

Exploration of Nature in Tropes in Śrī Kṛṣṇa Līlā of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata

Dr. Mohan Kumar Pokhrel, Asst. Professor of English of the Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Article Received: 07/03/2023

Article Revised: 08/04/2023

Article Accepted: 09/04/2023

Published Online: 10/04/2023

DOI:10.47311/IJOES.2023.5.04.156

Abstract

This article explicates the use of tropes of Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa's the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. The compiler furnishes the text in different context from the use of tropes. The tropes present the ideas of the writer in more standard way with hidden connotative meanings. In this endeavor, this research article explores how the compiler has implemented ornate style from the use of certain tropes. The tropes such as simile, hyperbole, allegory, paradox, and pathetic fallacy are tools for analysis. The objectives of this article are to explore simile and hyperbole from the perspective of Nature; to examine allegory and paradox from Nature relating to Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā, and to examine pathetic fallacy in the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā to point out his relation to Nature in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. The analysis bases on Charles A. Filion's theory on Nature which highlights Nature from the manifestation of God. The researcher has used English translation of Sanskrit text of Bhaktivedanta Swāmī Prabhupāda as the primary text. The discussion section of this article explores the effectiveness of simile, hyperbole, allegory, paradox, and pathetic fallacy to inspect Nature in Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā. The findings of this article are how the use of the aforementioned figures of speech enriches Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā from the lens of Nature. The conclusion of this article incorporates that the use of the figures of speech examines how those tropes have explored Nature in Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa.

Keywords: Pathetic fallacy, hyperbole, paradox, simile, tropes.

Tracing Tropes and Nature in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa

Epic, a literary form, inscribes varieties of language use from tropes. In this relation, M. H. Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham examine "Tropes, in which words or phrases are used in a way that effects a conspicuous change in what we take to be their standard meaning" (133). The tropes incorporate human emotions, thoughts, responses, and their reactions. In it, a word or a phrase has different meanings rather than its literal meaning. One further explores and explains that the use of these figures of speech makes connotative meaning which is

different from its denotation. In the same line of argument, J. L. Brockington analyzes those tropes "are valuable both for a fuller understanding of the author's poetic techniques and methods of composition" (441). To strengthen the argument, one intensifies that tropes explore in-depth meanings of poetry.

Nature shows the phenomena of the physical world collectively, containing animals, plants, and landscape. Paul W. Taylor extends the scope of Nature:" Humans are members of the Earth's Community of Life in the same sense and the same terms in which other living things are members of that community" (106). To support this idea on Nature, humans should respect other creatures and plants thinking that they have rights to survive on the earth as humans. In this connection, the view of David Lee is reliable. The critic analyzes that "The roots of Hinduism reveal a potential unity between humanity and nature" (155). This notion further supports that the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa is the focal text to show Nature from the use of tropes in Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā.

The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa incorporates sufficient evidences of tropes for the promotion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā and his contribution for the conservation of Nature in the Paurāṇic period. The tropes incorporate multiple meanings of the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the text. The writer uses the major alaṅkāra (figures of speech) such as simile, hyperbole, allegory, paradox, and pathetic fallacy. Principal figures of speech can be appreciated in the Sanskrit version and the following illustrations reveal Kṛṣṇa līlā in connection to Nature. "The Bhāgavata Purāṇa is not only a philosophical gem, but also a literary excellence" (Amma 34). Here, the writer compares this text with a gem. Different uses of figures of speech add charm in the connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā to Nature. Thus, this article analyzes the tropes which have been connected between Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa.

Problems, Objectives, and Methodology

Nature theory explores the value of Nature for the existence of all creatures and plants. This qualitative article uses the theory of Charles A. Filion's theory on Nature for analysis of the tropes relating to Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. To support this theory, Michael Lacewing states that the law of Nature comes from God and we should preserve (3). This standpoint justifies that Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā are same in their activities. Like Nature Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not differentiate between humans and other creatures. The hero respects the existence and rights of other creatures and plants. But moderns humans do not love and respect Nature as Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Irresponsible activities of modern humans to Nature create problems for study. This research work ventures to answer the following questions:

- What are the tropes used in Nature to connect Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa?
- How does the author use the tropes to relate Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa?

The major objectives of this analysis are to explicate simile and hyperbole from the perspective of Nature Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā; to explore allegory and paradox from Nature relating to

Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā, and to examine pathetic fallacy in the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa.

To examine the use of tropes in Nature with Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa, the researcher has used Charles A. Filion's theory on Nature. The theorist does not differentiate between Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā (154) in his analysis. The use of tropes explores the in-depth meanings of the text. For the analysis of this article, the researcher has used the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa translated and commented by A. C. Bhaktivedānta Swāmī Prabhupāda with Sanskrit stanzas.

Perspectives on the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa: A Review of Literature

The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa, the Hindu Bible, inspects varieties of subject matters. Various critics and scholars have examined on Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa from different perspectives. Muktaben Dasharathbhai Thakkar analyzes on bhakti literature: "Bhakti begins with self-surrender, culminates in self-knowledge and ends in union with God" (5). In this context, it is significant to pinpoint that bhakti literature enhances divine love. Its aim increases the frequency of love for the sake of love. Unlike Thakkar, Victor Turner explicates the condition of bhakti literature in the modern world: "Modern world does not know the value of this ritual reversibility" (qtd. in Silveria 375). What the critic argues seems to be plausible and credible in the context of the modern world. The literature of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa has been academically neglected.

Anna George analyzes the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa showing the mythical activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The critic argues that Śrī Kṛṣṇa provides justice to the oppressed humans by making an appropriate person to their king (1). In this connection, one examines that Śrī Kṛṣṇa works in favor of the oppressed humans. Everybody likes and admires this type of selfless work. Explaining this statement, R. K. Srinivasa Lyengar criticizes that "Kṛṣṇa, who holds the key to the solution of world's problems, has been grossly devalued in post-Vyasa times" (109). This standpoint postulates weaknesses of the academicians in the evaluation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. Lyengar draws the attention of academicians to evaluate Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā to change the directions of humans' life. Paru Kosambhi has different line of argument on Śrī Kṛṣṇa myth. She compares Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Hercules, a Roman mythical hero. In her logic: "Kṛṣṇa can be seen as a parallel to Hercules. Both were black in colour. Kṛṣṇa lifted Mount Govardhana while Hercules lifted Mount Atlas" (5). The aforementioned discussion shows that the myth of Hercules is popular only in the West but Śrī Kṛṣṇa myth is well-known everywhere.

John Stratton Howley has different line of argument in the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The critical thinker explicates on the pranks of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "Kṛṣṇa stealing butter: he lifts it to his mouth and smears it all over his face is one of his most characteristics acts" (427). The discussion concentrates that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is not an obedient child as others. To steal mākhana (butter) is his hobby and pleases cowherd boys and monkeys by providing mākhana. It shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa likes to those humans whose heart is as smooth as mākhana without conspiracy against others. On this ground, Edwin F. Bryant incorporates that Śrī Kṛṣṇa

bestows mākhāna to monkeys (126). The hero does not distinguish between humans and other creatures and shows the sign of love to them. The aforementioned reviews explore various dimensions on Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. As far as my knowledge is concerned, no one has examined the figures of speech on Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa from the lens of Nature. Thus, this article adds a new block in the academic field and motivates readers and researchers to evaluate the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa from a new perspective.

Analysis of Tropes in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa

Simile

In the words of M. H. Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham: "In a simile, a comparison between two distinctly different things is explicitly indicated by the word "like" or "as"" (133). There are number of noticeable similes in the Bhāgavata for the exploration of Nature with Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā. In this connection, Sheo Sankar Prashad argues that there are about eighteen hundred similes in the Bhāgavata (qtd. in Bryant 63). There is at least one simile in every ten verses and the uses of similes are "especially visible in the tenth book" (Bryant 63). Vedavyāsa invokes similes now and again in description of Nature and the manifestation of Nature reveals the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa .

Before the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Brahmā compares an individual life with an ancient tree using simile. According to him:

The body may figuratively be called "original tree." From this tree, which fully depends on the ground of material nature, come two kinds of fruit-the enjoyment of happiness and the suffering of distress. The cause of the tree, forming its three roots, is association with the three modes of material nature- goodness, passion and ignorance. The fruits of bodily happiness have four tastes- religiosity, economic development, sense gratification and liberation. The seven layers of bark covering the tree are skin, blood, muscle, fat, bone, marrow, and semen, and eight branches of the tree are the five gross and three subtle elements- earth, water, fire, air, ether, mind, intelligence and false ego. The tree of the body has nine hollows-the eyes, the ears, the nostrils, the mouth, the rectum and the genitals- and ten leaves, the ten airs passing through the body. In this tree of the body there are two birds: one is the individual soul, and the other is the Super soul.¹ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.2:27)

On this ground of comparison, a tree becomes as important as a human body. Everybody should love both human body and trees. In this regard, modern humans are made conscious to love a tree as human beings.

Moving ahead in this line of thought, Prabhupāda argues that the construction of a tree is from the five gross elements (earth, water, fire, air, and ether) as the body of human (162). Human beings should understand that the use of the above simile motivates readers to love and respect trees and other objects of Nature. A tree has fruits for humans and birds. In the same way, pleasure and pain are production from humans. On this ground, Sārārtha Darśinī confirms that the composition of human body and a tree is figuratively same (59). The above use of simile shows the value of Nature for creatures from its comparison between human and

a tree. Śrī Kṛṣṇa might have understood about it so that he spends the days of childhood and earlier time of his teenage in Vṛndāvana by tending calves and cows. This use of simile tries to convince humans to love trees and other objects of Nature as their lives.

One gets the use of next simile when Vasudeva takes newly born Śrī Kṛṣṇa across the Yamunā River during the time of torrential rain. On the basis of this context, the writer clarifies with the argument: "The River Yamunā was filled with deep water, foaming about with fiercely whirling waves. But the great Indian Ocean had formerly given way to Lord Rāmacandra by allowing Him to construct a bridge, the River Yamunā gave way to Vasudeva and allowed him to across"² (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.3:50). Readers compare the condition of Vasudeva with the condition of Rāmacandra while crossing the mass of water. Both Vasudeva and Rāmacandra face miraculous experiences during the time of crossing the body of water. Both the mythical characters feel difficulties to cross the mass of water but they have succeeded in their mission.

The same idea is ascertained by G.V. Tagare differently. He expresses his opinion remarking that the Yamunā River was "covered with foam created by the waves" (1277). We argue that the Yamunā River is as fearful as the Indian Ocean to cross for Vasudeva. The use of simile in this context notes fearful form of Nature. Human beings should face the threat of Nature remaining in peaceful condition as Vasudeva in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. In this regard, C. L. Goswāmī states that the Yamunā creates a problem to Vasudeva "as the ocean did to Lord Śrī Rāma" (115). From the aforementioned discussion, readers opine that the use of the simile is meaningful in this context. It makes readers ponder how to attach with Nature during the time of crisis.

Likewise, the use of simile during the time of rāsa līlā makes intimacy between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. Śukadeva exemplifies the use of simile appropriately: "In the midst of the dancing gopīs, Lord Kṛṣṇa appeared most brilliant, like an exquisite sapphire in the midst of golden ornaments"³ (10.33:6). In the light of this comparison, the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, his songs, clothes, and ornaments have been compared with lightening in amidst of dark clouds. In support of this line of argument, one realizes the connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Nature. The use of simile highlights both the beauty of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature.

On the basis of this relation, Ithamar Theodor writes: "Kṛṣṇa's dramatic character is developed most fully in it" (80). The connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's appearance to lighting establishes him as an example of a dramatic character. The character attracts other characters and audience before the performance. In the same way, Śrī Kṛṣṇa steals hearts of gopīs from his appearance. On the base of the above simile, E.H. Rick Jarow clarifies his idea: "The rāsa līlā itself is magical and belongs to the realm of yoga-māyā" (117). Explaining this statement, human beings conclude that the power of yogamāyā makes Śrī Kṛṣṇa as gorgeous as lighting while he is with gopīs in forest. The use of the aforementioned simile extends the scope of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in his physical attraction. He seems as a diamond in the pile of gold ornaments. It shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa surpasses the beauty of gopīs. From the above discussion, readers conclude that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is beyond comparison in the matter of beauty. Diamond is the product

of Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa always wears it. With this logical description, one opines that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is inseparable from Nature due to his attachment to it.

Likewise, the use of simile in the incident of Rukmiṇī Haraṇa is remarkable in the Bhāgavata. In the words of Vedavyāsa: "Kṛṣṇa beat down Śālva and other kings who took Śiśupāla's side. Indeed, as everyone watched, Śrī Kṛṣṇa took Rukmiṇī just as Garuḍa boldly stole nectar from the demigods"⁴ (10.52:17). In this statement, the word paśyatām has been used as a simile to compare Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Garuḍa for evocation of his courageous activity. A Garuḍa (vulture) is not frightened with demigods for the sake of nectar. In the similar vein, Śrī Kṛṣṇa takes Rukmiṇī using his chariot on her wedding day with Śiśupāla despite the presence of brave personalities on that occasion. The appropriateness of the use of simile establishes Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a fearless character.

Anindyayuti Chakravarty expresses that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is "The greatest crisis manager the world has ever seen" (9). With this discussion, readers conclude that Śrī Kṛṣṇa handles any difficult situation appropriately. The location of Ambika (Pārvatī) temple helps him to succeed his plan. In this context, readers opine that Nature helps Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the completion of līlā. To strengthen the argument, Edwin Bryant explores "Kṛṣṇa is saktiman, possessor of sakti" (45). The abduction of Rukmiṇī is against laws even though Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not care about it. He saves Rukmiṇī from her forthcoming marriage with Śiśupāla whom she hates. The use of simile forwards the movement of the entire story of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. From its use, modern readers know that it is necessary to violate the rituals and laws for the sake of righteousness.

With the similar use of simile in connection to Nature, Śukadeva compares lightning to the mode of goodness in the autumn season: "The sky was then covered by dense blue clouds accompanied by lightning and thunder. Thus the sky and its natural illumination were covered in the same way that the spirit soul is covered by the three modes of material nature"⁵ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.20:4). In this connection, Prabhupāda regards the sky as the navel of Śrī Kṛṣṇa (316) and advises audience to see Nature as the embodiment of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. To support this idea, Jivā Goswāmī explores: "The rain cloud is Kṛṣṇa's friend" (72). On the basis of this argument, humans agree that clouds and sky are necessary to keep Nature appropriate for the life of plants and animals.

In comparison of the aforementioned simile, Pushpendra Kumar rests on the argument that the sky is like a Brāhman who is worried in the well-being of others (923). With this conditioning, a reader understands that both Brāhman and cloud are useful for all. This comparison is justifiable for conservation of Nature. The use of simile iva (as) carries multiple meanings (sky to goodness, thunder to passion, clouds to ignorance, Brāhman to sky, and Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Nature) in comparison. On this ground, G.V. Tagare extends his view: "The sky looked like Brāhman modified by the conditioning guṇas of Prakṛti" (1381). This comparison has revealed the effect of simile for the projection of poetic beauty. The use of the above mentioned simile indicates the relation of Nature with Śrī Kṛṣṇa from multiple perspectives.

The analysis of the aforementioned similes discussed in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa shows that they have made the text more interested creating images of Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā for the extension of meanings. Almost all the above discussed similes extend the scope of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā and its relation to Nature. From the uses of the similes, especial ideas have been focused to make the meanings more effective. In this context, the uses of the aforementioned similes show in-depth knowledge of Vedavyāsa about Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā throughout the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. Thus, the uses of similes motivate readers to evaluate Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā from the perspective of Nature.

Hyperbole

Abrams and Harpham are apt to state that a hyperbole "is bold overstatement or extravagant exaggeration of fact or of possibility" (169). In the same line of thought, we note that a speaker exaggerates the expression for emphasis. The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa incorporates sufficient evidences of hyperboles for projection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā. This figure of speech transforms Śrī Kṛṣṇa from hero to superhero. Hyperbolic expression about Kṛṣṇa in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa establishes him as a debatable character. In this connection, Śukadeva expresses:

The cows, the bulls and the calves were thoroughly smeared with a mixture of turmeric and oil, mixed with varieties of minerals. Their heads were bedecked with peacock feathers, and they were garlanded and covered with cloth and golden ornaments.⁶ (10.5:7)

From this standpoint what the writer argues seems to be hyperbolic in expression. In this regard, human beings imagine how the cattle had been loved and cared during the time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

On the basis of this idea, Śrīdhara Svāmī clarifies with the argument that golden garlands and the decoration of cows, calves, and bulls prove love and respect of Nature and animals (qtd. in Filion 111). In the above statement, cows, calves, and bulls are decorated. Their condition is better than the condition of the Hindus' cows, calves, and oxen during the time of gāṅpūjā (worshipping of cows) and gorūpūjā (worshipping of oxen) in Tihār. Keeping the same idea in mind, one remarks that the use of this hyperbolic expression focuses love of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to animals. To explain the use of hyperbole, Purnendu Narayana Sinha writes that Nanda King decorates cows, calves, and bulls on the birthday ceremony of Śrī Kṛṣṇa (379). This background information using the hyperbole oscillates the reciprocal relationship between infant Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature.

Providing the extra- information on this alankār (figure of speech), Bibek Debroy has similar finding. The annotator further explores: "May the child be protected for a long time" (840). On this ground, one argues that the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the sign of love for animals and other objects of Nature. In this context, C. L. Goswāmī supports that love of domestic animals create the environment for love of animals (120). The use of the indicated hyperbole encourages human beings to love and care animals and other products of Nature as their kiths and kins. This use figure of speech on the birth ceremony of Śrī Kṛṣṇa hints future love of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Nature.

Likewise, other remarkable use of hyperbole we observe in the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa after stealing the boys and calves by Brahmā in Vṛndāvana . In the words of Śukadeva Gosvāmī: "Thereafter, just to create pleasure both for Brahmā and for the mothers of the calves and cowherd boys, Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the creator of the entire cosmic manifestation, expanded Himself as calves and boys"⁷(Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.13:18). It is the climax of the use of hyperbolic expression in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa and it establishes Śrī Kṛṣṇa a great hero of the Paurāṇic period. In support of this line of argument, Bibek Debroy inscribes that Śrī Kṛṣṇa "became exactly like the cowherd boys and exactly like the small forms of the calves" (965). In this context, readers realize unnecessary use of hyperbolic idea in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa.

Basing his argument on such idea, Maura Corcoran further explores: "Kṛṣṇa was a popular hero elevated to the status of a god" (28). It is important to note that he uses another hyperbolic idea for clarification of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's creation of calves and the cowherd boys. Elaborating this argument, Devdutt Pattanaik argues that "Kṛṣṇa multiplies himself" (16) into calves and cowherd boys so that no one knows about the stolen calves and boys. From the evidences that are presented in the preceding logic, it is evident that the use of the above hyperbolic thought is meaningful for the establishment of him from human to divine being. Concerning such arguments, the aforementioned hyperbolic use of expression creates confusion to readers. The expansion of himself into calves and cowherd boys proves Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the first scientist for the application of cloning on the earth.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa's devouring conflagration in forest emphasizes the role of hyperbole and its reliability in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. According to Śukadeva: "Seeing His devotees so disturbed, Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the infinite Lord of the universe and possessor of infinite power, then swallowed the terrible fire"⁸ (10.17:25). This discussion concentrates on superpower of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to deal with natural crisis. Keeping the same hyperbole in mind, Pattanaik notes in an authentic version that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is threatened by forest fire (23). In general understanding, this hyperbolic statement stresses the incredible capacity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to deal with problems. In this playful activity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, readers create a question mark and they claim that devouring conflagration is impossible for human beings.

Basing his logic on this idea, Prabhupāda remarks that Śrī Kṛṣṇa "immediately swallowed up the whole forest fire and saved them" (179). Explaining this statement, we clarify that the use of the hyperbolic idea portrays Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a nature lover who loves forest better than his life and controls the conflagration. Charles S. J. White has similar opinion in the activity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He argues about "Kṛṣṇa's superhuman character" (165) in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. This use of hyperbole advises humans to control destruction of forest using their efforts. Humans are unable to swallow fire as Śrī Kṛṣṇa even though they should dedicate themselves to save forest from multiple problems.

Next use of hyperbole and its importance in the is Śrī Kṛṣṇa's holding up Govardhan Hillock. In this context, Śukadeva argues: "Lord Kṛṣṇa, forgetting hunger and thirst and putting aside all considerations of personal pleasure, stood there holding up the hill for seven days as the people of Vraja gazed upon Him"⁹ (10.25:23). Explaining this statement, a reader

knows that this hyperbolic expression is incredible. Edwin F. Bryant has gone a step ahead when he explores Śrī Kṛṣṇa on the base of this hyperbole that "he did not move from that spot" (129). This condition shows that in the matter of strength, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is like Hanumān who carries Dronagiri Mountain.

Benjamin Preciado Solis has different line of argument in the use of the above hyperbolic expression. He remarks that "his divinity was fully recognized" (72). This idea concentrates on the hyperbolic expression which changes Śrī Kṛṣṇa from human to divine being. Many readers disagree in this view because they regard Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a hero on the basis of this hyperbolic utterance. Unlike Solis, Bibek Debroy furnishes this hyperbole from his further argument that Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not move his feet (1009). The above-mentioned example of hyperbole in Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa confirms that impossible works are possible for Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It motivates human beings to help others as Śrī Kṛṣṇa when natural disaster occurs. The use of this expression in the Bhāgavata extends the personality of Śrī Kṛṣṇa but it creates doubt to humans either he is really a human or not. They discuss that to lift up a hillock by a person is more than the hyperbolic expression than reality.

Likewise, another hyperbolic use of language we observe when Śrī Kṛṣṇa constructs a fortress in Dvārakā. In this context, Śūkadeva explains: "After thus discussing the matter with Balarāma, the Supreme Personality of Godhead had a fortress twelve yojana in circumference built within the sea. Inside that fort He had a city built containing all kinds of wonderful things"¹⁰ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.50:49). This use of the hyperbolic expression makes impossible works possible for Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It hints that he takes shelter of Nature making a fortress to save himself and his entire dynasty from the assault of demonic rulers such as Jarāsandha and Kālayamana.

Prabhupāda is correct when the critic puts forward his argument for the use of this hyperbolic expression. According to him: "Kṛṣṇa constructed the fort in the midst of the sea" (441). This logic provides the ground for interpretation in the use of this hyperbole. Explaining this opinion, human beings argue that Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses Nature to rescue the dwellers of Mathurā. Unlike Prabhupāda, Jiva Gosvāmī, circulates that shifting to Dvarakā is "nothing but an example of game theory" (184). The reliability of the use of this hyperbolic tone shows Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a perfect politician and warrior. To build a city in the middle of the Indian Ocean was a Herculean task even though Śrī Kṛṣṇa completed the task. Thus, this use of language deals with the miraculous works of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

The aforementioned examples of the hyperbolic expression deal with the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. This figure of speech changes Śrī Kṛṣṇa from hero to superhero and his activities are still memorable for readers. The importance and reliability of this figure of speech establishes Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a different personality from others and Vaiṣṇava cult regards him as a Supreme Personality of Godhead. But the philosophers, readers, critics, scholars, and writers respect him as a perfect hero in his plans, words and works. In this way, the use of the above hyperbolic expression of language makes Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a different mythical figure from others.

Allegory

In the words of Marian Wynne-Davies, an allegory is "speaker in other terms" (11). In it, a writer simplifies complex ideas. On the basis of this idea, Vedavyāsa uses allegorical expression in use of language to clarify historical evidence in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. One observes the historical allegory when the earth feels over-burdened. In the view of Śūkadeva:

After seeing this, Lord Brahmā hastily got down from his swan carrier, fell down like a golden rod and touched the lotus feet of Lord Kṛṣṇa with the tips of the four crowns on his heads. Offering his obeisance, he bathed the feet of Kṛṣṇa with the water of his tears of joy.11 (10.13:62)

In my understanding, Brahmā underestimates the capacity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and hides his calves and gopās. When Śrī Kṛṣṇa replaces all the calves and gopās in their respective places, Brahmā understands the allegorical form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

In this connection, Siddhesswar Bhattacharya writes in confirmation about "Eternal Kṛṣṇa and Avatār Kṛṣṇa " (138) in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. At first, Brahmā thinks that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a common person and hides his calves and herds boys. Later, the knowledge of allegory makes him conscious and bows down on the feet of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Bhattacharya confirms: "The avatār Kṛṣṇa merges into eternal Kṛṣṇa" (143). One partly agrees in this allegorical idea of Bhattacharya. Giving an overview in this allegory, Anindayuti Chakravarty states that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a matchless actor and manager (22). His managerial skill surprises even to Brahmā. The use of allegory in this context proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā is the base for the conservation of Nature.

Mattur has similar findings: "Brahmā was eventually forced to accept Kṛṣṇa's supremacy" (72). This use of allegory gives further insight to the miraculous action of Śrī Kṛṣṇa which surprises Brahmā. This allegorical statement shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has different capacity than assumption of Brahmā. With this idea at the centre of attention, Devdutt Pattanaik explores: "There is contrast between the two biographies of Śrī Kṛṣṇa" (168). Explaining this statement, one argues that the use of allegory differentiates between Vṛndāvana Śrī Kṛṣṇa and eternal Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The activity of Brahmā to Śrī Kṛṣṇa creates confusion. This allegory indicates superiority of Śrī Kṛṣṇa over the power to Brahmā. This allegory opens up the space for the use of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā not only for the conversation of Nature but also its creation. Human beings should try to care environment for the conservation of Nature.

Next evidence of allegory is observed in the activities of Rukminī in a temple of goddess Ambika before the time of her wedding. Śūkadeva, the narrator exposes: "Upon reaching the goddess's temple, Rukminī first washed her lotus feet and hands and then sipped water for purification. Thus sanctified and peaceful, she came into the presence of mother Ambikā"12 (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.53:44). To explain this incident further, readers analyze that Rukminī, the bride is expecting her conjugal life. But the reality is something different from the assumptions of others to her. Other people think that she is expecting bounty with the goddess for her conjugal life with Śīsupāla. But the bride is expecting boon from the goddess for the success of her elopement with Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Prabhupāda has similar idea on the use of this allegory and he writes ahead: "Rukmiṇī, however, desired to have Kṛṣṇa for her husband and therefore prayed that the deity be pleased with her" (474). The argument rests on the gap between the thoughts of common people and the intention of Rukmiṇī about elopement. One realizes the gap of thoughts in appearance and reality.

Keeping this use of allegory at the centre of discussion, Bibek Debroy claims that the bride expects to make Śrī Kṛṣṇa as her husband (1101). On the base of this idea, the allegorical utterance is reliable as the condition of the bride. Her body is in crowd but the mind is with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In the similar vein, E. H. Rick Jarow argues that the bride has expectation for union with Kṛṣṇa (122). From such perspective, one argues that the faith of Rukmiṇī in Śrī Kṛṣṇa presents the background of Nature. From the evidence of this allegory, human beings should learn not to force their marriageable daughters for marriage against their wishes. This allegory carries a didactic lesson for human beings in relation to marriage. In this situation, Rukmiṇī shows herself as a modern girl who violates the traditional marriage. With this discussion, we reach to the conclusion that there is appropriateness in the use of allegory in this context.

It is necessary to discuss the use of allegory in the battlefield before the marriage of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Rukmiṇī. In the words of Śūkadeva Gosvāmī: "Lying all around were thighs, legs, and fingerless hands, along with hands clutching swords, clubs and bows, and also the heads of horses, donkeys, elephants, camels, wild asses and humans"¹³ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.54:8). In the given extract, the word karabhā is a fine example of an allegory which hints a hand from wrist to finger. The same word also indicates the trunk of an elephant. From this standpoint, we argue that the thighs lying on the battlefield when the battle is going on between the soldiers of Balarāma and Rukmī.

Moving ahead in this line of logic, Bibek Debroy argues: "Like elephants destroying lotuses, the foremost and valiant ones among the Yadus crushed the extraordinary enemy soldiers" (1105). On the basis of this allegory, one explicates that the enemy soldiers are as strong as elephants even though they have been defeated by Nārāyaṇī soldiers of Yadus. Providing the ground for interpretation, one clarifies that limbs play a crucial role for victory in the traditional war. But this type of war becomes useless in front of modern nuclear weapons. At present, powerful weapons have their own role for victory during the time of war. Sārārtha Darśinī stresses on the point that the thighs on the battlefield resemble the trunks of elephants (1368). In this context, we argue that Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā has perfection in difficult situation. The dead enemies in the battlefield indicate success of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the abduction of Rukmiṇī. In this connection, Nature seems in favor of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for victory in the battle. This allegorical expression confirms that despite effort of the enemy soldiers as elephants, they are killed in the battlefield. From this scenario, human beings should understand that Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his Nārāyaṇī soldiers are invincible.

Likewise, the presentation of a mirage as a pond of water in the desert is the allegory for understanding Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā. According to King Parikshīt: "Just as men of childish intelligence consider a mirage in the desert to be a pond of water, so those who are irrational

look upon the illusory transformations of Māyā as substantial"¹⁴ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.73: 11). This condition shows illusion both in vision and knowledge for animals and human beings. Keeping the same concept in mind, one incorporates that the senses of creatures are not reliable all times to understand reality. In this connection, Sūrdās argues that Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā is like the mirage for humans to understand (qtd. in White 173). In support of this line of argument, readers debate to each other for playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this context, their condition is not better than a deer in mirage.

Supporting Sūrdās's argument, Prabhupāda confirms in this allegory from worldly perspective that "material happiness is just like searching for water in a desert mirage" (663). Explaining this statement, we examine that the destruction of Nature happens for the sake of humans' material happiness. Similarly, Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā resembles to be a mirage for us to understand. In line with this idea, C. L. Goswāmī rests on the argument: "the ignorant take mirage for a sheet of water" (428). On the basis of this allegory, one argues that the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is itself an allegory in which readers get multiple meanings. To understand him in detail is itself an illusion. The validity and reliability for the use of this allegory in this context indicates that humans misinterpret Śrī Kṛṣṇa and they do not bother to understand his contribution for creatures and plants.

The aforementioned examples of the allegorical expression on Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā claim that this figure of speech is meaningful in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa to understand Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his playful activities. To evaluate Śrī Kṛṣṇa only from one perspective without the allegorical understanding is injustice for him. Readers should try to evaluate Śrī Kṛṣṇa on the basis of the allegorical expression. This figure of speech is a tool to judge Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā from different perspectives. In conclusion, one states that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is not what he seems to be in relation to Nature in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa.

Paradox

A paradox, in the view of J. A. Cuddon, is "merely a view which contradicts accepted opinion" (634). The use of paradox can be observed in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa in relation to the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and its connection to Nature. Śūkadeva presents the use of paradox on the following verse: "At that time, cows and cowherd boys were feeling acute distress from the glaring summer sun. Afflicted by thirst, they drank the water of the Yamunā River. But it had been contaminated with poison" ¹⁵ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.15:48). The use of this statement explores the contradictory idea about the condition of cows and the cowherd boys. If the water of the Yamunā River was contaminated, how they bathed there. One ponders that the cowherd boys are foolish for the evaluation of water either it is drinkable or not.

The extension of this paradox is realized in the expression of Prabhupāda. IN HIS WORDS: "The river, however, had been made poisonous by the venom of the great serpent known as Kāliya" (163). In line with this idea, readers judge that serpent Kāliya poisons the river. In this context, there is contradiction between two words "poison" and "drink". These two words do not go together at the same time apart from the use of paradox. To add more bricks on this line of argument, David L. Haberman states that pollution in the Yamunā River

is the cause of destruction (qtd. in Hannigan 352). Regarding this idea, readers observe the use of the paradox from the use of the water without thinking the effect of poison. This paradox shows the condition of human beings who die every day due to the use of polluted water.

On the same issue, G. V. Tagare supports the use of Paradox from his logic: "the cows as well as cowherds drank the water polluted due to the contamination of poison" (1357). The above mentioned paradox confirms that cows and cowherds are so thirsty that they do not care about the condition of water either it is fresh or not. The use of this paradox shows that hungry humans and animals do not care about the condition of food and beverage. On the basis of this paradox, we state that humans have animal instinct during the time of hunger. This condition happens during the time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's absence and everybody expects help from Śrī Kṛṣṇa to rescue. Commenting upon this incident, one argues that Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā is useful to rescue creatures from crisis and for the conservation of natural things. The use of this paradox warns humans to be careful about the quality of food and beverage before its consumption. Otherwise, their condition is like the condition of the cows and cowherds in the Kālindī River.

Likewise, next use of paradox readers observes in the condition of gopīs when they come out of the Yamunā River in front of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this context, Śūkadeva shows the condition of the gopīs: "Then, shivering from the painful cold, all the young girls rose up out of the water, covering their pubic area with their hands"16 (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.22:17). The activities of gopīs are paradoxical for readers. Every girl is sensitive about the condition of her body and activities from girlhood to adulthood so that she becomes more careful than a boy in every situation. The activities of gopīs contradict for readers. Charles A. Filion stresses on the same idea that the gopīs have elevated love for Śrī Kṛṣṇa (91). This discussion further proves the validity of this paradox in the life of gopīs in front of their favorite hero.

In the same use of paradox in that situation, Swāmī Ranganathananda writes in confirmation with his argument that it "upholds the highest and purest type of love" (14). At the connotative level, this representation signifies the obedience of gopīs to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In nude condition, the gopīs feel shame even though they head to Kṛṣṇa for their clothes. In the words of Ithamar Theodor, this use of paradox creates "The Foundational Emotion of this rāsa" (164). It is exhilarating for the analysis of this paradox in this context and readers predict that the gopīs are ready to do anything for the pleasure of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. This scenario creates prelude of rāsa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. The aforementioned use of this paradox is debatable for readers in the present context. On the base of this paradox, we explicate that the gopīs regard Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a part of life and they do not feel hesitation to go near him in their naked condition. Clothes hide Nature (naked body) but those gopīs do not hide anything with him. But it is irrelevant for the use of this paradox in this situation. Generally, lovers do not give this type of torture to their beloveds for attraction. From the analysis of this paradox, one conclude that beautiful scenario of the Yamunā River becomes

the base for the relation of Kṛṣṇa līlā. From the perspective of Nature, it helps Śrī Kṛṣṇa to succeed in love.

Similarly, the paradox used by the gopīs to Śrī Kṛṣṇa during the time of his absence has its own importance to reveal their psychology. In their outlook:

Dear master, dear lover, when You leave the cowherd village to herd the cows, our minds are disturbed with the thought that Your feet, more beautiful than a lotus, will be pricked by the spiked husks of grain and the rough grass and plants.¹⁷ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.31:11)

This is so definitely said that the gopīs do not forget Śrī Kṛṣṇa during the time of his absence. The complexion, speech, and the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa haunt them. During the time of separation, the gopīs become psychologically close to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. With the support of this idea, Roger de Busty-Rabutin argues: "Absence is to love what wind is to fire: it puts out the little and kindles the great" (qtd. in Petix 17). With this conditioning, the use of this paradox is justifiable in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. Lovers have experiences of agony during the time of separation. The condition of the gopīs is not an exception from it during the time of separation with Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

In the similar vein, Edwin F. Bryant associates his idea on the use of the above paradox and explores that it draws "scholarly attention" (118). This paradox is based on the love of gopīs to their Śrī Kṛṣṇa during the time of his absence. The gopīs are different from other beloveds. Generally, a beloved gets irritation when her lover goes away without informing her. But the gopīs are worried about the pain of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in forest. In this connection, Charles A. Filion explores "Without separation, the meeting of lovers is not enhanced" (102). The use of this paradox turns to be valid for present lovers from this Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. Separation occurs in the middle of Vṛndāvana forest and the gopīs have their concentration in Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Lovers should think that absence is the background of reunion and they should accept it as a part of life.

Next noticeable paradox in the text is related to thoughts of the cowherd communities in Govardhana Hillock. According to them: "Since this boy performs such extraordinary activities, how could He warrant a birth among worldly men like us- a birth that for Him would seem contemptible?"¹⁸ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.26:2). The use of this paradox expresses superheroic activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. This standpoint justifies the discussion of idea that a hero proves himself superhero from his activities. In this connection, Martin Haigh explores that this paradoxical statement is related to the "environmental sustainability" (7). The cowherd community thinks Śrī Kṛṣṇa as their main supporter for the conservation of Nature. By lifting Govardhana Hillock during the time of torrential rain, Śrī Kṛṣṇa saves human beings and animals.

Explaining the importance of this paradox, Benjamin Preciado- Solis incorporates his idea that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has "extraordinary and super-human energy" (67). This activity creates paradoxical beliefs on him on the one hand as a superhuman and on the other hand, as a divine being. This concept establishes Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the subject matter of discussion for human beings from both perspectives. Bibek Debroy comments on these paradoxical activities of Śrī

Kṛṣṇa: "The deeds done by this child are extraordinary" (1010). Concerning this argument, one argues that the paradoxical activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa confuses not only for the dwellers of Vraja but also for humans of present. He belongs to the lunar dynasty so that his activities are dim to understand for readers. The above example on the discussed figure of speech proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a versatile personality. In this connection, it is important to remember that Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses Nature appropriately for protection of creatures. This dual character perplexes readers and analysts.

Likewise, Pauṇḍraka's imitative activities incorporate an influential paradox in the text. It is one of the discussed subject matters related to Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā. Pauṇḍraka, a king of Kāśī, claims himself to be Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Śūkadeva captures the attention of readers from the use of this paradoxical statement: "By constantly meditating upon the Supreme Lord, Pauṇḍraka shattered all his material bonds. Indeed, by imitating Lord Kṛṣṇa's appearance, O King, he ultimately became Kṛṣṇa conscious"¹⁹ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.66:24). This argument turns to be valid when Pauṇḍraka falsely dresses himself as Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The use of the paradox draws the attention of readers. The playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are inimitable even though Pauṇḍraka tries to imitate his appearance, speech, and works.

Pushpendra Kumar has similar findings in this paradox and stresses on the point that Pauṇḍraka hates Śrī Kṛṣṇa thinking as inferior to him on the one hand. He becomes conscious about Śrī Kṛṣṇa on the other hand (1123). The paradoxical idea is that no one imitates the appearance and the activities of a hateful person but Pauṇḍraka does and also understands Śrī Kṛṣṇa tattva –elements at the end. To strengthen the argument, audiences think that the personality of Śrī Kṛṣṇa impresses even to his enemies. The argument of this paradox turns out to be valid when Lance E. Nelson asserts that Śrī Kṛṣṇa "sees no other, hears no other, knows no other, that is the infinite" (316). From this standpoint what he argues in this paradox seems to be plausible. Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not mind in wrong activities of evil doers. It is an instance of a good and memorable quality of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa.

With this logical description, one explores that the use of the paradox in relation to the activities of Pauṇḍraka resembles to the activities of present humans. In this context, Devdutt Pattanaik concludes: "Modern humans are like Pauṇḍraka who imitate the activities of others in dress, speech, and other activities" (43). Explaining this statement, it is apt to mention that the use of this paradox in relation to the activities of Pauṇḍraka is appropriate in modern context. It is useful for promotion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā with a proof that he provides grace even to his haters. Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not have antagonism to those who destroy Nature and give troubles to others. If humans have their self-realization as Pauṇḍraka in the destruction of Nature, it is useful for future.

With all the aforementioned analysis on the use of the prime paradoxes on Kṛṣṇa līlā, readers conclude that the use of the paradoxical statements highlight that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a paradoxical character in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. His contradictory activities create confusion for readers. On the basis of this figure of speech, readers comment on the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from multiple perspectives. But the above uses of paradoxes on

Śrī Kṛṣṇa incorporate his connection with Nature. One proves that he is inseparable from Nature in relation to the paradoxical ideas. Other characters such as the gopīs, Pauṇḍraka, the community of the Govardhan Hillock, and the cowherd boys participate for completion of the paradoxical līlās of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa.

Pathetic Fallacy

In John Ruskin's words: "A writer was pathetically fallacious when he ascribed human feelings to the inanimate" (qtd. in Cuddon 650). On the basis of this expression, one regards objects of Nature as human beings. In literature, writers use this figure of speech to treat inanimate objects as human beings regarding their feelings. Vedavyāsa's the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa includes the pathetic fallacy to demonstrate the importance of Nature and its connection to Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā. In the use of pathetic fallacy, Śūkadēva postulates: "With its rays, the sun had for eight months drunk up the earth's wealth in the form of water. Now that the proper time had arrived, the sun began releasing this accumulated wealth" 20 (10.20:5). In this connection, the sun and its rays play the role of good rulers of a country who use the tax for the sake of citizens.

The same idea is ascertained by Prabhupāda: "This taxation is compared to the sun's drawing water from the earth" (187). This dealing of the pathetic fallacy is based on the idea of mutual help. In this line of thought, the sun has human qualities and it works as a trustful government. The sun takes water vapor from the earth for eight months and later returns to the earth in the form of rain. In this regard, Bibek Debroy further explains his point: "he released that wealth of water" (992). In this context, it is instructive to regard the sun better than human beings for works of others. The corrupted rulers are not good as the sun because they take tax from citizens and use the tax for their lavishness. On the base of this pathetic fallacy, the sun has better qualities and activities than human beings.

Providing the ground for interpretation, Sārārtha Darśinī notes that the sun is like the king (521). This example extends the scope of pathetic fallacy by regarding the sun not as an ordinary person but with the king. All of the above critics contribute to the expression of this figure of speech with the suggestive meanings. With this idea at the centre of attention, one concludes that the above pathetic fallacy has its relationship with Kṛṣṇa līlā in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa . The playful and social activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are for pleasure of others. Śrī Kṛṣṇa sees human feelings in inanimate objects. On the base of this analysis, readers suppose inanimate objects of Nature with human feelings for their conservation.

Next noticeable example of the pathetic fallacy is observed in the expression of gopīs during the time of separation with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Love-stricken gopīs hover to and fro to search their hero in the middle of forest at night. They ask creepers about whereabouts of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In gopīs' words: "Let us ask these creepers about Kṛṣṇa. Even though they are embracing the arms of their husband, this tree, they certainly must have been touched by Kṛṣṇa's fingernails, since out of joy they are manifesting eruptions on their skin" 21 (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10.30:13).

Keeping this idea at the centre of attention, readers examine that gopīs show the sign of jealousy to creepers. Readers get sharing of feelings of those gopīs to the feelings of creepers in the contrary condition.

Elaborating this argument, Charles A. Filion argues that this pathetic fallacy incorporates crazy words during the time of searching Śrī Kṛṣṇa (276). In support of this line of argument, readers analyze that gopīs have their keen interest to share their feelings with creepers. E. H. Rick Jarow stresses on the same idea: "Passion and love are the most powerful modalities of human experience" (110). Supporting Jarow's argument, one examines the pathetic fallacy is reliable for revelation of gopīs' condition in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa . To see human feelings in creepers and trees is the extreme use of pathetic fallacy. It shows that gopīs have same intention as creepers to hug Śrī Kṛṣṇa. When their desires are not fulfilled, they show their jealousy in love to creepers.

To explain this pathetic fallacy further, Mattur explores that "These lines reveal how the gopīs would feel in Kṛṣṇa's absence" (196). In this context, it is necessary to highlight intimacy of gopīs with their hero. To add more bricks in this line of thought, one inscribes that they always want to remain with company of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. With the above discussion from the use of this figure of speech, readers conclude that the gopīs are better than modern beloveds. They have keen desires for union with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The gopīs think that Nature is a component for projection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā. From the evidence of the above discussion, the gopīs prove themselves as the ideal beloveds.

As the gopīs, the queens of Śrī Kṛṣṇa praise the glory of their husband on the basis of pathetic fallacy regarding clouds with human feelings. In the words of those queens:
O revered cloud, you are indeed very dear to the chief of the Yādavas, who bears the mark of Śrīvatsa. Like us, you are bound to Him by love and are meditating upon Him. Your heart is distraught with great eagerness, as our hearts are, and as you remember Him again and again you shed a torrent of tears. Association with Kṛṣṇa brings such misery! 22 (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 10. 90: 20)

In this context, it is important to recall the color of clouds with complexion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. This analysis focuses on feelings of clouds with feelings of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's queens. The argument of Prabhupāda turns out to be valid when he deals with the use of pathetic fallacy in relation to the psychology of queens. In the similar vein, he remarks that the clouds are as eager as the queens to see Śrī Kṛṣṇa (933). This condition shows that the queens share their feelings with feelings of clouds from this pathetic fallacy. The realization of separation of clouds from Śrī Kṛṣṇa is as same as the separation of queens from him. To support the idea of pathetic fallacy, G. V. Tagare clarifies that the clouds has "excessively anguished for him" (1844). From this standpoint what Prabhupāda and Tagare argue on the use of the pathetic fallacy seems to be plausible. Both commentators compare feelings of the queens to clouds.

The analysis of Debroy is based on the condition of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's queens with the condition of clouds. He argues that both clouds and queens "must be distraught and extremely anxious" (1226). One concludes that the queens of Kṛṣṇa share their feelings with him using the pathetic fallacy in his absence. Both the gopīs and the queens of Śrī Kṛṣṇa exchange their

feelings with Nature. Basing this argument on the use of the pathetic fallacy, audiences conclude that females use pathetic fallacy more to share their feelings to inanimate things in comparison to males. One gets the same condition of women's feelings in present society in relation to Nature. The figure of speech in this context provides light in Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā in connection to Nature in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa.

In the analysis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā and its connection with Nature in the text using the importance of pathetic fallacy, it is necessary to refer the view of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Uddhava. According to Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "A saintly person should learn from the mountain to devote all his efforts to the service of others and to make the welfare of others. Similarly, as the disciple of the tree, he should learn to dedicate himself to others"²³ (Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa 11.7:38). This noticeable presentation of the pathetic fallacy is reliable illustration to provide welfare for others. On the basis of this idea, humans should share their feelings with the feelings of mountains and should help others. It is, therefore, essential to regard mountains and other things of Nature as a source of knowledge to dedicate our lives for others.

In support of this line of argument, G. V. Tagare states that a righteous human being should work for others as a mountain (1942). This explanation further supports that this pathetic fallacy instructs readers to learn useful lessons from natural things sharing their feelings. This attitude to mountain shows that everybody should regard mountain as an inspiration for the well-being of others. In this context, the use of the pathetic fallacy has occupied a considerable space in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. David L. Haberman explains his points using the importance of the pathetic fallacy in relation to mountain. In this connection, he argues that "it reveals the true nature" (342). Basing this statement on the pathetic fallacy, one concludes that this figure of speech is reliable to connect Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā to Nature.

Connecting upon this argument, Solis notes that "Kṛṣṇa enjoins the cowherds to offer the mountain" (89). Explaining this statement, readers examine that Śrī Kṛṣṇa realizes the feelings of mountain so that he starts a new trend to worship Govardhan Hillock. This example is an appropriate use of the pathetic fallacy in connection to hill and Śrī Kṛṣṇa. As the concluding remark on the basis of the above use of the pathetic fallacy, we argue that this figure of speech shows the importance of the things of Nature. If humans establish a trend to regard inanimate things of Nature with human feelings, it becomes useful to conserve Nature. These arguments support the connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā to the inanimate things of Nature. Keeping the concept of the pathetic fallacy in mind, one inscribes that this figure of speech is more significant than others in favor of Nature and its conservation.

Conclusion

From the evidences of analysis of the tropes on Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā and its connection to Nature in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa, readers conclude that the use of tropes have made the text better in expression and meaning. The analysis of these tropes such as simile, hyperbole, allegory, paradox, and pathetic fallacy, provide multiple tastes for readers on the same subject. The major focus of these tropes is Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā and its connection to Nature. It shows how the appropriate uses of the tropes help formulate major theme of the text. The

analysis of the figures of speech has proved that it is one of the perspectives to point out the problems on Nature and it makes aware of humans not to forget the very ancient text. As a researcher, I conclude that these figures of speech have made the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa interesting and meaningful.

Appendix

1. एकायनोऽसौ द्विफलस्त्रिमूल -
श्वतूरसः पञ्चविधः षडात्मा ।
सप्तत्वगष्टवितपो नवाक्षो
दशच्छदी द्विखगो ह्यादिवृक्षः ॥ २७ ॥ (10.2:27)
ekāyano 'sau dvi-phalas tri-mūlaḥ
catū-rasaù pañca-vidhaù ṇaò-ātmā
sapta-tvag añña-viòapo navākṣho
daṣa-cchadé dvi-khago hy ädi-vākṣho
2. मघोनि वर्षत्यसकृद्यमानुजा
गम्भीरतोयौघजवोर्मिफेनिला
भयानकावर्तशताकुला नदी
मार्गं ददौ सिन्धुरिव श्रियः पतेः ॥ ५० ॥ (10.3:50)
maghoni varṇaty asakād yamānujā
gambhéra-toyaugha-javormi-phenilā
bhayānakāvarta-ṣatākulā nadé
mārgaà dadau sindhur iva ṣriyaù pateù
3. तत्रातिशुशुभे ताभिर्भगवान् देवकीसुतः ।
मध्ये मणीनां हैमानां महामरकतो यथा ॥ ६ ॥ (10.33:6)
tatrātiśuśubhe tābhir
bhagavān devakī-sutaḥ
madhye maṇīnām haimānām
mahā-marakato yathā
4. प्रमथ्य तरसा राज्ञः शाल्वादींश्चैद्यपक्षगान् ।
पश्यतां सर्वलोकानां तार्क्ष्यपुत्रः सुधामिव ॥ १७ ॥ (10.52:17)
pramathya tarasā rājñah
śālvādīms' caidya-pakṣa-gān
paśyatām sarva-lokānām
tārṣya-purtaḥ sudhām iva
5. सान्द्रनीलाम्बुदैर्व्योम सविद्युस्तनयित्नुभिः ।
अस्पष्टज्योतिराच्छन्नं ब्रह्मेव सगुणं बभौ ॥ ४ ॥ (10.20:4)
sāndra-nēlāmbudair vyoma

sa-vidyut-stanayitnubhiù

aspañöa-jyotir äcchannaè

brahmeva sa-guëaè babhau

6. गावो वृषा वत्सतरा हरिद्रातैलरूषिताः ।

विचित्रधातुबर्हस्रग्वस्त्रकाञ्चनमालिनः ॥ ७ ॥ (10.5:7)

gāvo vṛṣā vatsatarā

haridrā-taila-rūṣitāḥ

vicitra-dhātu-barhasrag

vastra-kāñcana-mālināḥ

7. ततः कृष्णो मुदं कर्तुं तन्मातृणां च कस्य च ।

उभयायितमात्मानं चक्रे विश्वकृदीश्वरः ॥ १८ ॥ (10.13:18)

tataḥ kṛṣṇo mudam kartum

tan-mātṛṇām ca kasya ca

ubhayāyitam ātmānam cakre viśva-kṛd īśvaraḥ

8. इत्थं स्वजनवैक्लव्यं निरीक्ष्य जगदीश्वरः ।

तमग्निमपिबत्तीव्रमनन्तोऽनन्तशक्तिधृक् ॥ २५ ॥ (10.17:25)

ittham sva-jana-vaiklavyam

nirīkṣya jagad-īśvaraḥ

tam agnim apibat tīvram

ananto 'nanta-śakti-dhṛk

9. क्षुत्तड्व्यथां सुखापेक्षां हित्वा तैर्ब्रजवासिभिः ।

वीक्ष्यमाणो दधावद्रिं सप्ताहं नाचलत्पदात् ॥ २३ ॥ (10.25:23)

kṣut-trḍ-vyathām sukhāpekṣām

hitvā tair vraja-vāsibhiḥ

vīkṣyamāṇo dadhāradrim

saptāham nācalat padāt

10. इति सम्मन्त्र्य भगवान् दुर्गं द्वादशयोजनम् ।

अन्तःसमुद्रे नगरं कृत्स्नाद्भुतमचीकरत् ॥ (10.50:49)

iti sammantrya bhagavān

durgam dvādaśa-yojanam

antaḥ-samudre nagaram

kṛtsnādbhutam acīkarat

11. दृष्ट्वा त्वरेण निजधोरणतोऽवतीर्य

पृथ्व्यां वपुः कनकदण्डमिवाभिपात्य ।

स्पृष्ट्वा चतुर्मुकुटकोटिभिरङ्घ्रियुगं

नत्वा मुदश्रुसुजलैरकृताभिषेकम् ॥ ६२ ॥ (10.13:62)

drṣṭvā tvareṇa nija-dhoraṇato 'vatīrya

prthvyām vapuḥ kanaka-daṇḍam ivābhipātya

sprṣṭvā catur-mukūṭa-koṭibhir aṅghri-yugmam

natvā mud-aśru-sujalair akṛtābhiṣekam

12. आसाद्य देवीसदनं धौतपादकराम्बुजा ।

उपस्पृश्य शुचिः शान्ता प्रविवेशाम्बिकान्तिकम् ॥ ४४ ॥(10.53:44)

āsādyā devī-sadanam

dhauta-pāda-karāmbujā

upaspr̥śya śuciḥ śāntā

praviveśāmbikāntikam

13. हस्ताः सासिगदेष्वासाः करभा ऊरवोऽङ्घ्रयः ।

अश्वाश्वतरनागोष्ट्रखरमर्त्यशिरांसि च ॥ ८ ॥(10.54:8)

hastāḥ sāsi-gadeṣv-āsāḥ

karabhā uravo 'ṅghrayaḥ

aśvāśvatara-nāgoṣṭra-

khara-martya-śirāṁsi ca

14. मृगतृष्णां यथा बाला मन्यन्त उदकाशयम् ।

एवं वैकारिकीं मायामयुक्ता वस्तु चक्षते ॥ ११ ॥ (10.73:11)

mṛga-tṛṣṇām yathā bālā

manyanta udakāśayam

evam vaikārikīm māyām

ayuktā vastu cakṣate

15. अथ गावश्च गोपाश्च निदाघातपपीडिताः ।

दुष्टं जलं पपुस्तस्यास्तृषार्ता विषदूषितम् ॥ ४८ ॥ (10.15:48)

atha gāvaś ca gopāś ca

nidāghātapa- pīditāḥ

duṣṭam jalam papus tasyās

tṛṣṇārtā viṣa-dūṣitam

16. ततो जलाशयात्सर्वा दारिकाः शीतवेपिताः ।

पाणिभ्यां योनिमाच्छाद्य प्रोत्तेरुः शीतकर्षिताः ॥ १७ ॥ (10.22:17)

tato jalāśayāt sarvā

dārikāḥ śīta-vepitāḥ

pāṇibhyām yonim ācchādya

protteruḥ śīta-kaśitāḥ

17. चलसि यद्व्रजाच्चारयन् पशून्

नलिनसुन्दरं नाथ ते पदम् ।

शिलतृणाङ्कुरैः सीदतीति नः

कलिलतां मनः कान्त गच्छति ॥ ११ ॥ (10.31:11)

calasi yad vrajāc cārayan paśūn

nalina-sundaram nātha te padam

śīla-tṛṇāṅkuraiḥ sīdatīti naḥ

kalilatām manah kānta gacchati

18. बालकस्य यदेतानि कर्माण्यत्यद्भुतानि वै ।

कथमर्हत्यसौ जन्म ग्राम्येष्व्वात्मजुगुप्सितम् ॥ २ ॥ (10.26:2)

bālakasya yad etāni

karmāṇy aty-adbhutāni vai

katham arhaty asau janma

grāmyeṣv ātma-jugupsitam

19. स नित्यं भगवद्भ्यानप्रध्वस्ताखिलबन्धनः ।

बिभ्राणश्च हरे राजन् स्वरूपं तन्मयोऽभवत् ॥ २४ ॥ (10.66:24)

sa nityam bhagavad-dhyāna-

pradhvastākḥhila-bandhanaḥ

bibhrāṇaś ca hare rājan

svarūpaṁ tan-mayo 'bhavat

20. अष्टौ मासान् निपीतं यद्भूम्याश्चोदमयं वसु ।

स्वगोभिर्मोक्तुमारेभे पर्जन्यः काल आगते ॥ ५ ॥ (10.20:5)

aṣṭau māsān nipītaṁ yad

bhūyāś coda-mayaṁ vasu

sva-gobhir moktum ārebhe

parjanyaḥ kāla āgate

21. पृच्छतेमा लता बाहनप्याश्लिष्टा वनस्पतेः ।

नूनं तत्करजस्पृष्टा बिभ्रत्युत्पुलकान्यहो ॥ १३ ॥ (10.30:13)

ṛcchatemā latā bāhūn

apy āśliṣṭā vanaspate/

nūnaṁ tat-karaja-sprṣṭā

bibhraty utpulkāny aho

22. मेघ श्रीमंस्त्वमसि दयितो यादवेन्द्रस्य नूनं

श्रीवत्साङ्गं वयमिव भवान् ध्यायति प्रेमबद्धः ।

अत्युत्कण्ठः शबलहृदयोऽस्मद्विधो बाष्पधाराः

स्मृत्वा स्मृत्वा विसृजसि मुहुर्दुःखदस्तत्प्रसङ्गः ॥ २० ॥ (10.90:20)

megha śrīmaṁs tvam asi dayito yādavendrasya nūnaṁ

śrīvatsāṅkaṁ vyam iva bhavān dhyāyati prema-baddha/

aty-utkaṅṭhaḥ śvala-hṛdayo ' smad-vidho bāṣpa-dhārāḥ

smṛtvā smṛtvā visṛjasi muhur duḥkha-das tat-prasāṅgaḥ

23. शश्वत्परार्थसर्वेहः परार्थैकान्तसम्भवः ।

साधुः शिक्षेत भूभृत्तो नगशिष्यः परात्मताम् ॥ ३८ ॥ (11.7:38)

śāśvat parārtha-sarvehaḥ

parārthaikānta-sambhavaḥ

sādhuḥ śiketa bhū-bhr̥tto

naga- śiṣyaḥ parātmatām

References:

- Abrams, M. H. and Geoffrey Galt Harpham. A Glossary of Literary Terms. 11th ed. Cengage Learning, 2016.
- Amma, Vimala Padmavati. A Comparative Study of Similes in Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa with Reference to Self-Realisation Through Bhakti-Jñāna- Vairāgya with Selected Advaita Philosophy Texts. Doctoral Dissertation. Department of Sanskrit. The Kavikulaguru Kalidas Sanskrit University. 2014.
- Bhattacharya, Siddheshwar. Some Philosophical Problems in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. Doctoral Dissertation. The University of London. 1947.
- Brockington, J. L. "Figures of Speech in the Rāmāyaṇa". Journal of the American Oriental Society. 4th ed. Vol. 9. No. 4. American Oriental Society, 1977. P. 441. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/598628> .
- Bryant, Edwin. Krishna: The Beautiful Legend of God. 1st ed. Penguin Classics, 2003.
- Chakravarty, Anindyadyuti. Leadership Style and Management Techniques of Lord Krishna: Mahabharata Perspectives. Doctoral Dissertation. Department of Public Administration. Utkal University 2008.
- Corcoran, Maura. Vṛṇḍāvana in Vaiṣṇava Braj Literature. Doctoral Dissertation. University of London, 1980.
- Cuddon, J. A. A Dictionary of Literary Terms and literary Theory. 4th ed. Maya Publishers, 1998.
- Darśinī, Sārārtha. Śrīmad Bhāgavatam. 1st ed. Vol. 7. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2011.
- . Śrīmad Bhāgavatam. 1st ed. Vol. 8. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2011.pp. 1094-2093.
- Davies, Marian Wynne. Ed. The Bloomsbury: The Dictionary of English Literature. 2nd ed. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 1995.
- Debroy, Bibek. Ed. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa. 1st ed. Penguin Books, 2019.
- Filion, Charles A. Śrīmad Bhāgavatam: A Symphony of Commentaries on the Tenth Canto. 1st ed. Vol.1. Rasbihari Lal and Sons, 2018.
- . Śrīmad Bhāgavatam: A Symphony of Commentaries on the Tenth Canto. 1st ed. Vol.2. Rasbihari Lal and Sons, 2018.
- . Śrīmad Bhāgavatam: A Symphony of the Commentaries on the Tenth Canto.1st ed. Vol.6. Rasbihari Lal and Sons, 2018.
- Gośvāmī , C.L. Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. 13th ed. Vol. 2. Gitā Press, 2014.
- . Srimad Bhagavatam. 13th ed. Vol.3. Gita Press, 2014.P. 200.
- Goswāmī, Jiva. Gopal Campu. ebooks.iskcondesiretree.com > pdf > Jiva_Goswami
- . Śrī Kṛṣṇa Sandarbha. 1st ed. Sri Vaikunta Enterprises, 2014.
- Haberman, David L. "River of Love in an Age of Pollution". Environmental Sociology.1st ed. Routeledge, 2006. PP. 339-46. <https://www.quora.com/Who-is-the-husband-of-Yamuna-Yami-who-is-the-daughter-of-Surya-Dev>

- Haigh, Martin. Environment as God, Instruction and Call to Service: Toward a Manifesto for the Vaishnava Environmentalist. Oxford Brookes University. 2015. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287201487>
- Jarow, E. H. Rick. Tales for Dying: The Death Narrative of the Bhāgavata- Purāṇa. 1st ed. State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Kumar, Pushpendra. The Śrīmadbhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam. 1st ed. Vol.1. Eastern Book Linkers, 2009.
- . The Śrīmadbhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam. 1st ed. Vol.2. Eastern Book Linkers, 2009.
- . The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. 1st ed. Vol.3. Eastern Book Linkers, 2009.
- Lacewing, Michael. The State of Nature. Routledge,cw.routledge.com › alevelphilosophy › data › WhyShouldIBeGoverned
- Lee, David. The Natural History of the Rāmāyāṇa. 1st ed. Harvard UP, 2000.
- Mathur, Nita. "Myth, Image and Ecology." Indian Anthropologist. Vol.31. No.1. Indian Anthropological Association, 2001. p.25. [http:// www. jstor. org/stable.org/ stable/41919881](http://www.jstor.org/stable.org/stable/41919881)
- Nelson, E. Lance. Edwin Bryant. Ed. "Krishna in Advaita Vedanta: The Supreme Brahman in Human Form". Krishna. 1st ed. Oxford UP, 2007.
- . Purying the Earthly Body of God: Religion and Ecology in Hindu India Suny Series in Religious Studies. 1st ed. State University of New York. 1998.
- Pattanaik, Devdutt. Shyam: An Illustrated Retailing of the Bhāgavata. 1st ed. Penguin Random House, 2018.
- Prabhupāda. A. C. Bhaktivedanta. Śrīmad Bhāgavatam. 13th ed. Canto. 10th. Vol.1st. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012 .
- . Śrīmad Bhāgavatam. Canto.10th.Vol. 2nd. The Bhakti Vedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . Śrīmad Bhāgavatam. 13th ed. Canto. 10th. Vol.3rd. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . Śrīmad Bhāgavatam. 13th ed. Canto. 10th. Vol. 4th. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . Śrīmad Bhāgavatam. 13th ed. Canto.11th. Vol.1st Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- Ranganathananda, Swami. The Central Theme of Śrīmad Bhāgavatam. 1st ed. Advaita Ashram, 2002.
- Sinha, Purnendu Kumar Sinha. A Study on the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. 1st ed. The Theosophical Publishing House, 1901.
- Solis, Benjamin Preciado. The Śrī Kṛṣṇa Cycle in the Purāṇas. 1st ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.
- Tagare, Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare. (Ed.) The Bhāgavata Purāṇa. 5th ed. Vol. 10. Motilal Banarasiidass, 2007.
- Taylor, Paul W. Respect for Nature. 25th ed. Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Theodor, Ithamar. Rāsa and Personhood in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa: The Integration of Aesthetic Theory with Vedānta. 1st ed. University of Oxford, 2005.
- White, Charles, J. "Kṛṣṇa as a Divine Child". History of Religion. Vol. 10. No.2. The University of Chicago Press, 1970. P.158. [http://www. Jstor.org/stable/ 1061907](http://www.Jstor.org/stable/1061907)