

Modes [see Ch. 9th] are like the particular dispositions of the members [of the body]; Ornaments [see Ch. 10th] are like bracelets, earrings, and the like. Hence that also which he says

A 4th objection. [—see the definition of Poetry quoted under § 2 f.] viz., “and, again, [even though] undecorated”—I reject—for [—to state his meaning without ellipsis—] he means to say “Everywhere, when ornamented—and sometimes even when no ornament appears—[faultless] words and meanings constitute Poetry”—[and, I say, I must reject this] because here, too, [as well as in the case referred to under § 2. m.] embellished words and meanings, as regards Poetry, serve only to heighten it.

Another definition rejected.

o. For this reason I reject also the position of the author of the *Vakrokti-jīvita*, viz., that “Equivoque is the life of Poetry,” because equivoque is of the nature of ornament—and hence not the body even—much less the soul or essence].

p. And as for what he [the author of the *Kāvya Prakāś'a*] instances [as exemplifying his assertion that there may be Poetry] “sometimes when there is no obvious ornament”—[viz., these verses,]

“For there is that very husband who gained me as a girl, and those same April nights, and the odours of the full-blown jasmine, and the bold breezes [wafting perfume] from the Naucleas,—and I too am the same:—but still my heart longs for the sportive doings, in the shape of toyings, under the ratan-trees on the banks of the Reva:”—

—this requires some consideration—for here [where we were told that there was no obvious ornament] it is plain that there is that dubiously mixed ornament [to be described in Ch. 10th] which has its root either in the description of an effect without a cause [—the lady describing herself, not as regretting, but, as *longing* for what she had already possessed—whereas possession annihilates *longing*—or in a cause without an effect [—the lady having sufficient reason for *not* longing—while she yet speaks of herself as doing so*].

* It is but fair to mention that, in the *Kāvya Pradīpa*, a commentary on the work containing the definition which our author persecutes so perseveringly, it is remonstrated that if there be no other ornament in these verses than that which it required so much ingenuity to detect, then it was not so very great a mistake after all to instance the verses as being without “*obvious ornament*.”