

Classification of Literary Composition in Sanskrit Poetics

*¹ Dr. Hiteshkumar K Kubavat

*¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Sanskrit, Smt CR Gardi Arts College, Munpur, Affiliated with Shree Govind Guru University, Vinzol, Godhara, Gujarat, India.

Article Info.

E-ISSN: 2583-6528

Impact Factor (SJIF): 5.231

Available online:

www.alladvancejournal.com

Received: 05/Aug/2023

Accepted: 03/Sep/2023

Abstract

Various writers have described their contribution in Sanskrit literature very beautifully and especially the Sanskrit paintings known as Padya Sahitya have naturally struck a chord. Therefore, we can call these Sanskrit poets as poets of a status that at the time when there was no facility, all these poets made their contribution within their works to the students and the society with art, Sanskrit literature, Puranas, historical etc. A description of the single link narrative that today's paper is about is what diversity is within Sanskrit literature. Sanskrit literature contains a lot of things, especially verse literature and prose literature. Within this literature, there are various types of poems that calm the mind, critical poetry, heroic poems, poignant poems, and beautiful poems. etc. Within this poetic criticism is an evaluation of literature ranging from Vedic literature to the present day. As the Rigveda is your ancient Veda but also a poem full of beautiful praises of the Gods. The action of Yajna in Yajurveda also comes under Stuti Sahitya. A treatise analysing poetic beauty in Sanskrit literature. The use of the term 'Alankarashastra' in the criticism of 'Prataparudriya' is supporting evidence for this. Apart from the ornamentation, it is justified to name this Shastra as 'Alankara Shastra' as it describes the inherent interest or sound of the poem, the uplifting religions of the poem such as quality, style, propriety etc. There have also been attempts to give the name 'Saundaryasastra' to the Shastra which examines the overall beauty of poetry, based on the formula 'Soundarya Alankar' meaning 'Beauty is an ornament'-used in Vamana's 'Kavyalankarasutrvrtti'.

*Corresponding Author

Dr. Hiteshkumar K Kubavat

Assistant Professor, Department of Sanskrit, Smt CR Gardi Arts College, Munpur, Affiliated with Shree Govind Guru University, Vinzol, Godhara, Gujarat, India.

Keywords: Vangnaya, criticism of literary, bhamaha, poetry, prabandha kavya, vak, dandin, nataka.

Introduction

The present paper lays no claim to originality in its consideration of types or genres of literary compositions. It is an endeavour to understand genealogy of literary discourse with the help of great Indian teachers and thinkers or poorva acharyas (the earlier scholars) like Bhamaha, Dandin, Vaman, Rudratta, Rajashekhar, Acharya Vishwanath and Pandit Jagannatha among others.

The term vangnaya (Vak + maya i.e., speech + permeated by) stands for verbal discourse and refers to all forms of literature. Later on, the term came to be used for the written form of Vani (speech) or bhasha (speech, language) or vak (speech or utterance). Consequently, the term became so comprehensive that it came to be used as a synonym for modern Hindi term 'sahitya.'

In its traditional sense vanpnaya can be divided as the literature of knowledge and literature of power 2 The former included in it such systems of knowledge as physics, chemistry, medicine, economics and sciolous. As opposed to these purely intellectual domains of knowledge was the discourse that aimed at creating feelings and emotions in the heart of human beings. Not that this discourse was unconcerned with knowledge but its immediate object was to elicit certain emotive state of mind and knowledge later. The later form of literature was further divided into creative literature and critical literature. Creative literature includes in its poetry, epic, drama, story; and critical literature consists of treatises dealing with the criticism of works of creative literature. In other words, it deals with works of literary criticism whose criticism falls under the category of mimansa i.e., criticism of literary criticism or meta criticism.

Indian critical tradition divides literary discourse into shravya (aural) that can be read and drashya (visible or of visual interest) that is enacted. They are further divided into gadya (prose compositions) padya (poetic compositions) and champu (mixed i.e., prose and poetic compositions).

Let me examine the classification of literary genres in its long tradition in Indian poetics. Bhamaha is the first among these who pondered over the issue on the basis of medium, language, subject matter and form. According to Bhamaha, kavya is constituted by word and meaning taken together and it includes all forms-Natyam (drama), Katha and Akhyayika (narratives) and Mahakavya (epic). He states in Kavyalankara (1.16) "Words and meaning taken together constitute kavya. It is of two kinds, prose and verse. It is further distinguishable into Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhramsa".

"Kavya is divided, by the wise, fourfold thus-real narratives of gods, etc., stories put together (fiction), discourse relating to art (kala) and that relating to shastras (treatises of sciences). Dandin proposed only two grounds for classifying kavya i.e., Swaroop (form) and bhasha (language). From the view point of form, Dandin considered three categories as padya (poetic compositions), gadya (prose) and champu (mixed). According to him, prose and poetic compositions exist separately as forms of discourse, and they can be named differently. From this perspective of form, the poetic compositions are sargabandha (built of divisions called sarga e.g., mahakavya (epic). Similarly prose compositions are of the same sort through called differently as Katha or nibandha. Natak (drama) falls in the category of shampoo (mixed), as Dandin might have in his age seen or read the plays made of a combination of prose and poetry. From the view point of language, he wrote of four poetic forms i.e. Sanskrit, Prakrit, Aphramsha and mishra or mixed.

After Dandin, Vamana proposed medium as the basis of classification and proposed prose and poetry as the two forms. According to Vaman, prose compositions are more difficult than their poetic counter parts. An integral aspect of a poetic composition is its musicality. In other words, a writer attains success sooner and more easily in poetic composition than in prose composition, for the latter needs greater diligence.

Vamana further subdivided prose compositions into vrattgandhi, choora and utkalika. From the new point of subject matter, he sub-divided prose and poetic discourse as Anibaddha and nibaddha.

Rudrata described divisions of prabandha kavya (literary compositions) under the category of general verbal discourse (kavya). According to him, prabandha kavya on the grounds of kavyakatha (the narrative) is of two kinds-utpadya (called so because the protagonist and the subject matter of this discourse are product of the writer's imagination) and anutpadya (its subject matter, hero, and events are based on history and so leave little space for the flights of author's imagination). From the point of the size too, Rudrata divides kavya into laghukavya and mahakavya. Anandavardhan considered forms of verbal discourse on the basis of propriety of the subject matter.

Considering the criterion of perception by senses, Acharya Vishwanatha divided kavya into drashya (visual) and shravya (aural). He described 10 kinds of roopaka (natak, prakarana, bhana, vyayoga, samavakara, dima, ihamraga, anka, vithi, prahasana) and uproopaka (natika, trotaka, gosthi, sattaka, natya rasaka, prasthanaka, utapya, prenkhya, rasaka, shrigditita, shilpaka, vilasika, dumalika, prakarani, halisa, bhanika, samlapaka) under drashya kavya. The shravya kavya is subdivided as padya and gadya. Padya kavya is further divided as

prabandha and muktaka, of which the former is further classified as mahakavya and khand kavya. Gadya kavya is divided into muktaka, vrattgandhi utkalikapraya and choornika. The gadya kavya is divided into katha and akhyayika; and mishrit or mixed kavya into champu or viruda. The Acharya has mentioned karambhaka kavya that is composed in many languages.

The post-Jagannath critics like Vidyaram, Narsinhkavi, Shri Krishna Kavi and Chhaijooram Shastri followed, not Pandit Jagannath, but the rhetoricians, and accepted only 3 classes of kavya and ignored uttamottam. Acharya Achyut Ray followed Pandit Jagannath's categorization to good extent. He divided kavya into two-Sara kavya and chitra kavya. He compared kavya with to the body of a heroine (nayika) and stated that Rambha's body with its dependence on shrangara rasa is designated as saras. Also because of the ashraya pearl and jewel laden ornaments it is chitra also. Similarly, because of predominance of the rasas and figures of speech, the kavya is called saras and chitra. The presence of irony/suggestion (vyangya) determines sub-division of saras kavya into (1) dhwani (uttamottam (ji) gunibhoovyangya (uttam) and Chitra kavya into (i) shabdagaud and arthpradhan (madhyam) and (ii) arthgaud and shabdpradhan (adham) (Sahityakar, pp.15-20 Acharya Brahmananda Sharma considered uttam, madhyam and adham as the three categories of kavya but redefines them. Since the soul of kavya is realization of truth, he proposed classification of literature on the basis of its engagement with truth. On the basis of truth, he divides kavya into 3 categories. For him, the highest (uttam) form of literary discourse minutely describes truth of the world. Since the world is the arena of karma actions, so along with truth, karma (dutiful action is also desirable. ('Satyam karanmulkarshe, tasya cha jageti sthitih, karmakshetum jagatshetram, karmno yog uttame, Kavyasatyalok, 73) Due to their specific engagement with karma, the Ramayana and Mahabharat are the uttam kavya. The discourse dealing with non-worldly is madhyam, for its subject matter, characters and emotions are supernatural. Since the behaviour of the characters is other worldly, the sensitive readers (sahradya) find it difficult to believe in it and enjoy.

(Anyadalaukiham kshetram, madhyame tasya yojanam") The lowest (adham) discourse is dominated by intellectualization and by semblance of the parts of kavya. (Kavya tishthati yatsatyam, tasyanibhutiroopla, Ito bhinnammatam gyanam, adhame tasya prayojanam"). Acharya Madhusudan Shastri in his Sahitya shastriya Tattvon Ka Samalochanatmaka Adhyayan reads into Shabdhartho kavyam meaning artha (meaning) with shabda (words), and shabda (words) with artha (meaning). Is kavya. The literature with predominant meaning is drashya, and one with predominant words is shravya. Where both of them (word and meaning) coexist simultaneously and dominate is pathya, but if lipi dominates and words and meaning do not, then the discourse is chitra.

The classification of literary forms in Sanskrit poetics is valid because it categorizes literary (verbal) discourse ontologically on the basis of the primary categories of form, style and liveliness (ramaniyata). It subdivides these categories and hierarchizes its works in terms of their ability to suggest. Forms and style as category of classification need no explanation, liveliness (ramanivata) emanates primarily from its preoccupation with lively imitation of nature achieved through the use of fictitious elements and gives pleasure which is the immediate o-Jest of verbal discourse, and whatsoever, e.g. knowledge, next.

Conclusion

Thus, there is a lot of diversity in Sanskrit literature, which we have seen above. There is a big difference between both criticism and description. Moreover, there is a lot of difference in criticism and literature and also in the area. The name 'Kriyakalpa' is also found for this scripture. Vatsyayana points out this word as the name of one of the 64 arts mentioned in Kamasutra. In this Kriya means poetry and kalpa means statement-that way 'kriyakalpa' means 'poetic statement', but even this name could not become popular; But the name 'Alankarashastra' has become widely popular for this science which examines all the secondary elements of poetry and it is enriched by sects like rasa, alankar, style, sound, irony, justice and the analysis and development of the ancient principles of this subject etc. The term 'poetry' refers to the poet's art-the art of expressing the essence of thought in the best possible way. The speech of a poem can be verse, prose or mixed like prose. Whether the speech of a poem is eloquent or eloquent, it must inevitably be eloquent. In this way, rhymed speech has the highest prestige in poetry. In its Parvati-Parameshwara-Sash Shabd-Meaning-Samprakti is expected. Some poets, like Balvantaraya Thakor, are of the opinion that dashangul is superior to the meaning of the word; But broadly speaking, the integration of word and meaning, as suggested by Kuntak, is considered to be inherent in poetry. In poetry, as Coleridge points out, excellent words must be arranged in an excellent manner. For this, mastery of words-mastery of art is indispensable in the poet. Ishvardatta or the innate poetic power or talent, mastery, observation-knowledge of folk-sastra-poetry etc., developed creativity cultivated by education, study by a poet, etc. can sway the devotees with frutitfull poem like an archer's arrow.

References

1. Belvalkar SK. (Trans) Kavyadarsha, Poona, Oriental Book Agenc, 1924.
2. Bhamsha, Kavyalamkara (ed. & trs.) Shasrti PU. Delhi, Mubd, 1970.
3. Bhoja, Shringar Prakasha (tr.) Raghavan V. Madras: Punarvasu. 1963.
4. Dandin, Kavyadarsha (tr.) Belvalker SK. Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1924.
5. Pandit Jagannatha, Rasagangadhara (tr. in Hindi), Madanmohan Jha, Varanasi, Chowkhamba. Kapil Kapoor, "Theory of the Novel: The Indian View", Critical Practice. 1995; II (1):73-88.
6. Literary Theory: Indian Conceptual Frame-work, Delhi: Allied East West, 1998.
7. Manmata, Kavya Prakasha (tr.) Dwivedi RC. as The Poetic Light: Kavya Prakasha of Mammata, Delhi: M & B, 1970.
8. Rajshekhar, Kavyamimasa (tr. in Hindi) by Pt. Kedarnath Sharma. Patna: Bihar Rashtra Bhasha Parishad, 1954.
9. Vaman, Kavyalankarsutra (tr. Sir Ganganath Jha), Poona, Oriental Book, 1928.
10. Vishwanath, Sahityadarpana (tr. in English) Ballantyne JK, Mishra PK, Delhi: & B, 1967.
11. Walter Pater, "Style" The English Critical Tradition, ed. Ramaswami S, Seturaman VS. Madras and Delhi: Macmillan, 1978, 2.