र मण्ियमाषण न कीर्त्तिनीतामर्त्तीति संग्रामेन समर्णयता नीतिमिति।

V.J. p. 202 Read:

(1) Malli's comments: can be read by interested scholars.

(2) M.R.K. mentions: "Cf. निवार्यतामालि क्रिम्यपि वद्य:।

सतत्नानिन्दक: पापियथ श्रुणवन् शास्त्रासे।।

Vamanas, p. "यं करोति महादेवनिन्दामत्तमविनानं भिन्नं।।

स पापियथस्वामधापि श्रुणोति स पापमाभ।। S.R"—op.cit., p.88.

(3) Compare:

"युरोपेह श्रीरामदि निन्दा वापि प्रकटि।

कर्म कत्र विधात्वाय सम्पर्य वा तलोऽस्मयत्।।

- Manusmṛti-II.200.
46. उदारस्यपरिप्रेय-स्वहन-दर्शनेन वर्णनम्।
स्तुतिः कवितावेदकोवर्ततैन भक्ताः । — VI. III. 1.

47. यस्मादनितिकार्यः काय्यकरणं न यथाकथितं विदुधेयतामहति
तत्तति अनुरक्तत्तम्युक्तं स्वनीयस्यार्थं प्रमुखो भावितिभागो विशेषतः
बोधों त्रिश्चवाय-कार्यतां दुःखितानीहक्यवर्तनं शोभानिश्चर्गतां परिश्चितीं।
तथा विशिष्टं तथा यथायोगमित्यानुसारेण स्यकाय-लक्ष्यार्थोजनम् भविताद्वृत्।
एतत्वार्त्थं विषेषं यदू स्वाभाविकस्वस्मार्थं प्रायानवेदं विविधस्य न भूयता स्यकायः
लक्ष्यार्थ उपकाराय कल्पिते, वस्तुस्मादलक्ष्यात्त्वत्थतयं रत्नादिदिरियोपक्षेपं वा समाचारयदानं
तथा वैदिकस्य मिश्चे सर्वार्थमिहेक्यायं विलासवतन्त्रस्य थानसमय-
विचित्रितपरिगमनु तुरतासानाहदै नार्त्यनमार्शकणसदाता प्रतिपद्यते,
स्वाभाविकस्वस्मार्थेऽवेद रसिकाद्वयाललाकारित्वाय। — VI. p.226.

48. तर्फः प्रामुख्यिः तस्मिन निदेशं तन्त्रीः
क्रिया विलेखवतं पुरो निश्चयम्।
भूतार्थस्य भोब्धियमार्णेनात्:
पुस्तायेते सैनिनियोतिष्णु नार्त् — Kumāra. VII.13.

49. VI. p. 226-227 Read: Malli. observes:
"स्वभावसुन्दरिया: किमय्या: प्रतिपदनेति तृष्णहि तद्प्रतिरित्यथः।"
Compare:
(1) किमविषयि ति मधुरणा: मण्डलं नास्ति नाशि नामस्। — Abhi. Śāk. I.18.
(2) स्वभावसुन्दरवस्तुन्यास्तर्थकारसत्त्वोऽत् — Subhāṣita

51. रसोदीपनसाधारण्यक्रितिनिर्णयनन्दनमुरुस् ।
   वेतनाममुखव्य जडाना घापे भूयता ॥
   V.J. III.8.

52. युताशुरास्वादकापरशः:
   पुरस्कोफिलो यन्त्रधुरु युक्त ।
   मनस्विनीमानविधातद्वकः
   तदेवात् दयन स्वरस्वः ॥
   Kumāra. III. 32. Transl. K.K.

53. Here Malli. comments:
   "मथरु युक्तेऽि यत्तकृतसेव तथा स्वरस्विनीनां रोषारसे ददक स्वरस्वय दयना मानं त्वसत्तापादयन्त्वां वातस् । कोकिलक्षणेनानन्तरं स्वराश्रयता इव
   And in the Pūmsavanī commentary: मानं जद्दुहिरत्वथः: "॥
   "अपि निर्यतश्चापि कोफिलादयन्त्रण, कामिनीजनन्दु प्रत्येकस्य विद्युर्तस्य स्वरस्व श्रुतिमात्माविधायतश्च वनन्त्ये श्यादद स्पकाष्टः: "॥

54. Compare:
   (1) त्यत्र मानवत् बतं विमुंडेन्न पुनरेति गर्त चतुरस्य वयः।
       परमुपामितिरिव निर्देशिते स्मरयते रमसे र्मव वधून: ॥
       - Rāghu. IX.47.
   (2) कणेशु र्ववतित गतेऽि पश्रिपे पुरस्कोफिलानी सर्स ।
   (3) त्यत्र कामिनी मदनायतुभुदाहरण्ति ।
       मानववर्ग निपुष्य त्ययधवस्व: ॥
       - Vikram. IV.11.
55. न प्रेयस्तादिशः स्पादयेत् (वदस्तावलक्ष्मिनः)।
अल्पकारानांतरे स्पादात्मन्यावादशीतादिपि॥

56. तत्त्वेोर्ममल्लकार्यत्स्मांलकरण्तवं शैवयूक्तिपुरुल्ल। एकक्रियाविषयं
युक्तेऽक्षेत्रेऽवं वस्तुः कर्मकरण्तच नोपपदः।
V.J. p.544

57. आत्मानमात्मना देवत्स सूत्रास्तात्मानामहत्मना।
आत्मना कृतिना य तत्मात्मन्येऽवत्तीस्ते॥
- Kumāra. II.10. Transl. K.K.

58. V.J. p.247 Read: (1) Here Malli, explains:
"न द्विते पुराष्ट्रेऽयेऽत्स्वयमात्ममेऽवऽवर्षक्षेति फलितायः"।
(2) In Puṁsavāni Ṭīkā:

"अं इत्य: - "वर्ष सर्व शुद्धिन्द्रेषु माँ चाचिकन्त्वपराक्रमः।
आत्मस्वयमात्मनां भूयं: कार्ल कालेन पुरितवदन"॥ प्रिति।
(3) "The all powerful nature, all pervasive nature
and therefore the self-sufficiency or absence of
dependence on any one or anything else on the
part of Atman are what the gods have in view."

(4) "In Indian philosophy and religion both means and
object accomplishment and accomplishable, path and
destination are undistinguishable (unseparable).
Kālidāsa himself says in his laudation to Brahma
Kumarasambhavam (Text with English Translation).
59. "अन्तः स्वाधीनतास्तिथितिपुलकपथाय श्रद्धाः: पराधीनतादिति:
प्रप्ताद्विद्याः तत्र किति:।" - पुंसवनी

60. अनौपलितयुक्तसनातनाः कामोऽध्यायकारात्।
भागाः च रसाय च वन्य उद्दिश्य कथयते।। - Udbhata IV.5.

61. उद्दित वर्ण यथा पायपि पुनरागत:।
पदः सन्दर्शय धिन वर्णः शाल्येत्यहिरपाकृतः।। - Bhāmaha III.7.

62. अपकारासूत्रमीति दुःस्मि ते मार्गम श्रृद्धयम्।
विमुखेऽ न च चवर्ग स्थ्युः स्मातुर वाच्यति।। - Dāndin II.293.

63. अनौपलिताहो नान्यतत्तथायुः कारणम्।
पृशिद्धाध्यायंस्थलतु रसस्यपरिवर्तनम्।। - Dhv. p.138.
Transl. K.K. p.139.

And compare: Dhv. of Ānandavardhana, pp.135-142.

65. पशुपतिर्या ताण्याहिनि कृप्शः-
दगभपद्ध्रुता समागमोऽधिकः।
कमपरश्च न विसुक्रुषः।
विमुक्ति तै यदी स्पृहादिशि भावा।।
- Kumāra. VI.95. Transl. K.K.

66. "अन्तः विस्तृदिकार सर्वत्राद्यादितरर्जनविवारिकाः: कैमुऽतिक:-
न्यायादपवनतत्त्वाद्याधिपतिरत्नकारः। तथा च सूक्ष्मः दण्डापू:-
विकायाः न्यायत्तरनमयाधिकारः।। हि अर्धस्तरस्यसिद्धिः कश्चिदः
तदुपेक्षायम्। गुप्तस्तु विस्तरः अयान्नोच्याः।।" - Malli.
67. "अत्र सिद्धान्तः प्राकरणिको लोक्यतां नैम्याकरणिक्षमयात्मकि।"
   Alan. Sarv. of Ruyyaka. p. 262

68. D. R. of Dhananjaya, p. 25

69. "The poet describes Śiva as an ordinary lover probably
to meet the exigencies of a Mahākāvyā." M.R.K., p. 102.

70. "शल्यानू हिन्द्रयुगामो विद्वासममि कर्षति।" - Subhāsita.

71. अन्तकारो न रसवध परर्याप्रतिभासनावः
   श्युपादतिरिक्तसं शब्दार्थांकगोर्यपि

72. यथा स रसवनामवालिकारवर्जीवितम्
   काठेकारात्ता याति तथेताति विवाहति
   - V.J. III, 15.

73. रसेन वति तुल्यं रसवर्तवचाथान्तः
   योऽलिकारः स रसवद्य तवद्राहलादानिमिति

74. यथा रसः काठ्यपद् रसवता तवद्राहलादः च विद्वासत्यायमादिरपुश्चरः
   निप्पादनम् रसश्वलकारः शंयते। - V.J. p. 264

75. यथा ब्राह्मणेन तुल्यं वति ब्राह्मवव ऋषियः त्वायः
   श्वलकारः। - V.J. p. 264.
76. According to commentator Śitārāma there is Samāsokti:

"पुभनमां ये केतर्स्थिनिग्रहे यथापि रसायनम: स तद्वैवकमय प्रथमः। सम्बोधितादिवसः।"

77. And according to Malli, there is the mixture of the Arthapattyatśayaktirānkara and Utpreksā-

"अथावत्विशिष्यकतिरक्तार्थास्यप्राये उत्प्रेक्षासंकारे यत्।"

According to M.R.Kale here is a mixture of Upamā, Rūpakā and Utpreksā.—VII Edition, p.155.

Appayyadīkṣita says—"here both Utpreksā and Samāsokti are woven equally. Hence it is an example of Samaprādhānyāsāṅkarānākāra. Vide: Kuv. p.290–62.
78. "यथा नायको विगलित चिक्कुः निकुर्ष स्वदेशरूपस्याय निमीलितकमलन्यः प्रियापूर्वो गुम्बातिकेष्व चन्द्रोऽपरितः भवः। अन च चन्द्रोऽदयस्योद्दीपन- विभावविन्य स्थयोद्धः छन्दतः प्रयोगोऽत्यन्त समीचीनः॥
Suvar. of Kṣemendra, p. 244

79. "आदिशब्दे निशाचनन्दमोहसोनिष्ठावरोधाएव सम्भोगातासो।"
Kāvyānu, Hemacandra. p. 246

80. तन्नितेयाः नामाविलिपिः
युक्तः मधुरीस्तिलको निबिधः ।
राजेण बानासाकोमलेन
पूर्णपुरावोऽक्षयमलकार॥ - Kumāra. III.30.
Transl. K.K.

81. अन्त शमाकोपितानिष्ठक्रुतान्तत्तत्स्य शेषच्छायात्सनयस्य रूपः (कर्ष्य तदा)
घरणाौ पृष्णदलङ्कारतत्त्वम्। - V.J. p. 259
Read: (1) Here, according to Malli. the figure of speech is Rūpaka.

"अन्त रूपकालकारः "
(2) Pumsavanī रिको gives the sub-division that -
ङ्केदेशविन्यालिकः।

"अन्त प्रयोगशब्दादिक्रपाध्रदिश्याय शब्ददेशोऽवलोकाति। मधुक्रियः
प्रसाधनमुख्यत्तनिष्ठक्रुत्तत्तत्ततं पुनर्थीसाध्वां प्रतीयो इत्यकेदेशविन्यालिकः
रूपकालकारः।"
(3) And M.R.K. also agrees this vide p. 61.

82. "There is thus रूपक contained in the verse."
83. सर्वविद्यास्यवस्तुः यथोत्साहित्यान्तः।  
रसस्थायासापलः। परतः पुण्याति वहलाम॥  
\[\text{V.J. III.34. Transl. K.K. p.483.}\]

84. शब्दयौनयोनिस्योऽदया: कर्ष्णपूर्वरचनाकृते तव।  
अप्रगत्वमययुविचित्कोमला देखियमुगनधस्य:।  
\[-\text{Kumāra. VIII.62. Transl. K.K.}\]

85. अतः रसायपितमेकविद्यास्वादः: समुदभासते। तथा च नूतनोद्वाराः।  
दर्शितुःकुमारिणा। शास्त्रकिर्तिःनामनाद्वारः।  
सम्प्रति समुद्भेते, येवान्त्येव कपोलक्षणिकपकक्षपापाणीयाः। कर्ष-  
पूर्वरचना विविधचतात्त्वक: वार्तालापिः। श्रवणवाद-  
येष्वन्तावनेदुन्निःदर्शिणिन तत्त्वादभित्तियाः। श्रवणवादिचित्रतत्त्वः। अतीतजस्त:।  
\[-\text{V.J. p.258}\]

86. Compare:  
अस्मारंगनिष्ठिर्भिर्भूक्ते: प्रवणलब्धवैद्य यवाभूते।।  
\[\text{Raghu. IX.43.}\]

87. प्रतियंक्रमोदाहरणे परस्य रसस्थायाः।  
संवैत्यस्यवस्तुःनिवाचनामोत्साहित्यान्तः।  
परिष्ठाकाशपशुपातेष्वाधिकार्यवहनमंग्लगोवितायाः  
विषयायामयमात्त्वकात्त्वः। - \text{V.J. p.200}\]  
\[\text{Transl. K.K. p.491.}\]

88. महीमृत्यु: पुष्पवलोचनः हृदित-  
सत्रस्थान्यन्ति न जगाम हृदितम।।  
अन्तर्गुन्थयमय मधोर्भि यथे-  
\[-\text{Kumāra. I. 27.}\]  
\[\text{Transl. K.K.}\]

90. "There is बिंब-प्रतिबिम्ब भाव between पुज्वानु-महीमूट and उन्नतपुष्प-मुधः, तदुपर्युः and चूककुस्मस, टृणिक्ष्ठ and द्रिष्यकाला, the eyes of हिमालय ever were attracted to पार्श्व तिर though he had many children. The row of bees (Spring's eyes) is attached to the mango-blossom, in particular, though there are endless flowers that the season is possessed of. The figure of speech in the verse is therefore दृष्टान्त. — R.R.D. op. cit. p. 32-33. And also M.R.K. mentions that नागोजिबहाँत्ता in his Udhyota remarks on this— पूज्वानु उत्तरे दृष्टान्तः। Op. cit., p. 17.

91. अधर्माट्यालं: साधारणो पृथ: शब्दमेतेन वाक्यदेशपथिप्रयात्तएति प्रतिविम्बोपमालंकारः। — पूनर्प्राणी

92. "He begins the phrase with the word पुश्च and later uses the synonym 'अल्प्य'; hence there is पुष्चमालः। उपर्युः महीमूटप्रतिबिम्बसोपायस्य गुरुम्। And further continues— अति सत्त्वार्थः पुश्चे कन्यास्तेषस्यात्त्वे सन्तृष्टि मृदिति केषवं समर्पयन्ते।" K.P. VII chapter Vol. II. p. 262.

93. न च उपमानान्तरस्तरलक्षणात्स्यायं दल्लारात्तरत्वम् 
युक्तिमन्तुरित्यादैं उपमानेतरस्तरमात्रन्यथार्थ्याय्यविधानान्तरत्वम्(क) (गुरुम) 
प्रतिविम्बोपदेशप्रतिविम्बार्थसमायुक्तवैधमात्र वैधमात्र विधार्थम् न 
94. विषुव्वटरागाराधरानिवार्तितः
तस्तां भगवानुवमिषाचय कनुद्वाशः
कृष्णाकुरंदा नवपरिश्नायः
कृत्तिवध्वनिप्रकाशी तया करः
- Kumāra. V. 11 . Transl. K.K.

95. किमित्यपास्याभरणान योवने
त्वथा पृथि कार्यप्रयोगः वद्वलम्
- Kumāra. V. 44 . Transl. K.K.

96. अन गौराः करकमलस्यो ध्रुमः परिवर्तितः \( \text{V. J. p.} \) 209

97. क्वचिद्वृंहामपि धर्मिणि परिस्परिना पूर्वकतः सर्वत्र यथा परिवर्तितः
- V.J. p. 209.

98. So विनिमय is स्वकिर्त्तिविश्वास्य परस्य दल्ले तत्स्रष्य परस्य तद्दौतस्य कर्यचिदादानम्. Read: "विनिमयो दि केनविद्व वस्तुना दल्ले कर्यचिदादानम्" प्रदीपः विनिमयाय कर्यचिदादानामित्यथा: \( \text{V. J. p.} \) 209

99. Read: परक्रीयस्किर्तिविश्वास्य निर्विश्वास्य परस्य स्वकिर्तिविश्वास्य परिवर्तितः " रसाग्रहिणी, p. 481.

100. Dāndin's opinion is known from his illustration, which is "वस्त्रप्रतिव ददता मुच्यनः तव भूमिकुलः " विराजित हृदि तेषां यथा: कुमुदपाणिशः. " - काव्याद्यम् 11.356.\n
Rudrata's definition is explicit:

"यूणपदानादाने अन्योन्य वस्तुनोः कः प्रयते यदुः
कृतिविद्ययोर्क व प्रसिद्धिः लेति परिवृत्ति:'
काव्यालक्ष्मी, VII.77.

Viveśvara declares: "अन्त स्वर्र धर्म उपादानेतदर्शनकार्तीरम्" - अलकार कौर्तुम, p. 334.

101. Ruuyaka, therefore, says: "सिनिमयदुस्त किरिमिक्यस्या
कर्मचारणादानाय" - अलकारसारस्वतः, p. 152.

102. Some such cases are:

(1) तत्स्य च प्रययस्तो जटायुषः 
स्वर्गिणिः किमिव शोचयते हुः;) येन वर्जितकेवर- 
कृतितिमिन्दुकिरियको ज्ञात यस: II अलकारसारस्वतः.

(2) किमित्यपुवस्तामरणानि यौवने पृष्ठ तत्स्य वार्तिकेवोभि वस्तुकः 
यददेवे स्पष्टयद्वितारका विभाकी यथास्याय कत्यते II 
- कृमारसारस्वतः, 5.44.

(3) किमित्यपुवस्तार्थपार्थार्थार्थ रामा विषाका कामानुगुणम् पुणालीम्.

These, according to Mammata, would be examples of 
धार्माय.

103. Thus, "कृतितिमिन्दुकिरियको ज्ञात यस: बलमः:
is not an example of परिवृत्ति, because here the barter 
is real. Read: "एञ्जु दानादानव्ययकारः कविकृतित श्व न तु वास्तवः:
श्च वास्तवित्त नालस्कारः — रसाकायग्निधर, p.482".

The Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammata, Ed.by A.B.Gajendragadkar. 
Elphinstone College, Bombay. — P. 570-71.
104. (1) "कर्षणीकोष नेकारस्मानाहते क्रमानं। अथर कन्दुकरूपनिन्यूत्तपादान-
tया सहततें रितिकान्।" - Ruyyaka, p. 246

(2) Vide: दमोपरंधेत: S.D. of Viśvanātha. pp. 21-22
"अरुएकम्य कर्षण अथर, स्तनयो:, कन्दुके, कुशादरूहे, अक्षुरे ऋ
यथाक्रमं विधानात्म पर्यायः।" - लक्ष्मी दीका।

(3) M.A. Karandikar interprets:
"अनोज्तिवेद कर्षणाध्रादी दमाधुकराद्वं द्रुणेण वर्तनात्
परिसरोपकारः। पलतस्तु परिकृतिरिवर्त सर्वित्त्वे
विदेशीमाणात्। - N. It is quoted as an instance of
परिसर्य in ताहित्त्वद्वय, अलंकारसर्वसम्बन्धं और अलंकारकृत। p. 261

105. "अनु उत्त्पन्न्येशिभूमिन्यूष्ट्याः अवकलस्त्य परिश्रुतिः।"
Alan Sarv. of Ruyyaka. p. 246

106. अनुभविनिबुद्धतौ विद्विष्टवस्त्र अवकलस्त्यावध्ययव धारणम्।
न वाच्य परिश्रुतिरिवतिवध्यव। कार्यकारणवादविविष्णवथ।
- Alankāraratnākara by Sobhākaramitra.

107. Kālidāsa Mahākaviya Kumārasambhava. Ed. by Dr.K.
Pub: Pathyapustaka Nirdesanalaya, Karnatak University,
Dharwad, p. 51.

108. उस्मूलम प्रदण्डनमविभवः
रनासवाहनं करणं मद्यस्य।
कामबिन कुष्णाध्यविरितिकारः
बालाभारं सार्थवयः प्रथोऽवः।
- Kumāra. I.3.1. Transl. K.K.
109. स्वकारणपरिश्यागृहूप्पकानिन्त्यमात्र ।
भावार्थायथ केनापि विशेषण विभावना। \ V.J. III.57.

110. अनुक्रिमिकारणपरिश्यागृहूप्पक लोकोत्तर सहजविशेषविद्विषिवता
वर्णनीयस्य केदरभिमुः। \ V.J. p.233.

111. "अनु द्वितीयाद आसमिकारणामात्रपरि तत्कार्यमयोत्तिर्दिशानाल-
बकारा। । तदुक्तानूः कारणामात्र तत्कार्यमयोत्तिर्दिशानालकारः। कारणामयो
कारणामयोत्तिर्दिशानालकारः। कारणामयोत्तिर्दिशानालकारः। " - Malli.

Read: "In lines 1 and 3 youth has मम्मनत्व and अर्थत्व superimposed on it and both these are useful
for the subject matter in hand. The two lines, therefore, contain two instances of परिणाम अल्कार।"

112. Vide: Alan, Samg. of Amrīnand Yogin. op.cit., p.82.

113. (1) "In S.D. Viśvānātha has quoted this verse for
प्राचीनत्व in नविकालकारा।। पूर्तियारितकेशदे, P 94.

(2) M.R.K. has not given his opinion, but has quoted
opinions of others. Read: "Critics are at variance
as regards the figures of speech in this Sl. Cf. सर्वस्र विभावनेति मोहराजः। द्वितीयाद एव विभावनेति महुकः।
वामनः पपुः। श्रवणार्क निकल्पनाया। साम्यदातृ विशेषितः।
इति लक्ष्मणानिवृत्तिः। विशेषितकालिकारः। इत्युक्तावान।।
प्राचीनत्व मम्मनत्वादिस्पष्टाद ल्यकालकारः:। एव ल्युट: I - Nar.
This ŚII is quoted in S.D. as an instance of पौलनाथोमा and in Sar.K. as of विषय नाम कारणान्तर विभागना. op.cit., p.18.

114. कलिदास by R.D.Karmarkar. Karnatak University, Dharwad 1971, pp.31-33.

After the end of the eighth chapter R.C.Dwivedi says:

"इति: परं ये सर्वा:। ते कालिदाससाहित्या:। तत्र हेतु: अस्पष्टका-निदासपृष्टिमान्तवाद व्यक्तिकोक्तम्बेदः। दुśकर्म परभेवरोद्वादस्य संपत्ती कालिदासका सम्बन्धितस्य तत्ततः कर्मस्य तारकविध्या चौर्यांगित्तम्बूः। अन्वितस्य वय्युनोऽशणकार्यावादांकोर्चोक्तित्रेतव च। भवमत्सेजसत्तत्त्वत्र तत्र संकातिरिक्त पुराणांने स्थानं लक्षेत्, न तु चिन्तत्वाचार्यांने काव्ये। ब्रूयो च वाचा श्रेण:। कवि:। तत्रच कथमात्यक्त: प्राश्टरतत।"

- कालिदास-गुण्याक्षी, संपादिता:-रेवाणसाद दिवेदी, प्रकाश:-काशी हिंदू विश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी, ९६७६

115. पार्वत्या: प्रकाशतास्यावतारर्कनम्, शब्दकर्षणाः, दुस्तरतत्त्वका-परभेवारोद्वादस्य कर्मरिवन्दस्यंस्करस्य, कुमारकर्षणः कर्तनरस्य पुरवदरोद्वेशाश्च गौर्यः। सार्वदलिष्यान्तरं हरिवीयानविचारत्वमुनाभिप्रेमीकरणः, दुःशक्तिविचारश्च रत्नाविलापनम्, विश्वासविचारम्य-मननामस्यावतारर्कनम् आदुत्तमाश्रय धर्मयात् तह मनस्यविचारसाकलोवाद-विश्वयं, विज्ञानविभिग्धिम्: विश्वदर्शायांविश्वन्यम् निर्यालुराग्रामारमके परियुक्त वेतनानि (परभेवरोद्वेशानि) पाश्चिमदनम्। इति प्रकरणानि पौराणिक-पर्यायस्यतुद्वेदसाकसंबंधस्यर्थाणि सामाज्यधारामधिरोहितत।"

V.J. p.272