

## A Study on the Identities of *Guṇa-Rīti* Discourse of *Siyabaslakara*

---

Professor H. W. B. I. Sampath

### Abstract

*Siyabaslakara*, written by *King Sena I* in the 9th century of the *Anurādhapura* era, is the first *Sinhala* critical book, and it is an adaptation of *Kāvyaṇḍarśa* written by *Daṇḍin*, one of the early critics of Sanskrit Literary criticism, in the middle of the 7th century. It is not a verbatim translation but an adaptation. Because of that, the author has been able to add some significant changes relevant to the *Sinhala* language and poetry. This research paper studies the identities of *Guṇa-Rīti* concepts in *Siyabaslakara*. This qualitative research is based on primary and secondary data. The editions of *Siyabaslakara* and Sanskrit critical books such as *Kāvyaṇḍarśa*, written by *Daṇḍin*, and *Kāvyaṇḍarśa*, written by *Vāmana*, which are based on *Guṇa-Rīti* concepts are primary resources and critical books, and journal articles written by post-critics are the secondary data. Text analysis and comparative study are the data analysis methods used in this study. Stanzas, 31 to 63 of chapter one of *Siyabaslakara*, is the main limitation of this research, and to discuss the identities of *Guṇa-Rīti*, the explanation of that text is the main objective. The truthfulness of the ideas of modern critics on that phenomenon is re-examined in this study.

**Keywords:** *Guṇa-Rīti*, Identities, *Kāvyaṇḍarśa*, Sanskrit, *Siyabaslakara*

## Concepts analysis and Literature review

**Guṇa-Rīti** is the second stage of **Alaṅkāra Vāda**, the rhetoric of Sanskrit literary criticism. *Vedic literature*, two epics *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*, Inscriptions of Sanskrit and Prākṛit are the root of Sanskrit literary criticism, and the dramaturgy book '*Nāṭyaśāstra*' written in on or before 3rd century is the first book that discusses the critical theories of Sanskrit. '*Kāvyaālaṅkāra*', written by *Bhāmaha* in the 7th century, is the first book in Sanskrit literary criticism. *Kāvyaadarśa*, which was written by *Daṇḍin* at the end of the 7th century, is the original text of *Siyabasalakara*. After that, having written the book ***Kāvyaālaṅkārasūtra***, ***Vāmana*** introduced the ***Guṇa-Rīti Vāda*** to the field of Sanskrit literary criticism. Although *Ānnadavardhana* wrote *Dvanyāloka* in the 9th century, *Kāvyaālaṅkāra* written by *Rudrata* in the 9th century, *Vackrocti Jeevita* written by *Rājānaka Kuntaka* in the 11th century, and *Sāhitya Darpaṇa* written by *Viśvanātha* in the 14th century are the explanations on *Guṇa-Rīti* concepts, *Siyabasalakara* is older than, all those texts.

***Guṇa-Rīti Vāda*** is the combination of three concepts: ***Guṇa***, ***Rīti***, and ***Dosa***. According to *Kāvyaālaṅkārasūtra* written by *Vāmana*, *Guṇas*, the merits are the compulsory doctrinal of the poem, and in the *Alaṅkāra*, the rhetoric (Figures of speech) are optional doctrinal<sup>1</sup>. Not only *Vāmana* but also *Ānnadavardhana*, the author of *Dvanyāloka*, has also explained *Alaṅkāra* as being like the decorations of the ladies, and he has also explained *Guṇa* as being their spiritual and other inner qualities<sup>2</sup>. *Guṇa* and *Alaṅkāra* are essential to increase the poem's beauty, but *Guṇa* are compulsory principles, and *Alaṅkāra* are optional. Stability is another difference between *Guṇa* and *Alaṅkāra*. *Guṇa* are stable and never differ from poet to poet or poem to poem. For example, *Prasāda Guṇa* is the clearness of the poem's meaning, and it is invariable, but the *Upama Alaṅkāra*, the similes are variable by its nature. The similarity of the *Alaṅkāra* is not a good quality of the poet, and he uses different types of rhetoric (Figures of speech).

***Dosas*** (poetic defects), the blemishes are the poem's errors or weaknesses, and those are the opposite side of the *Guṇa*. *Guṇas* are admirable, but the *Dosas* are not. *Guṇa* are the great qualities of the poem, and *Dosa* are its bad characteristics. However, because of the

1 *Kāvyaālaṅkārasūtra*, 3.1.3

2 *Kāvyaālaṅkārasūtra*, 3.1.2 and *Dvanyāloka*, 2.29

applicability of the identification and abandonment of the mistakes of the poems, *Dosas* are also important.

**Rīti**, the styles of the poets are the writing patterns. According to *Vāmana*, *Rīti* is an excellent method of using words by the poet and is a result of the correct usage of *Guṇas*<sup>3</sup>.

The tenfold *Guṇas* and the tenfold *Dosas* have been explained by *Bharata*, the author of the dramaturgy book *Nāṭyaśāstra*. *Śleṣa*, *Prasāda*, *Samatā*, *Samādhi*, *Mādhurya*, *Ojas*, *Sukumāratā*, *Arthavyakti*, *Udāratā*, and *Kānti* are *Guṇas* of his explanation<sup>4</sup>, and *Gūṇhārtha*, *Arthāntara*, *Arthahīna*, *Bhinnārtha*, *Ekārtha*, *Abhiluptārtha*, *Nyāyādapeta*, *Viśama*, *Visandhi*, and *Śabdacyuta* are *Dosas*, which are discussed by him<sup>5</sup>. Although *Guṇa* and *Dosa*'s explanations in *Nāṭyaśāstra* are similar to explanations of those concepts by post-critics, sometimes those differ analytically.

*Bhāmaha*, the author of the book *Kāvyaṭīkāra*, presents only three *Guṇas*, but he explains several *Dosas*. *Mādhurya*, *Ojas*, and *Prasāda* are *Guṇas*, which he discusses. *Mādhurya* is the lessness of the compounds and sweetness of the sounds, *Ojas* is the multiplicity of long compounds, and *Prasāda* is the lessness of the compounds and clarity of the meaning, according to the discussion of *Bhāmaha*<sup>6</sup>. He had knowledge about two *Rītis*, the writing styles *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya*, and he was also knowledgeable about the beliefs of previous critics who considered that the *Vaidarbhīya* was more valuable than *Gaudīya*, but he disagreed with them. His idea was that the names of the writing styles were optional, but the correct usage was valuable<sup>7</sup>.

**Daṇḍin**, in his book *Kāvyaḍarśa*, written in the 7th century, has analyzed ten *Guṇas* and ten *Dosas*, and he has also presented two *Rītis* *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya*. Using other words to name *Guṇa* and *Rīti*, he introduces *Prāṇa* and *Mārga* instead of those. Because of the great importance of the ideas presented by *Daṇḍin* for this study, those will be widely discussed in the next part of this article.

*Vāmana*, the leading critic of the *Guṇa-Rīti Vāda*, has presented 20 *Guṇas* as ten *Shabda Guṇas* and ten *Artha Guṇas* each. Although the

3 *Kāvyaṭīkārasūtra*, 1.2.6-8

4 *Nāṭyaśāstra II*, P.219-221

5 *Nāṭyaśāstra II*, P.221-223

6 *Kāvyaṭīkāra*, 2.1.3 and 2.2

7 *Kāvyaṭīkāra*, 1.31-33

names of those two sets of ten *Guṇas* are identical, their characteristics differ<sup>8</sup>. His *Dosa* discussion is also descriptive, and ***Pancālī Rīti*** has also been added among to the *Vaidarbhīya Rīti* and the *Gaudīya Rīti*, which are explained by *Bhāmaha* and *Daṇḍin*. According to *Vāmana*, the reason for the naming those writing styles by city names is due to their usage by poets in that area, such as *Vīdarbha*, but there is not a logical relationship between the writing styles and the places<sup>9</sup>.

After *Vāmana*, ***Ānnadavardhana*** presented new ideas about *Guṇa-Rīti* in his book ***Dvanyāloka*** (Theory of Suggestion of Poetry). Having delimited the number of the *Guṇa*, he has presented only three *Guṇas*: *Mādhurya*, *Ojas*, and *Prasāda*<sup>10</sup>. The *Guṇas* presented by *Ānnadavardhana* are combinative with ***Rasa*** (sentiments), the taste of the poem. Having neglected the *Rīti* explanation, which is based on the city names by the previous critics, he has introduced three new *Rītis* based on compounds named ***Asamāsa*** (uncompounded), ***Madyama Samāsa*** (having middling compounds), and ***Dīrgha Samāsa*** (having long compounds)<sup>11</sup>. The *Asamāsa* is the lessness of the compounds, and the *Dīrgha Samāsa* is the fulness of the long compounds. The *Asamāsa* is the mid-way of those two writing styles. *Dvani* critics have used the word ***Samghaṭanā*** instead of *Rīti*. The *Rītis* have also been discussed as a usage of the compounds by *Rudrata* in the 9th century<sup>12</sup>.

In the 11th century, ***Kunthaka***, the leading critic of the ***Vakrokti Vāda*** (the theory of Oblique Expression), introduced a new categorization based on *Guṇa-Rīti*. The word ***Mārga*** has also been used to name *Rītis* and ***Sukumāra Mārga***, ***Madyama Mārga***, and ***Vicitra Mārga***, the three writing styles he presented<sup>13</sup>. The *Sukumāra Mārga* and *Vicitra Mārga* reflect the *Vaidarbhīya Rīti* and the *Gaudīya Rīti* of previous critics. *Madyama Mārga* is a mixture of those two writing styles. *Kuntaka* presented two sets of *Guṇas*, each with four *Guṇas*. His *Guṇa* sets are related to his *Mārga* concept, and those are based on *Sukumāra* roots and *Vicitra* roots. The *Sukumāra Guṇa* and *Vicitra Guṇa* sets have the same-named four *Guṇas*: *Mādhurya*, *Prasāda*, *Lavanya*, and *Abhijati*. Although

9 *Kāvya-larikārasūtra*, 1.2.11-15 and 1.2.10

10 *Dvanyāloka*, 2.31-33

11 *Dvanyāloka*, 3.61

12 Hemapala Wijayawardena, *Sanskuta Kāvya Vicāraye Mūladharma* (Colombo: M.D. Guṇasena, 1967), P.61-63

13 Ibid, P.64

*Mādhurya* and *Prasāda* are similar to the *Guṇa* names of previous critics, *Lavanya* and *Abhijati* are not similar to their *Guṇa* names. According to *Kuntaka*, *Auchitya* and *Saubhagya* are common *Guṇas* of all writing styles.

*Viśvanātha*, the last critic of the classical era of Sanskrit literary criticism, has summarized the ten *Guṇas* presented by the old critics to three *Guṇas*. These are nominally identical to *Guṇa*'s explanations by *Bhāmaha* and *Ānnavardhana*. *Mādhurya*, the sweetness; *Ojah*, the Energy; and *Prasāda*, the perspicuity, are three *Guṇas* they discussed, but they differ in characteristics. *Viśvanātha* has presented four writing styles: *Vaidarbhi*, *Gaudi*, *Pancāli*, and *Lāti*. Those are also city names of India, and those are nominally identical to *Rīti* explanations by *Rudrata* in the 9th century. Other critics like *Boja* have discussed six writing styles with the *Māgadhi Rīti* and the *Avantikā Rīti*.

## Studying the original text *Kāvyādarśa*

*Kāvyādarśa*, written by *Daṇḍin*, the original text of *Siyabaslakara*, is the first great discussion on *Guṇa-Rīti* concepts of Sanskrit and *Rīti*, *Guṇa* and *Dosa* concepts have been discussed in it. In the 40th stanza of chapter one, *Daṇḍin*, having explained about the *Rīti*, said that the manifold was the style of composition with minute mutual differences. Of those styles, the *Vaidarbha* and the *Gaudīya* were clearly different from each other. Then he presented the tenfold *Guṇas* as *Śleṣa* (Cohesion), *Prasāda* (Lucidity), *Samatā* (Evenness), *Mādhurya* (Sweetness), *Sukamāratā* (Tenderness), *Arthavyakti* (Explicitness of meaning), *Udāratva* (Pregnancy of expression) *Ojas* (Floridity) *Kānti* (Grace) and *Samādhi* (Transference)<sup>14</sup>. He considered that the tenfold *Guṇas* were the soul of the *Vaidarbha* style. In the *Gauda* style, the differences between those could be seen<sup>15</sup>.

*Śleṣa* is cohesion without looseness, and it consists mainly of faintly-aspirated syllables. Gaudian poets have permitted the use of many alliterations in the *Śleṣa Guṇa*. *Daṇḍin* has presented “*Mālatī-dāma laṅghitam bhramaraih*” (a wreath of Malati invaded by bees) as an example of the *Vadharbhiya* style and “*Māliṭi-māla lolāli-kālilā*”

14 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.41

15 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.42

(a garland of Malati flowers laden with longing bees) as the *Gaudian* example<sup>16</sup>.

**Prasāda** is the clarity and lucidity that convey a well-known sense. “*Indor indīvara-dyuti lakṣma lakṣmim tanoti*” (the spot on the Moon shining like a blue-lotus augments her charm) has been presented for the *Vaidharbhiya* example an “*Anatyarjunābjanmasadṛikṣaṅko valakṣaguḥ*” (the white-rayed Moon having a spot resembling a water-born lotus not-very-white) has been presented for the *Gaudian* example<sup>17</sup>. The first one, the *Vaidharbhiya* example, is [for instance] an expression conveying the sense without effort, but the second one, the *Gaudian* example, is not very understandable. Because of the unconventionality of the *Gaudian* grammarians, they did not agree to use straightforward language even in the *Prasāda Guṇa*.

**Samatā** is the evenness of the sound combination of the poem, and there are three types of **Mrudu** (soft), **Sphuta** (harsh), and **Madyama** (Mixture of soft and harsh) of that quality<sup>18</sup>. After explaining this *Guṇa*, *Daṇḍin* presents three examples for those three subtypes. The example for the *Mrudu Samatā* “*Kokilāpavācālo māmaiti Malayānilah*” (garrulous because of the cuckoo's notes the Malaya wind approaches me) is a usage of soft sounds from beginning to the end, and the example for the *Sphuta Samatha* “*Ucchahalacchhīkarācchhācchhanirjharāmbhaḥkanokṣitah*” (being surcharged with drops of very pure water from rills with their spouting sprays) is a usage of harsh sounds from beginning to the end. “*Candana Praṇayodgandhir mando Malayamārutaḥ*” (the soft Malaya breeze with its spreading fragrance due to friendship with sandal trees) is an example of the *Madyama Samatā*, the mixture of soft and harsh. After presenting those three subtypes, *Daṇḍin* discusses the *Gaudian* ideology related to *Samatā Guṇa*, having presented the example “*Spardhate ruddhamaddhairyo vararāmananānilaiḥ*” (having upset my courage [the wind] vies with the breath from the mouths of excellent damsels) for the *Gaudian* style<sup>19</sup>.

**Mādhurya** is the sweetness in the refinement of the expression of the poem. According to *Kāvyaḍarśa*, *Mādhurya Guṇa* as follows; “Sweet is what has Sentiment; [for] in words no less than in things Sentiment

16 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.43, 44

17 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.44-46

18 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.47

19 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.49,50

exists: [Sentiment] whereby the learned are delighted like unto the honey-loving [bees] by honey." <sup>20</sup> After that definition, *Daṇḍin* discusses the importance of suitable sound devices for *Mādhurya Guṇa*, discussing *Vaidarbha* and Gaudian ideologies<sup>21</sup>. The *Anuprāsa* and the *Yamaka* have been discussed. The *Anuprāsa*, alliteration, is the repetition of one or more of the same sounds whose purpose is to provide an audible pulse, and the *Yamaka* is the repetition of similar words with different meanings. Although *Anuprāsa* increases the *Mādhurya Guṇa*, *Yamaka* does not help to increase it, according to *Kāvyādarśa*<sup>22</sup>. Because of the damageability of the Vulgarly and the importance of the refinedness for the *Mādhurya Guṇa*, *Daṇḍin* also discusses the *Grāmyatā Dosa* (the blemish of the rustic). If the poet presents a vulgar thing in contrast to urban and refined, it is not sweet and damages the poem's interest. According to *Kāvyādarśa*, "O girl, how is it that while I long for thee thou dost not long for me?" is rustic but "No doubt this low-born Cupid, O fair-eyed one, is ruthless unto me; but happily, he is free from malice for you!" is not rustic<sup>23</sup>. The second one gives rise to the Sentiment because it is not being coarse, and it uses aesthetic beliefs as the cupid.

*Sukumāratā* is the soft and delicate part of the poem, and it is thought to have mostly no harsh letters. *Daṇḍin* says that using only the soft letters in the poem was not a quality and was a weakness, and therefore wanted to mix a few harsh letters in the *Sukumāratā Guṇa*. According to him, the usage of all soft letters is a blemish, which is called *Bandhaśaithilya*<sup>24</sup>. This is evidence for the oppositeness of the blemishes (*Dosa*) from the qualities (*Guṇa*). However, the mixture of soft and harsh letters has already been discussed in *Madyama Samatā's* explanation. According to some critics, *Sukumāratā* is a repetition of the *Madyama Samatā*. *Vāmana* has also excluded this *Guṇa*. According to Gaudian poets, the usage of harsh letters in the *rasas*, the aesthetic delights *Vīra* (Heroic), *Raudra* (Anger) and *Bībhatsa* (Disgust) is not unsuitable. It is good quality of the poem. "Nyakṣeṇaṣapitahpakṣaḥkṣatriyānam kṣaṇāt" (*Parasurama* in an instant destroyed the troop of *kshatriyas*) is the *Kāvyādarśa* example for that<sup>25</sup>.

20 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.51

21 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.52-60

22 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.61

23 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.63, 64

24 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.69

25 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.72



**Arthavyakti** is the explicitness of the poem's meaning, requiring nothing extraneous to be brought over for completion. "Hari, the Vishnu having incarnated as Boar uplifted the earth from the ocean reddened by the blood of serpents" is an example for the *Arthavyakti*, and "The earth was by the Great Boar uplifted from the reddened ocean" is not an example. In the second example, the meaning of the Great Boar is unclear, and it is not a direct synonym for the Vishnu. The meaning 'the blood of serpents' is not included in the second one. It would have to be extraneously brought over to complete the meaning of the poem<sup>26</sup>. Therefore, the *Neyatva Dosa*, the wordlessness is the oppositeness of the *Artavyakti Guṇa*, and Both *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya* poets do not agree with these type sentences.

**Udāratva** is the exaltation of the praise of the poem. Upon recitation of a composition, a certain eminent charm is experienced; that composition is styled Pregnant-in-expression, and that charm lends excellence to poetic style, according to *Kāvyādarśa*<sup>27</sup>. "The forlorn look of the mendicants fell upon Your face but once; and after that, Your Majesty, it had not in that same condition to look upon another's face<sup>28</sup>." is the example of it and that statement is explanative about the bountifulness of the king. According to *Kāvyādarśa*, some critics have considered that the usage of epithets such as 'sportive lotus (*Līlāmbujakrīda*),' 'pleasure-pond' (*Krīda Sarah*), 'golden bracelet (*Hemangada*)' was the *Udāratā Guṇa* of the poem<sup>29</sup>. However, the author of *Kāvyādarśa* has not explained the differences between the two main styles, *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya*, in this *Guṇa*.

**Ojas** is the vigor or brilliance of long compounds. *Ojas*, the soul of Prose, is the floridity consisting of a superabundance of compounds. Even in poetry, this is the sole resort for non-Southerners who are the Gaudian poets<sup>30</sup>. That is of manifold varieties by the profusion or sparseness of heavy or light syllables or with an equal mixture<sup>31</sup>. After this explanation, two examples were presented for the *Ojas Guṇa*, and the first was for the *Gaudian* style.

26 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.73,74

27 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.76

28 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.77

29 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.79

30 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.80

31 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.81



"Astamastakaparyasta - Samastārkaṁśusanīstarā  
Pīnastanāsthītātāmra - Kamravastreva vāruṇī"

(Clad in the drapery of all the beams of the Sun scattered on the summit of the Setting-mountain, the Western direction looks like a dame with a beautiful reddish garment covering her expansive bosom)<sup>32</sup>.

The Second example is for the others. Although the author has not defined 'the others,' it is sure that they were *Vaidarbians* because of the clarity of his other main style, *Vaidarbhi*. However, in this *Guṇa*, he prioritized the *Gaudīya* style, which is the second one that he explained, and it is evidence of the high value of the *Ojas Guṇa* in the *Gaudīya* style. The first poem, presented to explain the *Gaudīya* style, uses long compounds, but the second one, presented to explain the *Vaidarbhiya* style, uses fewer compounds. The second example for the *Ojas Guṇa* is as follows;

"Payōdharataṭṭsaṁga - Lagna sandhyātapāṁśukā  
Kasya kāmāturaṁ ceto - Vāruṇī na kariṣyati"

(With her garment in the form of the evening rays clinging to the sloping ridge of the bosom in the form of the clouds, whose mind cannot the damsel in the form of the Western direction make love afflicted?)<sup>33</sup>

***Kānti*** is the gracefulness of the poem, and it is agreeable to the whole world because, being striking withal, it does not transcend ordinary possibilities<sup>34</sup>. There are two kinds of *Kānti Guṇa*: ***Kānti Guṇa in friendly inquiries*** (Reports) and ***Kānti Guṇa in descriptions***. This is the *Vaidarbhi* example for the *Kānti Guṇa* in descriptions that the author of *Kāvyādarśa* presented;

"Thou of faultless limbs, unto these thy breasts as they are expanding, there is no room adequate between thy two creeper-like hands."<sup>35</sup>

*Kānti Guṇa* is graceful to the poets who are content to keep within the usual run of things, according to *Kāvyādarśa*<sup>36</sup>. The author has also

32 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.82, (English translation) S.K. Belvalkar (Poona: The Oriental Book-Supplying Agency, 1924.

33 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.84 (English translation) S.K. Belvalkar

34 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.85

35 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.87 (English translation) S.K. Belvalkar

36 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.88

presented another example, the *Gaudian* example, which is a comparison that helps clarify this *Guṇa*;

“Small has been the Aerial space created by the Creator, quite unmindful of this so extensive an expansion of your breasts that was to be.”<sup>37</sup>

The smallness of the bust of that lady growing her young breast in the first example is agreeable, but the smallness of the sky in the second example is not agreeable. Both are hyperboles, but the second one is an overstatement. *Gaudian* poets who like the second type of poem based on overstatements consider poems like those in the second example, as the *Kānti Guṇa*.

The *Vaidarbhīya* example for the *Kānti Guṇa* in reports of *Kāvyādarśa* is "Those alone are verily houses which a great ascetic like you thus honors by the purifying dust of his feet"<sup>38</sup> and "Like a Sanctuary of Gods this our house from today onwards is to be honored in as much as its sin has been entirely washed off by the falling of the dust from your feet" is its *Gaudian* example. *Gaudian's* example is also an overstatement in these ideas, but *Vaidarbhīyan's* is an acceptable hyperbole.

***Samādhi*** is the transference of metaphorical meanings. When keeping within the limits of mundane possibilities, the nature of a thing is neatly transferred to another thing distinct from it, known as Transfer, the *Samādhi Guṇa*<sup>39</sup>. This *Guṇa* is conceptually similar to the *Ātyantatīraskrutavācyadhvani* of the critics of *Dhvani*, and this is a type of the *Upacāravackratā* of the critics of *Vackrokti*. The transferred epithet of the Western critics is also similar to those concepts explained by the critics of Sanskrit.

“The night lotuses close the eyes, and the day lotuses open the eyes” is an example of the *Samādhi Guṇa* of the *Kāvyādarśa*. Here, because of the superimposition of the action of the eyes upon the lotuses, words that express that action have been predicated on the lotuses<sup>40</sup>. The blooming and the withering are the natures related to the flower, and the looking is the eye’s action. This example is a swap of those concepts.

37 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.91 (English translation) S.K. Belvalkar

38 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.86

39 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.93

40 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.94

The following stanzas explain the *Samādhi Guṇa* of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and discuss the correct usage of *Samādhi Guṇa*. According to *Daṇḍin*, Spitting, belching, vomiting, and such other words, only when appearing under a secondary sense, are very pleasing; elsewhere, they fall within the limits of vulgarity<sup>41</sup>. 'The lotuses, having drunk the sparks of fire emitted by solar rays, seem once again to vomit them through their mouths that eject reddish pollen'<sup>42</sup> is an example. In this poem, the word 'vomit' is used in the miner's meaning rather than in the significant meaning. Therefore, this idea is not rustic, and it is Metaphorical. But 'the young lady is spitting'<sup>43</sup> is rustic and not agreeable because the word 'spitting' has been used in the primary meaning. Poems 98 and 99 of chapter one of *Kāvyaḍarśa* discuss that, and poem 100 concludes about the importance of this *Guṇa*. According to *Kāvyaḍarśa*, this *Guṇa* is common for poets in all styles, including *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya*;

"This quality that is called Transference is indeed the all-in-all of poetry; all poets whatsoever, without exception, follow its guidance."<sup>44</sup>

After *Guṇa*'s discussion, the writer of *Kāvyaḍarśa* explained the writing styles and their importance. *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya* are the leading writing styles, and a description of the nature of each differentiates those. However, other individual writing styles of poets, which are slightly difference, are difficult to describe<sup>45</sup>. Greatness is the sweetness of sugar cane, milk, and molasses. However, it is impossible to have it described even by Sarasvati, the Goddess of Learning<sup>46</sup>. In the same way, the presumptions about the writing styles' goodness and badness are not acceptable. Those are combined with the objectives of the poets.

In chapter three of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*, *Daṇḍin* presented ten *Kāvya Dosas*, the ten Defects that wise men should avoid in poetry. *Apārtha* (Senseless), *Vyārtha* (Self-contradicting), *Ekārtha* (Iterative), *Sasaisaya* (Dubious), *Apakrama* (Non-sequent), *Śabdahīna* (Defective-in-word), *Yatibhraṣṭa* (Defective-in-caesura), *Bhinnavrutta* (Defective-in-meter), *Visandhika* (Defective-hiatus) And *Desha-Kaala-Kala-Loka-Nyaya-*

41 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.95

42 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.96

43 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.97

44 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.100 (English translation) S.K. Belvalkar

45 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.101

46 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.102

*Agama Virodha* (Not-conforming to requirements of place, time, science, experience, philosophy or scriptures) are the ten Defects which was presented by *Daṇḍin* the author of *Kāvyaḍarśa*<sup>47</sup>.

## Studying the present text *Siyabasalakara* and the discussion

*Siyabasalakara* by King *Sena I* (826-846 AD) of the *Anuradhapura* era is the first Sinhala critical book and an adaptation of *Kāvyaḍarśa*. Although the number of verses in *Kāvyaḍarśa* is 660, there are only 400 verses in *Siyabasalakara*. The number of chapters and the main content are the same in both texts, but the *Siyabasalakara* author has reduced the number of poems in every chapter. He has accepted the *Kāvyaḍarśa* in many concepts, but sometimes he abandons the concepts discussed in the original text. In other cases, he has revised the principles cited by the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and added new points<sup>48</sup>. Having considered the identities of the ***Guṇa-Rīti*** of the Sinhala poetic language, the author of the *Siyabasalakara* has revised those principles.

This study focuses on Stanzas 31 to 63 of chapter one of *Siyabasalakara*, which discusses the *Guṇa* and the *Rīti*. After discussing the *Mahākāvya* tradition, the author starts the *Guṇa* explanation directly before starting the discussion of the *Guṇa*, the author of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* introductions about the two main writing styles, *Vaidarbha* and *Gaudīya*, as its foundation. However, *Siyabasalakara* did not present any idea about the writing styles. First, in that discussion, he named the ten *Guṇas*.

“Maṭasilutu ya Pahan – Samabav, Miyuru, Sukumara  
Aruthpala, Ulāra, Oda – Danakal, Samādi mese”<sup>49</sup>

He has said that the *Maṭasilutu* (*Śleṣa*, Cohesion), *Pahan* (*Prasāda*, Lucidity), *Samabav* (*Samatā*, Evenness), *Miyuru* (*Mādhurya*, Sweetness), *Sukumara* (*Sukumāratā*, Tenderness), *Aruthpala* (*Arthavyakti*, Explicitness of meaning), *Ulāra* (*Udāratva*, Pregnancy of expression), *Oda* (*Ojas*, Floridity), *Danakal* (*Kānti*, Grace), *Samādi* (*Samādhi*, Transference) were the tenfold *Guṇa* doctrines of Sinhala poem. There

47 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.125,126

48 Punchibanda Ekanayaka, *Cirantana Sinhala Sāhitya Vicāra Cintanaye Vikāsanaya* (Colombo: Samayawardena, 1999), P.35

49 *Siyabasalakara*, 1.31

are no notable differences in naming the *Guṇas* of *Siyabaslakara* other than using *Sinhala Thadbhava*, the derivative words. In the following poem, he presented his observations and objectives related to the *Guṇa* concept.

“Dasa pamaṇi kivikama – Paṇa Lakara ve panthis  
Meyin Ruvan divhi – dananata yuth kiyath path<sup>50</sup>”

He has said there were thirty-five rhetoric kinds and about ten *Guṇas* in the Sinhala poetry. He says that the relevant theories of those to the people of the Gem-Island, Sri Lanka, would be discussed.

The first two words of this stanza, "**Dasa pamaṇi**", have different meanings. One meaning is "only ten," and the other is "about ten." The second meaning is believable in this context. Before discussing the ten *Guṇa*, *Danḍin* said those were the *Guṇas* of the *Vaidarbhīya* style<sup>51</sup>. However, the author of the *Siyabaslakara* has not discussed anything about the two Indian poetic styles, *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya*, and he also had an idea about other different views of Sanskrit commentators regarding the concept of *Guṇa*. "About ten *Guṇa*" is evidence of that because *Danḍin* explains the ten *Guṇas*. However, the *Siyabaslakara* author did not agree to accept all the Sanskrit *Guṇas*, and he wanted to reveal the identities related to the *Guṇa* concept of the Sinhala poetic language.

Although the *Siyabaslakara* author named the ten *Guṇas* following *Danḍin*, he has not discussed the first one, the **Śleṣa Guṇa**, and he starts his explanation with the second one, the **Prasāda Guṇa**.

The definition and examples of the **Prasāda Guṇa** in *Siyabaslakara* are the same as those in *Kāvyaḍarśa*. However, it was relative to the two writing styles, *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya*, and *Siyabaslakara* did not consider those writing styles. According to *Siyabaslakara*, *Prasāda* is the precise meaning of the poem, "*Pahan nam palavat -Sudeniya bas yæ.*"<sup>52</sup> The first example of the *Prasāda Guṇa* of the *Siyabaslakara* is "*Sisihu sasale pul nil – mahanel kelum lagane.*"<sup>53</sup> It means that the rabbit spot on the moon was shining like a blue lotus, increasing its allure. This example is the same meaning as the *Vaidarbhian* example "*Indor*

50 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.32

51 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.42

52 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.33

53 Ibid

*indīvara-dyuti lakṣma lakṣmim tanoti*”<sup>54</sup> of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*. After that, the *Siyabasalakara* author says that that meaning was clear, but some people who did not accept that style liked that; “*Nu sudu pulupula surak – pala ak se res dise*”<sup>55</sup>. It means that the white-rayed moon’s rabbit spot resembled a bloomed lotus, which was not white. It is the similar meaning of the Gaudian example “*Anatyarjunābjanmasadrīkṣaṅko valakṣaguh*”<sup>56</sup> of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*.

Although the *Siyabasalakara* author accepted the differences in the writing styles, he did not accept the *Vaidharbhiya* and *Gaudīya* writing styles of *Kāvyaḍarśa*. Because of that, he discusses those styles as two unnamed styles. His first explanation is similar to that of the *Vaidarbhan* poets, which is his accepted style. His second example is presented for the extra style, which was partially accepted and reflects the *Gaudian* style. He used this method many times in his *Guṇa* dissection, but sometimes, he accepted the extra style, and *Ojas Guṇa*’s explanation is an example of that<sup>57</sup>. However, he never uses the words *Vaidarbhiya* and *Gaudīya* in his book *Siyabasalakara*, and he used the words like “*Noisno*”<sup>58</sup> (disliked people), “*Kenek*”<sup>59</sup> (Someone) instead of *Gaudians*.

*The Samatā Guṇa* (*Sama bæv*) is also excluded from his *Guṇa* discussion by the *Siyabasalakara* author, and the *Miyuru* (*Mādhurya*) is the second *Guṇa* he introduced to Sinhala poetry. It is the same as the definition of *Kāvyaḍarśa*<sup>60</sup>, but he did not use *Vaidarbha* and *Gaudian* ideologies about that, and common examples have explained those concepts. Although *Kāvyaḍarśa* has used 18 stanzas to explain *Mādhurya Guṇa*, *Siyabasalakara* explains it in a nutshell, using only nine poems. The ideas of the stanzas 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66, and 67 of *Kāvyaḍarśa* have not been presented to Sinhala by the *Siyabasalakara*. The importance of the usage of *Anuprāsa* (Alliteration), the repetition of one or more of the same sounds, and the freeness of the blemish of the rustic has been explained in the explanation of *Mādhurya Guṇa* by *Siyabasalakara* author. However, he has not explained all the types of *Anuprāsa* and *Grāmyatā Dosa* in the original text (the blemish of the rustic). He has not paid attention to

54 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.45

55 *Siyabasalakara*, 1.34

56 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.46

57 *Siyabasalakara*, 1.51, 52

58 *Siyabasalakara*, 1.34

59 *Siyabasalakara*, 1.56

60 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.51 and *Siyabasalakara*, 1.35

the differences between the two styles, *Vidarbha* and *Gaudian*, in this discussion, and he has not explained *Yamaka* (Chime).

The repetition of similar words with different meanings was mentioned in the discussion of the *Mādhurya Guṇa* of *Kāvyaḍarśa*<sup>61</sup>. The usage of *Yamaka* is higher in the Sanskrit poetic tradition than the poetic tradition of Sinhala, and *Kāvyaḍarśa* has used 76 stanzas in the third chapter to explain the *Yamakas*<sup>62</sup>. However, in the third chapter, *Siyabaslakara* uses only 28 stanzas for that<sup>63</sup>. The presentation of the unimportance of the *Yamaka* for the *Mādhurya Guṇa* by the *Kāvyaḍarśa* author may be the reason for not mentioning it in this discussion by the *Siyabaslakara* author. *Kāvyaḍarśa* has explained *Ṣṛutyānuprāsa* the repletion of similar sounds and *Varṇavṛutti* or *Chekānuprāsa* is the repletion of two or more similar sounds. *Siyabaslakara*'s author presents *Anuprāsa* in a nutshell, but he has not used a technical term (a name) for it. He only explains its behavior. He says that repeating one or two similar letters, not too much removed from each other, helps to spill interest in the poems<sup>64</sup>. According to Sanskrit critics of *Alaṅkāra Vāda*, the repletion of one similar sound is the *Vṛutyānuprāsa*, and the repletion of two similar sounds is the *Chekānuprāsa* (*Varṇavṛutti Anuprāsa*). The *Siyabaslakara* author has not explained *Ṣṛutyānuprāsa*, the repletion of similar sounds, because of the simplicity. "*Me rada deraṇisuru lada da yam kal vip kal – e kal himin levhi pævæth dahamisuru mahath*" is the *Siyabaslakara* example for the *Madhuraya Guṇa*, which related with the *Anuprāsa* and it is a similar meaning of the stanza 53 of the chapter one of *Kāvyaḍarśa*. After the introduction of the *Grāmyatā Dosa* (the blemish of the rustic), *Kāvyaḍarśa*'s author has explained the two types of it, *Śabdagata Grāmyatā* and *Arthagata Grāmyatā* (the rustic of the sounds and the rustic meaning). He explained that compositions like that were not commended in both styles. The example of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*, "No doubt this low-born Cupid, O fair-eyed one, is ruthless unto me; but, happily, he is free from malice for you!" has been used to explain the freeness of the rustic (*Agrāmyatva*) and the example "O girl, how is it that while I long for thee thou dost not long for me?" for the rustic also by the *Siyabaslakara* author. Some examples of the rustic *Kāvyaḍarśa*<sup>65</sup>

61 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.61

62 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 3.2-77

63 *Siyabaslakara*, 3.339-367

64 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.36

65 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.65, 67



have not been translated to Sinhala by the *Siyabaslakara* author, and he says that it is unnecessary to present those types of examples<sup>66</sup>. In poem 43, in addition to the original text, he said that the usages of previous poets considered vulgar words in the present, were not good to use in the poems.

*Sukumāratā* (*Sukumara*), the soft and delicate of the poem and the freeness of harsh letters, has also not been introduced by the *Siyabaslakara* author, and the *Arutpala* (*Arthavyakti*) is the third *Guṇa* which he explains. The explanation and the example of the *Arutpala Guṇa* of *Siyabaslakara* are the same as the *Kāvyādarśa*. Because of the commonness of the *Arthavyakthi Guṇa* in both styles, the *Siyabaslakara* author has been able to translate it to Sinhala without any changes.

*Udāra* (*Udāratva*), the exaltation of the poem's praise, is the fourth *Guṇa* of *Siyabaslakara*. It is also similar to the original text and familiar in both styles. The fifth *Guṇa* of the present text is the *Oda* (*Ojas*), which is the vigor or brilliance of long compounds. According to both texts, *Siyabaslakara* and *Kāvyādarśa*, *Ojas* is a quality of prose. *Kāvyādarśa* author says that the *Ojas* was the soul of the prose. However, it was only a quality of it, as told by *Siyabaslakara*<sup>67</sup>.

*Kavyadarsya* says that, according to the Gauda style, *Ojas* was a *Guṇa*, which is also relevant to the poetry<sup>68</sup>. However, *Siyabaslakara* says only that the *Ojas Guṇa* had been accepted by some critics (*Kenek*) for the Verse<sup>69</sup>. He did not define the word 'some critics.' Both *Kāvyādarśa* and *Siyabaslakara* have commonly accepted the *Vaidarbhīya* style in many situations. However, in *Ojas Guṇa*'s discussion, their following of the Gaudian theory is a specialty. In Sinhala poetry, long compounds are not used. Although *Siyabaslakara*'s author has accepted the *Ojas Guṇa*, he has not discussed all the types of it and the examples of *Kāvyādarśa*. In discussing this *Guṇa*, the author presented a new example outside of the original text, which was explanative about the identity of Sinhala poetry.

“Supun Sarā sisi – Ras kalambev semera raja  
Dahasēndili mudune vāenjēmbi – Palambathehi tā bajath Kaga<sup>70</sup>”

66 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.42

67 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.51

68 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.80

69 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.51

70 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.52

This poem means that when the sword was shining on that king's beating hand, thousands of kings who had flywhisks like the bundle of rays of the full moon in the autumn worshiped him. Because "*Supunsarāsisiraskalambev*" (like the bundle of rays of the full moon), "*Semeraraja*" (kings who had flywhisks), "*Dahasændili*" (Thousands of worshiping hands), and "*Palambata*" (beating hand) of this poem are compounds, *Siyabasalakara* author means it as a usage of *Ojas Guṇa*. However, compounds are optional in the Sinhala language tradition, and the writers can use those words as single words or divided words. Therefore, the reason for considering the *Ojas* as a *Guṇa* by the *Siyabasalakara* author is unclear.

**Kānti**, the gracefulness of the poem, is the sixth *Guṇa* of *Siyabasalakara*, and it is the poet's agreement with the ordinary nature of the world, according to the author. His definition is the same as the *Kāvyādarśaya*, and the two types of it, *Kānti Guṇa* in reports and *Kānti Guṇa* in descriptions have also been accepted by him. His two examples for both types are the same as the *Kāvyādarśa*, but he has not considered the differences between the two styles. He discusses *Gaudian* explanation as 'some people's ideas. Finally, in conclusion, he has also presented *Daṇḍin's* idea, which is related to the *Gaudian* example based on the big-breasted lady whose breasts are growing up more than the sky<sup>71</sup>. *Daṇḍin's* idea is;

“*Idamatyuktirityuktametadgaudopalālitaṃ*  
*Prasthānaṃ prākpraṇītaṃ tu sāramanyasya vartmanah*”<sup>72</sup>

*Daṇḍin* says that the exaggerated statement of the previous poem was the way of *Gaudas*, and the mode earlier illustrated was the spirit of the *Vaidarbhīya* style. This is the adaptation of *Siyabasalakara* for that poem;

“*Nove paṇa danakal – nam athisaya lakara vī*  
*Kiyath yuth salelu kal – meyaṭa pera kī maṅga sara*”<sup>73</sup>

*Dana* (*Jana*) means people, and *Kal* (*Kalya/Kantha*) means pleasantness. **Danakal** (*Jana Kantha*) is the Sinhala technical term for the *Kanthe Guṇa*. *Siyabasalakara* says in the first two rows of this poem that the previous example (the *Gaudian* one) was not the *Kanthe Guṇa* but the *Athīṣayokti Alankāra*, the hyperbole. In the second two rows of this

71 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.91

72 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.92

73 *Siyabasalakara*, 1.59

poem, he said that those types of poems might be attractive to lust people, but the previous example, about the lady who could not have enough chest to grow her breasts<sup>74</sup>, was more significant than this one. In this poem, the *Siyabasalakara* author has used the two words 'Salelu' (lustful or the joyful people) and 'Pera kī maṅga' (*Pūrva kathita Mārga*, *Previous style*) instead of the 'Gauda' (*Gaudian style*) and 'Anyasya' (the style of the others/*Vīdarbhiyan's style*) of the original stanza.

**Samādhi**, the transference of symbolic meanings, is the seventh and the last *Guṇa* of the *Guṇa* discussion of the *Siyabasalakara*. Because of the commonness of the *Samādhi Guṇa* for the two styles, both *Kāvyaḍarśa* and *Siyabasalakara* have explained it as a common attribute. *Danḍin* has used eight stanzas to explain *Samādhi Guṇa*, but the *Siyabasalakara* author translates only the first two<sup>75</sup> of those to Sinhala. Therefore, *Siyabasalakara* has presented the explanation and the example of the *Samādhi Guṇa* of *Kāvyaḍarśa*. The author is not presentative about the further discussion of the original text.

Having introduced those seven *Guṇas* to the Sinhala poetry, the *Siyabasalakara* author has presented a particular idea about the other three *Guṇas*, which is a different explanation from the original text.

“sama bav maṭa siluṭu - sukumara metun viyatun  
diva vadanin mæ yedē - pavasat hot paḷaṭa koṭa<sup>76</sup>”

The idea of this stanza is that the Sanskrit language was better for explaining the three *Guṇas* **Samabav** (*Samatā*), **Matasilutu** (*Śleṣa*), and **Sukumara** (*Saukumārya*) than Sinhala. Because of the controversiality of this idea, some critics have said that the ten *Guṇas* of *Kāvyaḍarśa* have been delimited to seven *Guṇas* by the *Siyabasalakara* author.

“*Kāvyaḍarśa* explains the ten *Guṇas*, but *Śleṣa*, *Samatā*, and *Saukumārātā* are relevant only to Sanskrit, not Sinhala. Therefore, the number of *Guṇas* in the Sinhala poem is seven, and those are *Pahan*(*Prasāda*), *Miyuru*(*Mādhurya*), *Arutpala*(*Arthavyakti*), *Ulara*(*Udara*), *Oda*(*Ojas*), *Danakal*(*Kānti*), and *Samādi* (*Samādhi*).<sup>77</sup>”

74 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.87

75 *Siyabasalakara*, 1.93, 94

76 *Siyabasalakara*, 1.62

77 Hemapala Wijayawardena, *Sinhala Gī Kāvyaaya Kerehi Sanskruta Alankāra Śāstraye Balapema*, (Trans.) Rohini Paranavitana (Colombo: Visidunu Publishers, 2009), P.29

“For the edited points by *Siyabaslakara* author, *Guṇas* are an example. '*Sama bav mata silu...*' According to *Siyabaslakara*, the three *Guṇas Śleṣa, Samatā, and Sukumāratā* are relevant to Sanskrit but not to Sinhala.<sup>78</sup>”

“The three *Guṇas Samatā, Śliṣṭa, and Sukumāra* are to be explained in Sanskrit, but they cannot be explained in Sinhala because of the absence of it.<sup>79</sup>”

Those commentaries are incorrect, and the *Siyabaslakara* author only mentioned the importance of explaining those *Guṇas* in the Sanskrit language. It is not evidence for the absence of those *Guṇas* in Sinhala.

Although the two styles, *Vaidharbhīya* and *Gaudīya* of *Kāvyādarśa*, have been neglected by the *Siyabaslakara* author, he has accepted *Daṇḍin*'s comparison of *Guṇas*.

“*Sakuru kiri mī ugu - ven ven rasa veses vē  
kiyatē asakiya gin - dukiya pīli kiviya manga*<sup>80</sup>”

This is a similar idea to stanza 102 of chapter one of *Kāvyādarśa*, and *Daṇḍin* has said in it that the difference in the sweetness of sugar cane, milk, and molasses was not possible to have described even by *Sarasvati*, the Goddess of Learning. In the present text, *Siyabaslakara*'s author did not use the word *Sarasvati*, and '*kiyatē asakiya gin - dukiya kiviya manga*' is a common idea he presented. It means that describing the styles of the poets was very difficult.

In chapter three of *Siyabaslakara*, after discussing the sound devices, the author presented *Kavya Dosa* and introduced only nine *Dosas* to the Sinhala language<sup>81</sup>. He is not explanative about the *Visandhika*, the tenth *Dosa* of *Kāvyādarśa*, which was the non-observance of the rules of conjunctions (*Sandhi*) in compound words<sup>82</sup>. Although *Visandhika*, the disjunction is an error in Sanskrit, it is not an error according to the Sinhala language. In Sinhala, conjugation of the near words is not a mandatory rule but an optional thing.

78 Punchibanda Ekanayaka, *Cirantana Sinhala Sāhitya Vicāra Cintanaye Vikāsanaya* (Colombo: Samayawardena, 1999), P.39

79 Henpitagedara Gnanasiha Thero, *Siyabaslakara Vistara Varṇanāva*, (Colombo: H.K.D. Chandrasena & Sons, 1964), P.41 (The commentary for the 1.62 stanzas of *Siyabaslakara*)

80 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.63

81 *Siyabaslakara*, 3.377

82 *Kāvyādarśa*, 3.159

## Conclusion

Although *Siyabasalakara*, the oldest Sinhala critic book written by King *Sena I* of the Anuradhapura era, is a translation of *Kāvyaḍarśa* written by *Daṇḍin*, the famous Sanskrit critic, sometimes, as a result of the consideration of the identities of the Sinhala, *Siyabasalakara* author has not translated the original text into word by word, and he has adapted some theories. Many times, including the discussion of *Guṇa-Rīti*, the *Siyabasalakara* author has translated the original text in a nutshell, but sometimes, he has added some new ideas.

*Siyabasalakara* was written after *Vāmana's Kāvyaḍaṅkārāsūtra* the main text for the *Guṇa-Rit Vāda*, so the author must have had an idea about that. It is also clear from the ideas of *Vāmana* that it is not appropriate to introduce *Rītis* according to regions. "The names are due to the particular 'qualities of style' being met within specific countries. The *Vaidarbhi* diction is so called, not because the country of *Vidarbha* has any effect upon poetry, but simply because of use among that country's poets.<sup>83</sup>" The author must have thought deeply about it. It may be one of the reasons for not naming the *Rīti* the styles according to the regions, and the fact that the introduction of the *Rīti* according to the regions of India is not important to the Sinhala poets may have caused them to abandon the analysis of the two styles *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya*.

According to some critics, *Kāvyaḍarśa's* author also had an independent idea about *Guṇa-Rīti*, and that short discussion is more independent than the descriptive discussion about the rhetoric<sup>84</sup>. *Siyabasalakara's* author is concerned about the identity of *Daṇḍin* based on the concepts of *Guṇa* and *Rīti*, as well as the peculiarities of Sinhala poetry, which is different from Sanskrit poetry. *Siyabasalakara's* author has been concerned about *Daṇḍin's* identity in the concepts of *Guṇa* and *Rīti* and the peculiarities of Sinhala poetry, which differs from *Sanskrit* poetry. He used similar derivative Sinhala words to name *Guṇa* and *Rīti*. '*Prāṇa*' and '*Mārga*' are the words used by *Daṇḍin* instead of *Guṇa* and *Rīti*, and the *Siyabasalakara* writer has used '*Pana*' and '*Maga*' for those. '*Prāṇa*' or '*Pana*' means the soul, and that usage reflects the importance of the

83 *Kāvyaḍaṅkāra Sūtra*, 1.1.10 (English translation) Ganganath Jha (Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1928).

84 Hemapala Wijayawardena, *Sanskuta Kāvya Vicāraye Mūladharma* (Colombo: M.D. Guṇasena, 1967), P.45

*Guṇa* in the poems. According to both critics, *Daṇḍin* and *Siyabaslakara* writer, *Guṇa* is the poem's soul, and it is the most essential part. *Alaṅkāra* is vital for the poem's beauty, but the poem's life is *Guṇa*. Although *Guṇa*, *Rīti*, and *Dosa* concepts have been discussed separately, neither author has explained the combination of those concepts discussed by the post critics.

In the *Guṇa* discussion of *Siyabaslakara*, the author does not consider the style to be the basis of the *Guṇas*, and there is no comparative discussion about *Guṇa* of two different styles named *Gaudīya* and *Vaidarbhīya*. However, the author has accepted the *Mārga* (*Rīti*/ Style) concept of *Kāvyādarśa*. Poems 10 and 63 of chapter one of *Siyabaslakara* are examples. The 10th poem of chapter one of the *Siyabaslakara* is a translation of the ninth poem of chapter one of *Kāvyādarśa*, and it says that the sages, to secure people's proficiency in letters, have laid down, in the case of compositions of divers' styles, the methods. The 63rd poem of chapter one of the *Siyabaslakara* is a translation of the 102nd stanza of chapter one of the *Kāvyādarśa*. This means that the sweetness of the difference between sugar cane, milk, and molasses was impossible for anyone to describe, and in the same way, the greatness of the writing styles of the poems is not comparable. After discussing two main styles and ten *Guṇas* related to those styles, *Kāvyādarśa* presented that idea as a conclusion to his *Rīti* explanation. However, *Siyabaslakara* presented that idea without discussing *Rīti*, the styles. Therefore, the *Siyabaslakara* author's idea, which is not limited to any style or language, is universal and can be easily adapted to the poetic features of the Sinhala language.

On the other hand, geographical writing styles like *Vaidharbhiya* and *Gaudīya* of Indian critics are not relevant to Sri Lankan poets, and those are the same as *Anurādhapura*, *Kandy*, and *Colombo*, which are the city names of Sri Lanka. Although the *Siyabaslakara* author disagrees with the naming of writing styles by *Daṇḍin*, sometimes the author has accepted his explanation on the resistance of the *Guṇa* and *Dosa*, which is discussed in chapter one of *Kāvyādarśa*. According to *Daṇḍin*, *Shaithilya* (The looseness of the poem), *Anathirūḍhatā* (the confusion of the meaning), *Grāmyatā* (The blemish of the rustic), *Niṣṭuratā* or *Dīpta* (Usage of the harsh letters), *Neyārthatā* (Incompleteness of the meaning), *Atyukti* (Over statements) are the opposite phenomena of *Śleṣa*, *Prasāda*, *Mādhurya*, *Sukumārātā*, *Artavyakti* and *Kānti* *Guṇas* in order. *Grāmyatā*

and *Neyārthatā* are common *Dosas* to all the writing styles, but the other four *Dosas* are influenced only in the *Vaidharbha* style. Those are not errors in *Gaudīya* style; sometimes, they may be *Guṇas* in it<sup>85</sup>. The *Siyabaslakara* author also accepted *Grāmya Dosa* (*Gam vesi Vādan*), The blemish of the rustic and *Neyārtha Dosa* (*Ne bav*), the incompleteness of the meaning as the opposites of *Mādhurya Guṇa* (*Miyuru*) and *Arthavyakti Guṇa* (*Arutpala*). However, he has not explained *Banda Śaithlya Dosa* (The usage of all the soft letters) and *Niṣṭuratā* (Usage of the harsh letters) as the opposite of *Saukumārya Guṇa* because he did not discuss that *Guṇa* in *Siyabaslakara*. According to *Daṇḍin*, *Atyukti* (the presentation of overstatements) is the opposite of *Kanṭhi Guṇa*. However, the example presented by the *Siyabaslakara* author for the opposite of *Kanṭhi Guṇa* is a decoration by *Athishayokṭhi* (*Atisayalakara*), the hyperbole according to him. *Atisayokṭi* is presented as a rhetoric kind (type of poetic embellishments, the *Alaṅkāra*) and *Atyukti* as a *Dosa* (blemish) by *Daṇḍin*; therefore, this explanation of *Siyabaslakara* differs from *Daṇḍin*. *Atiśayokṭi* is the hyperbole, and *Atyukti* is the overstatement. Because of that, the *Siyabaslakara* author's idea about the sameness of *Atishayokṭi* and *Atyukti* is unacceptable.

Although *Siyabaslakara's* author has named the ten *Guṇas* of *Kāvyaḍarśa*, he has described only seven *Guṇas*. Some *Guṇas* he described are the same as the original text, but other *Guṇas* partly differ from the original text. The *Udāratva Prāṇa* and the *Samādhi Prāṇa* of *Kāvyaḍarśa* are the common *Guṇas* of both styles; therefore, *Siyabaslakara's* explanation is similar to the original text. After discussing the *Samādhi Prāṇa*, *Daṇḍin* has explained its importance as "this quality that is called Transference is indeed the all-in-all of poetry; all poets whatsoever, without exception, follow its guidance<sup>86</sup>", but the *Siyabaslakara* author has not considered the *Samādhi Paṇa* as 'the all-in-all of poetry' and it is only one of a *Guṇas* according to him. This is evidence of the high importance of the *Samādhi Guṇa*, the transferred epithet in Sanskrit poetry, than Sinhala poems. The five *Guṇas* named *Prasāda*, *Mādhurya*, *Arthavyakti*, *Ojas*, and *Kanṭhi* have been discussed by both authors, but *Daṇḍin's* discussion is related to two styles, and *Siyabaslakara's* discussion is independent. The differences between the *Guṇas* in those styles have been explained as 'someone's idea' by

85 Ibid, P.53

86 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1.100 (English translation) S.K. Belvalkar



the *Siyabaslakara* author, who did not use the words *Vaidarbhīya* and *Gaudīya*. Both authors have prioritized the *Vaidarbhīya* style in their *Guṇa* discussions, but in *Ojas Prāṇa*, the vigor or brilliance of long compounds *Gaudīya* idea is considered. Although the long compounds are not used in the poetic language of Sinhala, The *Siyabaslakara* author may have included this *Guṇa* in his *Guṇa* discussion because of the usage of compoundable separate words in the Sinhala poetic language. The example presented for the *Ojas Guṇa* in the *Siyabaslakara*<sup>87</sup> is not a translation of a stanza of the original text *Kāvyādarśa*, and it is an independent composition by the writer.

The three *Guṇas* **Ślesha**(Cohesion), **Samatā**(Evenness), and **Saukumārya**(Tenderness) of *Kāvyādarśa* are not discussed in *Siyabaslakara*. *Ślesha Guṇa* is a well-known composition that skillfully employs many shades of meaning. It is a natural quality of the old poetic language of Sinhala because of the abandonment of rough letters, aspirated consonants, and vowel combinations. *Samatā Guṇa* is the evenness of sound within a line, and *Mrudu* (soft), *Sphuṭa* (harsh), and *Madyama* (a mixture of smooth and rough) are the three types of it<sup>88</sup>. Sinhala poetic language in the period of the *Siyabaslakara* author is naturally soft; therefore, the evenness of the gentle sounds within a line is also a natural quality of Sinhala. *Sukumāratā*, the poem's softness and delicacy, and the harsh letters' abandonment is another natural quality of Sinhala.

The *Siyabaslakara* writer is not expressive about the irrelevance of those three *Guṇas* to the Sinhala language. However, he has guided the identification of those *Guṇas* in the Sanskrit language.

The reason for that is the naturalness of those three *Guṇas* in Sinhala. All the Sinhala poems of his period were naturally explanative those *Guṇas*. Those were not natural qualities in the Sanskrit language, and those were used in particular by the poet. This difference in translation illustrates the independence of the *Siyabaslakara* writer and his consideration of the identities of Sinhala poetry.

The collection (*Sandhi*) of collectible near words is not compulsory in the Sinhala language but is mandatory in Sanskrit. Therefore, *Visandhika*, the non-observance of the rules of conjunctions (Defective-hiatus) is not an error in Sinhala language. This freedom is another identity

87 *Siyabaslakara*, 1.52

88 *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.47

of the Sinhala language, and the *Siyabaslakara* author has paid attention to it in his *Dosa* discussion.

Siyabaslakara is not a summarized translation of *Kavyadarsa*, and he has adopted the theories of the original book to Sinhala poetry as a result of the deep consideration and correct application by the author. The discussion on the *Guṇa-Rīti* of *Siyabaslakara* is an excellent example of that.

## References

- Ballantyne, James R., (ed.) *The Sāhitya Darpaṇa or Mirror of Composition*, Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1851.
- Belvalkar, S.K., (ed.) *Kāvyaḍarśa*, Poona: The Oriental Book-Supplying Agency, 1924.
- Dharmakeerti, Thalakiriyaagama, (ed.), *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra (Bharatiya Kavya Vicharaya-1)*, Colombo: Deepa Printers, 1969
- Ekanayaka, Punchibanda, *Cirantana Sinhala Sāhitya Vicāra Cintanaye Vikāsanaya*, Colombo: Samayawardena, 1999
- Gnanasiha himi, Henpitagedara, *Sāhityaya*, Colombo: M.D. Guṇasena & Cooperation, 1964
- Gnanasiha himi, Henpitagedara, (ed.) *Siyabaslakara Vistara Varṇanāva*, Colombo: H.K.D. Chandrasena & Sons, 1964.
- Jha, Ganganath, (ed.) *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra Sūtra Vṛitti*, Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1928.
- Krishnamoorthy, K., (ed.) *Dvanyāloka or Theory of Suggestion in poetry*, Poona-2: Oriental Book Agency, 1955.
- Kulasuriya, Ananda, (ed.) *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra Sūtra Vṛuttiya (1,2,3 Adhikarana)*, Colombo: **M.D. Guṇasena & Cooperation, 1966.**
- Marasinghe, Walter, (ed.) *Nāṭyaśāstra II (Ādyaya 8-27)*, Colombo: S. Godage & Brothers, 2004
- Pemaratana Thero, Velivitiye and Halgastota Dewananda Thero, (ed.), *Subodhinī Vyākhyā Sahita Kāvyaḍarśaya*, Colombo: Samayawardena Bookshop, 2001.
- Senanayaka, G.S.B., (ed.) *Dvanyāloka Vivaraṇaya*, Colombo: M.D. Guṇasena & Cooperation, 1969.
- Wijayawardena, Hemapala, *Kāvya Vicāra Gaveṣaṇa*, Colombo: Nikan Limited, 1968
- Wijayawardena, Hemapala, *Sanskuta Kāvya Vicāraye Mūladharma*, Colombo: M.D. Guṇasena & Cooperation, 1967
- Wijayawardena, Hemapala, *Sinhala Gī Kāvya Kerehi Sanskruta Alaṅkāra Śāstraye Balapema*, (Trans.) Rohini Paronavitana, Colombo: Visidunu Publishers, 2009.