

Réti Vāda (style)

Ven. Malwane Chandarathana Thero

සාහිත්‍ය විචාරයට අදාළ ව විවිධ මිණුම් දැඩු පෙරදිගත් අපරදිගත් විචාරකයන් විසින් හඳුන්වා දී ඇත. විශේෂයෙන් ම කාව්‍ය සම්බන්ධයෙන් විචාර සංකල්ප බොහොමයක් බිහි වී ඇත. එකී විචාර මාර්ගවලින් සිදුවන්නේ නිර්මාණය මැනවින් විචාරයට ලක්කොට නිර්මාණකරුවා බලාපොරොත්තු වූ නියම අදහස සහාද පාඨකයාට සම්ප්‍රදානය කිරීමයි. එවිට එම සාහිත්‍ය නිර්මාණයේ සැබෑ වූ රසය විදගත හැකිය. විශේෂයෙන් ම පෙරදිග කාව්‍ය විචාරය තුළ රසවාදය, අලංකාරවාදය, ඊතිවාදය, ධ්වනිවාදය, වක්‍රෝක්තිවාදය, ඔෆ්විතාවාදය වැනි ප්‍රධාන විචාර සංකල්ප ගණනාවක් බිහි වී ඇත. එහිදී කාව්‍ය විචාරයේ දී වැදගත් වන විචාරවාදයක් වන්නේ ඊතිවාදයයි. ඊතිය යනු කාව්‍ය නිර්මාණයේ දී වචන ගොතන පිළිවෙලයි. මෙය කාව්‍ය ගුණ හා එකට බැඳී පවතින්නකි. දණ්ඩින් ඊති යන්න මාර්ග වශයෙන් සඳහන් කළේය. ඔහු සඳහන් කරන මාර්ග ද්විධ වේ. වාමන හා කුන්තක ද එවැනි මාර්ග තුනක් ද, හොඳ නම් විචාරකයා ඊති හයක් ද හඳුන්වා දී ඇත. මේ අතරින් 'ඊතිරාත්මා කාව්‍යසා' යනුවෙන් ඊතිය කාව්‍යයේ ආත්මය කොට සඳහන් කළ විචාරකයා වන්නේ වාමනයයි.

Among Sanskrit poetic criticism, which occupies a prominent place is *rīti*. Even though this concept is introduced as *rīti*, it is closely associated with merits of poetry (*guṇa*). Therefore, it is advisable to discuss merits and *rīti* taken together rather than being taken them individually or separately, because it is indivisibly integrated/fused with each other. The main reason for this is that the concept introduced as merits (*guṇa*) serves as the main factor that produces *rīti*. This concept of *rīti* is first mentioned in *Nāṭyaśāstra* by Bharata. Ten merits (*guṇa*) are described in his work.

© Ven. Malwane Chandarathana Thero

සංස්. මහාචාර්ය පැට්ටික් රත්නායක, ආචාර්ය කේ. බී. ජයවර්ධන, ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ කලීකාවාර්ය දිනලි ප්‍රනාන්දු

මානවශාස්ත්‍ර පීඨ ශාස්ත්‍රීය සංග්‍රහය, 22 කලාපය, 2014/2015

මානවශාස්ත්‍ර පීඨය, කැලණිය විශ්වවිද්‍යාලය

*śleṣaḥ prasādaḥ samatā samādhirmā dhūrya
mojaḥ padasaukumārtham
arthasya ca vyaktirudāratā ca kāntiśca kāvyasya
guṇādaśaite – (Nāṭyaśāstra,17-95)*

They are

1. *śleṣa* : Pleasing combination of words having double meaning.
2. *Prasāda* : The clearness of style.
3. *Samatā* : Fairness of expression.
4. *Samādhi*: Imposition of attributes.
5. *Mādhurya* : Grace of style in the employment of separated words.
6. *Ojas* : Elaborate style of words. (use of compound words)
7. *Saukumārya* : Tenderness of expression.
8. *Arthavyakti* : The clearness of expression of sense.
9. *Udāratā* : Elegance of speech or expression.
10. *Kānti* : Poetic beauty.

But he does not mention about *rīti*. Certain facts relevant to both merits (*guṇa*) and *rīti* have been mentioned in *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra* by Bhāmaha not as merits or *rīti* but otherwise.

*śravyannāṭisastārtham kāvyam madhuramiṣyate
āvidvadaṅganābālapratīrtārtham prasādavat
(kāvyāḷaṅkāra 3-3)*

(Auditory poetry (*śvanīya kāvya*) which lacks compound words (*samāsa pada*) is said to be euphonious and melodious. If the meaning of poetry is intelligible and understandable to the scholar, pundit, and woman and to the uneducated as well it is adorned with *Prasāda.guṇa*.)

However in the books and texts available at present, Daṇḍin, the author of *Kāvyaḷadarśa* can be cited as the first critic who made a clear mention of merits (*guṇa*) and *rīti*. The word *mārga* is mentioned by him instead of *rīti*. It is mentioned in *Kāvyaḷadarśa* as follows.

*astyaneko girām mārgaḥ sūkṣmabhedah
parasparam
tatra vaidarbhī gaudīyau varṇyete
pusphuṭāntarau* (kāvyādarśa,1-40)

(There are different ways of composition of words which are of very sensitive and subtle difference. Among those ways of composition, *Vaidarbhī* and *Gaudī* which have striking differences are praised and evaluated)

Especially, even though Daṇḍin composed and edited *Kāvyālaṅkāra* presenting his views on *alaṅkāra*, he deserves to be introduced as the first critic who mentioned features of *Kāvyā rīti* of poetry more than a rhetorician. Daṇḍin has the honour of presenting figures of speech systematically introduced by Bhāmaha. But it is justifiable to introduce him as the first critic who paid special attention to *rīti*.

What is meant by the concept of *rīti* is the special manner/way in which the lines of words of a poem are connected or interwoven. Therefore, Daṇḍin defines two methods of connecting lines of words of which the first one is the charming, precise and simple style of *rīti* without verbosity and circumlocution or embellishment and he mentions it as *vaidarbhī mārga*, and the second one is *vicitra rīti* which is full of embellishment, adornment and verbiage and he mentions it as *gaudī mārga*. *vaidarbī mārga* devoid of embellishment is used in South India while *gaudī rīti* replete with embellishment is widely used in the Eastern part of Bharata. Especially, Daṇḍin has illustrated the nature of each style of *rīti* by means of merits. He calls those merits *prāṇa*. Ten *prāṇa* found in the style of *vaidarbī rīti* have been illustrated with examples in *Kāvyādarśa*.

*śleṣaḥ prasādaḥ samatā mādhyam
sukumāratā
arthavyaktirudāratvamojaḥ kānti samādhayaḥ*
(kāvyādarśa,1-41)

The opposite of these ten *prāṇa* which are the features of *vaidarbhī rīti* should be understood as features of the style of *gaudī rīti*. As these two *rīti* are two extremes, he says that there could be other different forms of *rīti* of poetic composition in between them.

Although inherent features of this *rīti* are mentioned, Daṇḍin opted to present it as a kind of poetic criticism. Vāmana, a critic who lived in the 8th century and composed *Kāvyālaṅkāra sūtra vṛtti* is credited for introducing a concept of criticism called *rīti* for the first time based on this criticism. He views *rīti* as the soul/spirit of poetry.

rītirātmākāvyaṣya (kāvyālaṅkāra sūtra vṛtti,1-1-3)

Likewise he further goes on to say that special arrangement of words is *rīti* and the specialty of this is that merit is the soul of it.

viśiṣṭā padaracanā rītiḥ viśeṣo guṇātmā
(kāvyālaṅkāra sūtra vṛtti,1-1-7)

(*rīti* is a particular/special form of poetic composition and this specialty here is that merits are considered to be the soul.)

He was of the view that if a poem is composed according to a particular *rīti* or style, it excels every other thing and leads ahead. In addition to the two *rīti*, i.e. *vaidarbhī* and *gaudī*, Vāmana introduces a third one called *Pāñcālī*. (the mixed)

sā tridhā vaidarbhī gaudīyā pāñcālī
(kāvyālaṅkāra sūtra vṛtti,1-1-9)

Vāmana states that *vaidarbhī rīti* is adorned and replete with all features/merits (*Samagra guṇa vaidarbhī*) while *gaudī rīti* contains/abounds with *Ojas* (elaborate style of words) (*Oja kānti mati gaudīyā*) and *kānti* (poetic beauty)

pāñcālī rīti is a kind of soft bond/connection which is simpler than the other two i.e. *vaidarbhī rīti* and *gaudī rīti*. It is

embellished and adorned with *mādhurya* (grace of style) and *saukumārya* (tenderness of expression). (*mādhuryasaukumāryopapannā pāñcālī*) Vāmana too like Daṇḍin, introduces *rīti* based on the merits of poetry. *rīti* presented by Vāmana can be introduced as special properties/features found both in auditory poetry (*śavya kāvya*) and visual poetry alike. (*dṛśya kāvya*). Among the Sanskrit drama, *śākuntala* can be cited as a fine example of simple and charming style of *rīti* while *vēnisanhāra* can be cited as a fine example of *rīti* which is colourful and high-flown linguistic extravagance.

No critic who considered merits (*guṇa*) and *rīti* as the soul/spirit of poetry after Vāmana can be found. Critics like Mammatabhatta and Jagatnātha who lived in later times paid attention to the merits/qualities of poetry but they did not seem to have paid sufficient attention or given priority to *rīti* but Kuntaka can be cited as a critic who paid attention to *rīti* to some extent. He illustrates three kinds of *mārga* such as *Sukumāra*, *vicitra* and *madya*.

*samprati tatra ye mārgaḥ kaviprasthānahetavaḥ
sukumārovicitraśyamadhyamaścobhayātmakaḥ
(vakrōkti jīvita,1-24)*

Like Daṇḍin, he too uses the same name *mārga*. Also a critic called Rudrata illustrates four kinds of *rīti* in his *kāvyaśāstrakāra* i.e. *Pāñcālī*, *lāṭī*, *gaudī* and *vaidarbhī*. And these four *rīti* are mentioned in *agnipurāṇa* too.

*vāgvidyāsampratijñāne rītiḥ sāpi caturvidhā
pāñcālī gaudī deśīyā vaidarbhīlāṭajā tathā
(Agnipurāṇa,40-1)*

Thus a critic called Bhōja who categorized style of *rīti* according to merits and compounds (*Samāsa*) illustrates six *rīti* i.e. *vaidarbhī*, *pāñcālī*, *lāṭī*, *māgadhī*, *gaudī* and *āvantikā*.

In the concept of *guṇa rīti*, *Dvanivadihu* were more concerned and paid much attention to *guṇa* than *rīti*. They proposed that merits (*guṇa*) match very well with their concept of *dhvani* and therefore *guṇa* occupies a special place here. Yet the concept of *Sanghatanā* presented by them corresponds largely and is very much similar to the concept of *rīti*/style. What they meant by *Sanghatanā* is compositions associated and mingled with *mādhurya* which supports/helps to generating literary taste.

*guṇānāśritya tiṣṭanti mādhuryadīn vyanakti sā
rasāmstanniyame heturaucityam
vaktṛvācyayoḥ (Dvanyālōka, 62-256)*

The concept *guṇa rīti* belongs to the early stage/period of criticism which explored and investigated the structural features of poetry. S.K. De points out that it is not comparable to the concept of *rīti* or “style” introduced by Western critics. (Sanskrit poetic – Vol,ii page 92) Hemapala Vijewardhana states that *Reethi* which is introduced by Eastern critics has structural features/properties which are strikingly different from “style” (*sankṛta kāvya vicāra mūla dharma*-46 page)

The concept of *rīti* cannot be understood considering only the quotation “*viśiṣṭāpadaracanārītiḥ*.” The reason for this is that methods of composing with different words being taken together cannot be enumerated. Therefore, in understanding the concept of merits of poetry, the quotation “*viśēṣō guṇātmā*” which means that speciality is based on the soul/spirit of merit should be compulsorily connected.

This indicates that *rīti* is built on merits/qualities of poetry. A special point to be made here is that any critic who presented Sanskrit criticism has failed so far to provide a precise and clear definition on the concept of merit/quality. However Vāmana says

that rhetoric (*alaṅkāra*), as well as merits/qualities are the standards/ norms of beautification (*kāvya śōbhākara dharmā*) of poetry.

kāvyaśobhāyā kartāro dharmā guṇāḥ
(*kāvyaśāṅkāra* sutra vṛtti,1-31)

Bharata in his *Nāṭyaśāstra* illustrates ten kinds of merits i.e. *ślēṣa*, (pleasing combination of words having double meaning). *Prasāda* (The clearness of style), *Samatā*, (Fairness of expression) *Samādhi*, (use of compound words) (imposition of attributes) *Mādhurya*, (grace of style in the employment of separated words), *Ojas* (Elaborate style of words) *Pada Saukumārya*, (tenderness of expression) *arthavyakti*, (The clearness of expression of sense) *udāratā* (elegance of speech or expression) and *kānti*: (poetic beauty).

The other critic who paid special attention to the concept of merits (*guṇa*) is Bāmaha and he refers to two kinds of poetic errors that should be avoided. One such kind is of twelve errors and the other kind is of eighteen errors and each error is analyzed and described with examples by him. The eleven errors in the first chapter are related to the core/nucleus of poetry.

neyārtham kliṣṭamanyarthamavācakamayuktimat
gūḍhaśabdābhidānam ca kavayo na prayuñjate
(*kāvyaśāṅkāra*,1-37)

(Poets do not use *neyārtha*, (error of indistinct meaning) *kliṣṭārtha*, *anyārtha*, (word expressive of unintended meaning) *avācaka*, (word non expressive of intended meaning) *auktimat*, (word expressive of illogical sense). *Prayōga* and *gūḍha* sounds/ words.)

śrutiduṣṭārthaduṣṭe ca kalpanāduṣṭamityapi
śrutikaṣṭam tathaiivāhurvācām doṣam
caturvidham (*kāvyaśāṅkāra*,1-47)

(There are four kinds of errors i.e. *śṛtiduṣṭa*, *arthaduṣṭa*, *kalpanāduṣṭa*, and *śṛtikaṣṭa*.)

The eighteen poetic errors (*dōṣa*) mentioned in the fourth chapter are connected with the external structure/form of poetry.

apārtham vyarthamekārtham samāśayamapakramam
śabdahīnam yatibhraṣṭam bhinnavṛttam visandhi ca
deśakālakalāloka nyāyāgamavirodhi ca
pratiññāhetudṛṣṭāntahīnam duṣṭam ca neṣyate
(*Kāvyaśāṅkāra*,4-1/2)

(*apārtha* (wrong meaning), *vyartha* (contradictory meaning), *ekārtha* (repetition of words that have same meaning), *Samaśaya*, *apakrama* (not being in the regular order). *yatibhraṣṭa* (wanting of caesura) *śabda hīna* (use of a word in a form not sanctioned by standard authors), *bhinna vṛtta*, (words containing metrical fault), *visandhi*, *dēśa virōdha* (contradictory statement regarding a region/country) *kāla virōdha* (contradictory statement regarding seasons), *kalā Virōdha* (contradictory statement regarding aesthetics and arts) *lōka Virōdha*, *nyāyavirōdha* (going against the law of dharma, *artha*, *kama* and the rule of punishment), *āgamavirōdha* (going against the traditional doctrine), *Pratiññāhīna*, *hētuhīna* and *dṛṣṭhāntahīna* should not be in poetry).

Afterwards Daṇḍin in his *Kāvyaḍarśa* refers to ten merits i.e.

ślēṣaḥ prasādaḥ samatā mādhuryam
sukumāratā
arthavyaktirudāratvamojaḥ kānti samādhayaḥ
(*Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1-41)

ślēṣa, *prasāda*, *samatā*, *mādhurya*, *saukumāratā*, *arthavyakti*, *udāratva ojas*, *kānti*, and *Samādhi*. Daṇḍin who cites these merits as *prāṇa* in *vaidarbhī* has introduced the opposite of these *prāṇa* as features of *gauḍī rīti*.

Vamana, who is considered to be the critic who confirmed *rīti* states that there are ten merits or criteria that beautify poetry and he admits that those merits should be in both sound and in meaning. The definition he gives to the concept of merits is *kāvya śōbhākara dharma* i.e. that which supports to generate the beauty of poetry)

kāvyaśōbhāyā kartārodharmā guṇāḥ
(*kāvyaśōbhāyā sūtra vṛtti*,1-8)

Accordingly he presents ten merits/qualities of sounds and ten merits/qualities of meaning and he has introduced these two sound-meaning element by the same name.

ojaḥ prasāda śleṣa samatā samādhi mādhurya
saukumārya udāratā arthavyakti kānti.

But some critics are rather reluctant about this division of merits as sound and meaning-wise. Critics like Hemachandra, Mānikyachandra and Pundit Rāja Jagannātha considered it as an unnecessary division.

Dvanivadihu were compelled to analyze the concept of merits (*guṇa*) in a new way and different perspective. They restricted merits to three such as *mādhurya Ojas* and *Prasāda*. Critics like Mamta have pointed out that the ten-fold merits proposed by rhetoricians are subsumed in these three kinds of merits.

Merit/quality of *mādhurya* exists in sentiments of *Sambōgha*, *śṅgāra*, *vipralambha* and *karuṇa* in a way that it increases gradually in great proportion. Merit/quality of *Ojas* exists in common to all sentiments or *rasa* as well and in *Veera* and *adbūta rasa* too. Both *mādhurya* and *Ojas* exist bended in *hāsya*, *bhayānaka*, *bībhatsya* and *kānti*. *prasāda* is common and reasonable to all sentiments or *rasa*.

mādūryaujaḥprasādākhyāstrayaste na punardaśa
āhlādatvaṃ mādhūryaṃ śṅgāredṛtikāraṇaṃ
karuṇe vipralambhe tacchānte cātiśāyānvoitam
dīptyātmavistṛterheturojo vīrarasasthiti
bībhatsaraudrarasayostasyādhikeyaṃ krameṇa ca
vyapnotyanyat prasādosau sarvatra vihitāsthitiḥ
(*Kāvya prakāśa*,8-89/90/91)

Afterwards, the critic who paid much attention to *rīti Vada* was Rājanaka Kuntaka who composed the book titled *vakrōktijīvita*. As mentioned by Daṇḍin, Kuntaka too uses the same name *mārga* in place of the name *rīti*. According to his view, those *mārga* are of three-fold i.e. *Sukumāra*, *vicitra* and *madyama*. He is rather hesitant and reluctant to categorize the *rīti* according to a region. *Sukumāra mārga* and *vicitra mārga* bear resemblance to the *vaidarbhī mārga* and to *gauḍī mārga* presented by Daṇḍin. *madya* is the moderate *mārga* of these two ways of composition. He enumerates that there are four merits (*guṇa*) related and relevant to *Sukumāra* and *vicitra mārga*. They are *mādhurya*, *Prasāda*, *lāvanya*, and *abhijātya*. Here, the *mādhurya guṇa* created/originated in *sukumāra mārga* changes in the *vicitra mārga*.

A combination of these two *sukumāra* and *vicitra mārga* can be seen in *madya mārga*. As the post-era critics held the view that what is important in poetic criticism is the combination of *Rasa* and *dhvani*, *rīti* was pushed behind or became subordinate.

Reference

- Agni Purāṇa, Ed, Gopal Publication Press, 1957
Nātya śāstra, Ed, manmohan gos press, kolkata, 1967
Kāvyaśāstra, Ed, Jayakriṣṇadāsa Haridasa publication Banārasi, 1928
Kāvyaśāstra, Ed, Rev. R. Dhammarama, Satya samuccaya press,1925
Kāvyaśāstra, Ed, Anandakulasooriya, gunasena,press,
Colombo, 1966
Vakrōkti jīvita, Ed, Ramlal puri, Sagara press, kasmira-1955
Dhvanyāloka, Ed, Jayakriṣṇadāsa Haridasa publication Banārasi,1953

Kāvya prakāṣa, Ed, Ragunath Damodar, Oriental Research poone, 1950
Sanskrita kāvya vicāra mūla dharmā, Vijayawardhana Hemapala, Gunasena
press, Colcmbo, 1967

Kāvya vicāra gavesāṇa, Vijayawardhana Hemapala,
Kāvya rasaya ha bhāṇāva, Rev. D. Piyathissa, Mathara publication, 1950
Siyabaslakara vistara varṇaṇā, Rev. H. Nanasiha, Svabhasa press,
Colombo, 1964

Sanskrita kāvya sāhitya, J.thilakasiri, S. Godage Press, Colombo, 1961

කේ. ජයතිලකගේ වර්තන තුනක් නවකතාවේ වර්තන නිරූපණය පිළිබඳ විග්‍රහයක්

කුසුම් හේරත්

The novel **Charitha Thunak** by K. Jayathilaka presents characters formed by traditional rural society and culture. The conduct of three main characters of this novel is reviewed here. These three characters are different in their thinking, aspirations and conduct. The character of Isa arises as a main character while Sana is a self-willed characters. Although 'Ranjith' is a teacher by profession he acts selfishly.

නවකතාව වූ කලී ඒ ඒ රටට, ඒ ඒ සාහිත්‍යාංගයට හා ඒ ඒ ලේඛකයාට මෙන් ම ඒ ඒ කෘතියට සුවිශේෂ වූ නවතම ලක්ෂණවලින් යුක්ත කලා මාධ්‍යයකි. ඉයන් වොට් නම් විචාරකයාගේ අදහස අනුව ද නවකතාව වූ කලී නවතාව විෂයයෙහි පෙර නොවූ විරූ අවධානයක් යොමු කෙරෙන සාහිත්‍යාංගයකි.¹ නවකතාව නම් සාහිත්‍යාංගය පැහැදිලි කිරීම සඳහා ඉදිරිපත් වී ඇති මත අසම්පූර්ණ බව ඒ ඒ විචාරකයන් විසින් ම පිළිගනු ලැබ ඇත.² එයට හේතු ව මෙම සාහිත්‍යාංගය සෙසු සාහිත්‍යාංගවලට වඩා සංකීර්ණ ලක්ෂණවලින් යුක්ත වීමයි.

නවකතාවේ ස්වභාවය එබඳු වුව ද නවකතාව නම් සාහිත්‍යාංගය විමසීමේ දී එහි සන්දර්භය, කතා වින්‍යාසය, වර්තන නිරූපණය, දෘෂ්ටිකෝණය ආදී ශිල්පීය ලක්ෂණ පමණක් නොව, එම කෘතිය මගින් යථාර්ථ නිරූපණ ඇසුරෙන් ජීවිතය කෙරෙහි හෙළන ආකල්පය ද ඇතුළු කරුණු රැසක් කෙරෙහි අවධානය යොමු විය යුතු ය. නවකතාකරුවාගේ පරමාර්ථය වන්නේ ස්වකීය නිර්මාණය

© ආචාර්ය කුසුම් හේරත්

සංස්. මහාචාර්ය පැට්‍රික් රත්නායක, ආචාර්ය කේ. බී. ජයවර්ධන, ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ කවිකාචාර්ය

දිනලි ප්‍රනාන්දු

මානවශාස්ත්‍ර පීඨ ශාස්ත්‍රීය සංග්‍රහය, 22 කලාපය, 2014/2015

මානවශාස්ත්‍ර පීඨය, කැලණිය විශ්වවිද්‍යාලය