

Chapter - III

NRTYA VINODA IN RELATION TO OTHER  
DANCE TEXTS

The Nṛtya Vinoda Portion of Mānasollāsa offers a succinct and authentic exposition of the dance technique as was contemporaneously witnessed by King Bhūlokamalla Someśvara III. It comprises of four hundred and fifty-five ślokas within which Someśvara has lucidly put forth his own observations and the views of earlier writers which continued to have a bearing on the dance scene of the 12th century A.D. Since dance is a creative form of art, it is dynamic and no finality can be ascribed to it. Therefore, the dance style of any age such as the 12th century A.D. must contain the assimilation of knowledge attributed to previous generations, which had perpetuated down to mingle with the contributions made by the creative genius of the 12th century A.D., which had also gained currency and recognition. The Nṛtya Vinoda therefore must also consist of such assimilation of the old and new. For this purpose Someśvara has incorporated those lakṣaṇas (features) of earlier centuries which were faithfully continued, but has eliminated those lakṣaṇas which were discontinued in the practise of dance in the subsequent years. In order to give the correct picture of the dance scene in Karnāṭaka during

the 12th century A.D. Someśvara has also added the new developments and creations noticed by him and for this he needs to be specially commended.

At the outset in the Nṛtya Vinoda, Someśvara discusses eight occasions during which dance is performed. They are Utsava (festival), Vijaya (Victory), Harsha (happiness), Kāma (desire), Vilāsa (merriment), Vivāda (debate), Parīkṣā (test), and Tyāga (charity). This is followed by the definitions of six kinds of Nartana which are Nāṭya, Tāṇḍava, Lāsyā, Lāghava, Viṣama and Vikāṭa. Next, the descriptions of Naṭa, Nartaki, Nartaka, Vaitālika, Cāraṇa and Kolaṭika are set forth. After dealing with these few general aspects of dance, Someśvara enters into an exposition of Āṅgika Abhinaya. Classifying the limbs of the body into Aṅga (major limbs), Upāṅga (features), and Pratyāṅga (minor limbs), Someśvara gives the details of their movements and their usages in dance. With the exception of few dissimilarities, the treatment of Āṅgika Abhinaya in the Nṛtya Vinoda is to a large extent in concordance with the Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata. The subjects covered under Aṅga, Upāṅga and Pratyāṅga are as follows :

#### I. Aṅgas (Major limbs)

(a) Thirteen head movements comprising of Ākampita (slow up and down movement), Kampita (quick up and down movement), Dhuta (slow side to side movement), Vidhuta,

(quick side to side movement), Avadhūta (bringing the head down once), Ādhūta (lifting obliquely) Añcita (bending side-wise), Nyañcita (shoulders raised to touch the head), Parivāhita (circular movement), Parāvṛtta (turned away), Utkṣipta (turned upwards), Adhogata (turned downwards), and Lolita (turned in all directions).

(b) Five shoulder movements namely Ucchrita (raised), Śrasta (relaxed), Ekānta (raising only one shoulder), Samlagna (clinging to the ears) and Lola (rotating).

(c) Five chest movements relating to Ābhugna (sunken), Nirbhugna (elevated), Vyākampita (shaking), Utprasārita, (stretched) and Sama (natural).

(d) Four belly movements namely Kṣāma (sagging), Khalla (hollow), Pūrṇarikta (bulging and then emaciated) and Pūrṇa (bulging).

(e) Five side movements comprising of Nata (bent forwards), Samunnata (bent backwards), Prasārita (stretched), Vivartita (turning aside) and Apasṛta (reverting back to the front).

(f) Five hip movements comprising of Chinna (turned obliquely), Vivṛtta (turned aside), Recita (moving round quickly), Āndolita (moving to and fro) and Udvāhita (raising).

## II Upāṅgas (features)

(a) Seven varieties of eyebrow movements - Utkṣipta (raised), Patita (lowered), Bhrūkṣti (knitted), Catura (pleasing), Kuñcita (bent), Sphurita (quivering) and Sahaja (natural).

(b) Three groups of eye movements based upon Rasa, Sthāyī Bhāva and Sañcaribhāva.

In the first group are Kāntā (erotic), Bhayānaka (fearful), Hāsyā (humorous), Karuṇa (sorrowful), Adbhuta (wonderous), Raudra (furious), Vīra (heroic), and Bībhatsa (fearful).

In the second group are Snigdha (affectionate), Hrṣṭa (rapturous), Dīna (distressed), Kruddha (cruel), Dṛpta (proud), Bhayānvita (fearful), Jugupsita (disgust), and Vismita (surprise).

In the third group are Sūnya (vacant), Malina (impure), Śrānta (drooping), Lajjānvita (bashful), Glāna (languid), Śankṣita (doubtful), Viṣaṇṇa (depressed), Mukula (bud-like), Kuñcita (curved), Abhitapta (distressed), Jimha (athwart), Lalita (graceful), Vitarkita (pondering), Ardhamukula (half-opened bud), Vibhrānta (distracted), Vipluta (Scattered), Kekara (squinting), Vikōśa (wide open), Trasta (timid), and Madira (intoxicated).

(c) Seven kinds of nose movements - Nata (closed), Manda (slightly pressed), Vikr̥ṣṭa (fully blown), Socchvāsa (breathing out), Vikūṇita (compressed) and Svabhāviki (natural).

(d) Five types of cheek movements - Kṣāma (diminished), Utphulla (blooming), Pūrna (fully blown), Kampita (tremulous) and Sama (natural).

(e) Eight varieties of lip movements - Mukula (bud-like) Kūṇita (compressed), Udvṛṭta (raised), Recita (circular), Kampita (tremulous), Āyata (stretched), Samdaṣṭa (bitten), Vikāsi (displaying), Prasārita (spread out) and Nigūhita (concealing).

(f) Eight kinds of jaw movements - Vyādhir (opened), Śithila (slackened), Vakra (crooked), Samhata (joined) Galasamhata (joined and moving), Pracala (opening and closing), Prasphura (tremulous) and Lola (to and fro).

(g) Five types of teeth movements - Mardana (grinding), Khaṇḍana (breaking), Kartana (cutting), Dhāraṇa (holding), and Niṣkarṣaṇa (drawing out).

(h) Five varieties of tongue movements - Rijvi (straight), Vakra (crooked), Nata (lowered), Lola (swinging) and Promnata (raised).

Lastly, four fascial colours are described, namely Sahaja (natural), Prasanna (clear), Rakta (red) and Śyāma (dark).

### III Pratyāṅgas (minor limbs)

(a) Eight movements of the arms - Sarala (simple), Pronnata (raised), Nyañca (lowered), Kuñcita (bent), lalita (graceful), Lolita (swinging), Calita (shaken) and Parāvṛtta (turned back).

(b) Four movements of the wrists - Ākuñcita (moving out), Nikuñcita (moving in), Bhrāmita (circular) and Sama (natural).

(c) Three groups of hand gestures - twenty seven single hand gestures, thirteen double hand gestures and twenty four Nṛttahand poses. Four Hasta karaṇas called Āveṣṭita, Udveṣṭita, Vyāvartita and Parivartita.

(d) Seven movements of the knees - Unnata (raised), Nata (lowered), Kuñcita (bent), Ardhakuñcita (half bent), Samhata (joined), Vistrṛta (spread out), and Sama (natural).

(e) Five movements of the shanks - Nihasṛta (stretched forward), Parāvṛtta (kept backwards), Tiraścina (side touching the ground), Kampita (tremulous) and Bahikrānta (moving outwards).

(f) Nine movements of the feet - Ghaṭita (striking with the hēel), Ghaṭitotsedha (striking with the toe and

heel), Mardita (sole rubbing the ground), Taḍita (striking with toes), Agraga (slipping the foot forward), Pārṣniga (moving backwards on the heels), Pārśvaga (moving with the sides of the feet), Sūci (standing on the toes) and Nija (natural). Along with the movements of the feet five movements of the toes are described namely - Avakṣipta (lowered), Utkṣipta (raised), Kuñcita (contracted), Prasārita (stretched) and Samlagna (joined).

After dealing with Āṅgika Abhinaya, Someśvara takes up the subject of the Sthānakas (postures), Cāris (feet movements) and Karaṇas (jumps) relating to Deśī tradition.

The Nṛtya Vinoda chapter can be thus conveniently divided into two sections on the basis of the subjects discussed and source material. The first section of the Nṛtya Vinoda dealing with the subject of Āṅgika Abhinaya setting forth the method of expression through Aṅga, Upāṅga and Pratyāṅgas has essentially come down from Bharata and they have been termed as Mārgī. In the post-Bharata times, many other movements were created and were codified as Deśī varieties. This Deśī material is discussed in the latter section of the Nṛtya Vinoda under three aspects namely Sthānakas, Cāris and Utpluti Karaṇas. For this Someśvara must have in all probability utilized the Brhaddeśī (Magnum opus of Deśī Art) of Maṭaṅga. This is not a mere conjecture, but

based on Someśvara's own statement in the previous chapter of Gīta Vinoda, that he subscribes to the views of Maṭaṅga.

In the Nṛṭya Vinoda, Someśvara has at several instances acknowledged the views of scholars in general, but has not specifically named any of them. The terms 'Nṛṭya Nāṭya ca Kovidaihi, Nāṭya Vedibhihi, Budaihi, Nāṭya Viśāradaihi, Nāṭya Kovidaihi, Nipunaihi, Vicakṣanaihi, Maniāibhihi, Niyoktribhihi, Viśārdaihi, Kavibhihi, Hastalakṣaṇapāragaihi, Kara Karaṇa Kovidaihi, Hastalakṣaṇavedibhihi, Hastaprayoktrubhihi, Nṛṭya Viśāradaihi, Nṛṭta vidyā Vicakṣanaihi, Nāṭyaśāstra Viśāradaihi, Hastasya kovidaihi, Nartakaihi, Nartana kovidaihi, Nṛṭtata-ttvagnaihi, occur at several places throughout the entire length of the Nṛṭya Vinoda. These, by themselves do not help in revealing the identity of the sources which Someśvara must have consulted for the compilation of the Nṛṭya Vinoda. As such there are few available works on dance, belonging to the period earlier to that of Someśvara. Apart from the Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata (dated 2nd century A.D.), The Bharatārṇava (whose date and authorship are questionable, but believed to be of an early date), and the Brhaddeśī of Maṭaṅga (9th century A.D. whose text is incomplete, without the chapter on dance), there are no other earlier extant works. Yet a large number of exponents and writers are known to have existed earlier to Someśvara. They may have influenced him and it is some of them, that are probably referred to.

In the discussion of the Gīta Vinoda, Someśvara has mentioned Bharata and Mataṅga by name. Here, he says that it would be futile to discuss the lakṣaṇas of Mārgī rāgas as explained by Bharata, since they are no longer in vogue. He has, however, subscribed to the views of Mataṅga. It can be therefore surmised that even with regard to the treatment of dance he has disregarded Bharata to a large extent and has depended more on Mataṅga. It is however noticed that Someśvara has not totally excluded Bharata's tenets. He has omitted some aspects, while for a few he shows divergences, and then there is a vast amount of material which are related in both texts. This will be treated at a subsequent stage. As far as Mataṅga's Brhaddeśi<sup>is</sup> concerned, assessing its utility to Someśvara in relation to Nṛtya, poses a problem because of the nonavailability of its dance chapter. There are stray quotations of Mataṅga found in other texts but they provide very little assistance in this matter. But it is necessary to consider them. It will be relevant to examine how much Someśvara is indebted to these two great authorities Bharata and Mataṅga. While referring to Bharata's Nāṭya Śāstra, commentary to the Nāṭya Śāstra of Abhinavagupta describing certain parallel practises also requires to be analysed to see how far the opinions of Abhinavagupta have influenced Someśvara.

Bharata

As mentioned earlier Someśvara makes a direct reference to Bharata in the Gīta Vinoda chapter. Before expatiating on the Rāgas, Someśvara makes the following remark about Bharata:

नामतो गदिताः सर्वे रागा मुनिसमीरिताः ॥ १३१ ॥  
 His name appears in other two instances also:  
 धस्तुनामा प्रबन्धोऽयं मुनिभिः परिकीर्तितः ॥ २९४ ॥  
 भस्तोक्तप्रकरणे नानारससमुद्भव ॥ २९८ ॥

In the Nṛtya Vinoda chapter, Bharata has only been drawn upon anonymously at several places. A comparative study of the Nṛtya Vinoda with the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata, has helped to lead some of the references in the Nṛtya Vinoda to Bharata. Even where Someśvara does not specify any previous authority, the influence of Bharata is discernible. It is to reveal the closeness between the two works that a complete concordance of the text of the Nṛtya Vinoda and the Nāṭya Śāstra is presented by way of notes at the end of the text. Before proceeding to that, a short sketch of the noteworthy similarities as well as dissimilarities between them will be useful for the critical evaluation of the Nṛtya Vinoda.

In the very first and fundamental stage concerning the classification of the body into Aṅga, Upāṅga and Pratyāṅga, there are conflicting ideas between Bharata and Someśvara.

Bharata has divided the body into Aṅga and Upāṅga and has also indicated the Pratyāṅgas. In the category of Aṅga are listed the head, the hips, the chest, the sides and the feet. The eyes, the eyebrows, the nose, the lips, the cheeks and the chin are listed in the category of Upāṅgas. Though not specified categorically the six Pratyāṅgas will include the remaining limbs described by Bharata which are the neck, the belly, the thighs, the shanks and the arms.

Someśvara has followed the general pattern of classification as laid down by Bharata, but has made changes in the arrangement of the limbs, within the three major groups. Thus Aṅgas of Someśvara include shoulders and belly in place of palms and feet and Pratyāṅgas include, arms, wrists, palms, knees, shanks and feet. Two extra Upāṅgas have been incorporated by Someśvara. They are the teeth and the tongue. For a clear understanding the following chart will be helpful.

Aṅgas

<u>Bharata</u> (6)	<u>Someśvara</u> (6)
Head	Head
Palms	Shoulders
Hips	Hips
Chest	Chest
Sides	Sides
Feet	Belly



Upāṅga

Bharata (6)

Eyes (including eyeballs  
and eyelids)

Eyebrows

Nose

Cheeks

Lips

Chin

Someśvara (8)

Eyes

Eyebrows

Nose

Cheeks

Lips

Chin

Teeth

Tongue

Pratyāṅga

Bharata (5)

Arms

Neck

Belly

Thighs

Shanks

Someśvara (6)

Arms

Wrists

Palms

Knees

Shanks

Feet

Almost all writers follow the Bharata pattern and not Someśvara's example. Someśvara, it seems is the only writer who has not observed the conventional practise. It is difficult to comment and pass judgement on whether Someśvara or Bharata is right. But it is reasonable to discuss the reasons attributing to the divergent views.

Firstly, taking up the matter of the palms and feet, it is common knowledge that they are the limbs which are most profusely used in dance. So it is probably for this reason that the palms and feet have been included in the list of Aṅgas in the Nāṭyaśāstra. Yet the Nṛtya Vinoda is not wrong for incorporating the shoulders and belly in place of palms and feet. This is because they are anatomically larger parts. The thigh has been omitted by Someśvara in the category of Pratyāngas. This could be due to the reason that the movements of the shanks itself signify the movements of the thigh. Someśvara has omitted the neck for which no reason can be ascribed. All other limbs mentioned by Bharata have been mentioned by Someśvara and over and above them, he has described additional limbs as well.

The first instance of Someśvara's close adherence to Bharata is noticed in the description of head movements. All thirteen head movements laid down by Bharata, have been incorporated by Someśvara and the manner of treatment, definitions and usages are quite similar. Except for interchanging of words in some of the definitions or adding a few more usages or some other usages in place of those mentioned by Bharata, there is no major discordance. However, Someśvara did not think it necessary to mention Bharata even once.

After the description of the head movements Someśvara

has taken up the shoulder movements. This has not been discussed by Bharata.

Next, in the elucidation of chest movements Someśvara has not indicated any authority, even anonymously, but the influence of Bharata is obvious since the chest movements are identical in both texts.

In the analysis of the belly movements Someśvara has stated, that the matters stated by him, are in accordance with the views of experts in Nāṭya (Nāṭyavedibhihi). Since the plural has been used, it is unlikely that Someśvara refers to Bharata alone. As such Bharata has considered only three belly movements. They are Kṣāma, Khalla and Pūrṇa. But he acknowledges, that there are others who speak of four belly movements, the fourth being Sama. Someśvara has given four movements of the belly. His additional movement over the three movements considered by Bharata, is however not Sama, but it is Riktapūrṇa. While elucidating on the usage of Riktapūrṇa, Someśvara once again reiterates that it is in accordance with the opinions of experts in Nāṭya. It can be said with certainty that these experts must be some people other than Bharata.

In the description of the side movements which follows the belly movements in the Nṛtya Vinoda, there is a lapse in

the definition of Prasārita, which is missing. The explanations given by Bharata for all the side movements are more lucid than Someśvara. He even indicates the relative positions of the other limbs such as the waist and shoulders which are effected when the sides are moved. It will be therefore, advantageous to read Bharata's descriptions for understanding the side movements described by Someśvara and more so for the missing Prasārita definition. Prasārita has been described by Bharata as stretching of the sides. The usages of Prasārita that have been prescribed by Someśvara and the meaning of the word Prasārita itself conveys that this is also what Someśvara had in mind.

The last Aṅga that is described by Someśvara is the hips. There are three differences between the hip movements described by Bharata and Someśvara. The first difference, is in the use of the term Vivṛtta and Nivṛtta. Bharata uses the term Nivṛtta, whereas Someśvara uses Vivṛtta. Vivṛtta means turning round or circling and Nivṛtta means coming back or retreating. Thus Bharata's description and usage of Nivṛtta, as turning in front from the sidewise position appears to be correct for that term. Similarly Someśvara describing Vivṛtta as moving the hips (further from the sidewise position) also seems to be correct for the term Vivṛtta and specially since Vivṛtta is prescribed for looking down at the back. There is

also a slight variation regarding Recita hips movement in both the texts. Bharata says that the hips moved in all directions is Recita and it is to be used in circling and the like. But according to Someśvara moving the hips with quivering movements is Recita and it is prescribed for usage in dance (Nṛtya). Bharata has described the Kampita movement of the hips, which Someśvara has also mentioned under the term Āndolita, which is only a variation of the word Kampita. In the Nṛtya Vinoda the usages of both Āndolita and Udvāhita seem to have been borrowed from Bharata and the references to the learned (Budhaihi) and those skilled in Nāṭya (Nāṭyaviśāradaihī) probably include Bharata.

The Upāṅgas, beginning with the eyebrows are taken up next in the Nṛtya Vinoda. Seven kinds of eyebrow movements are enumerated, of which utkṣipta, Patita, Bhrūkatī, Catura, Kuñcita and Sahaja are in the Nāṭyaśāstra also. The only non-conformity is in the seventh movement, which is Recita in the Nāṭyaśāstra and Sphurita in the Nṛtya Vinoda. But a close examination reveals that the two movements have a lot in common. Firstly, both the words express the same meaning and secondly their movement is almost alike. Recita is said to be lifting one eyebrow in an amorous way, whereas Sphurita is described as quivering one eyebrow delicately. The change made by Someśvara is only an improvement over Bharata's description

of Recita. Similarly the definition given by Someśvara for Catura is more exact. It is perhaps Bharata, who is probably acknowledged with other experts in Nāṭya (Nāṭya kovidaihi) in sloka 1033 and (Nipunaihi) in sloka 1034 which prescribes usages for Utkṣipta with one eyebrow and both eyebrows respectively. Most of these usages are found in the Nāṭyaśāstra. Again it appears that Bharata is drawn upon in Śloka 1035 which gives usages of Patita. Someśvara has specifically said the usages of Patita are in accordance with the views of the learned. Since Bharata has expressed the same view in the Nāṭya Śāstra, it seems that he must have been included in the learned. The usages of Catura also, seem to have been borrowed from Bharata, because the line describing the usages of Catura in the Nṛtya Vinoda is almost verbatim to the corresponding line in the Nāṭyaśāstra. Some manuscripts of the Nāṭyaśāstra have Vilāsa as one of the usages of (Ni) Kuñcita. It is probable that Someśvara had access to these manuscripts since he has mentioned Vilāsa. Regarding the learned (Budhaihi); who have according to Someśvara prescribed the usages for Sphurita in Śloka 1038 nothing can be claimed with certainty.

The glances, form the next topic of discussion in the Nṛtya Vinoda. Their classification into three categories based on Rasas, Sthāyibhāvas and Sañcaribhāvas is in keeping with the Nāṭyaśāstra tradition. The glances in both the texts are

taken up in the same order and the concordance, specially in the first two categories of glances discussed by both is very striking. Some of the descriptions are almost verbatim such as Hāsya, Adbhuta, Vīra, Raudra, Dīna, Krudha, Bhayānvita and Jugupsita. Striking similarities are also evident in the descriptions of the transitory glances such as Viṣāḍini, Mukula, Jimha <sup>and</sup> Lalita, Kekara. One special feature of the glances described in the Nṛtya Vinoda is, that unlike the Nāṭyaśāstra which has described usages only for glances based on Rasa and Sthāyibhāva, the Nṛtya Vinoda gives usages for glances based on Sañcāri bhāvas also. These usages relating to Sañcāri bhavas might have been borrowed from some other text because Someśvara makes a reference at two places that is, in Śloka 1075 and śloka 1082, about the experts (Budhaihi, Drṣṭikovidaihi) having prescribed them. In the definition of Raudri glance in śloka 1050, the first line is almost verbatim to the corresponding line in the Nāṭyaśāstra and so, the wise (Vicakṣanaihi) could perhaps include Bharata.

Next, the śloka enumerating the nose movements in the Nṛtya Vinoda is identical with the corresponding śloka in the Nāṭyaśāstra. Both have referred to the learned (Budhaihi). Despite this, there is a dissimilarity in the descriptions. The Socchvāsa nose movement has been presented at variance in both the texts. The Nṛtya Vinoda itself has two contradictory

readings. According to one reading of Sacchvāsa it is the slightly crooked nostrils and according to the other reading, it is the slightly blown nostrils. According to Bharata, the nose which draws in breath is Socchavāsa. This definition contradicts the very meaning of the word Socchvāsa and its usage prescribed by Bharata and Someśvara. Socchvāsa means exhaling breath. Thus, the definition of Socchvāsa given by Bharata appears to be wrong, which Someśvara has tried to rectify ~~it~~. Regarding the definitions to other nose movements, there is an agreement between both the texts, but different usages have been prescribed. Probably Bharata is referred to by Someśvara in the śloka 1091, defining Svābhāviki.

Close adherence to Bharata's views is the distinguishing feature in Someśvara's description of the next Upāṅga which is the cheek. Six cheek movements have been described with their usages. There is only one slight non-conformity between Nāṭyaśāstra and Nṛtya Vinoda with regard to the Pūrṇa cheek movement. According to the former Pūrṇa is the stretched cheek, whereas according to the latter it is the raised cheek. Between the two, Someśvara's definition seems more apt, considering that it is prescribed for expressing zeal and pride. Usages of the cheek movements are the same in both the texts. Only the usage pride has been omitted in the usages of Pūrṇa movement in the Nṛtya Vinoda.

The next Upāṅga taken up by Someśvara is the lip and in contrast with the earlier Upāṅga, there are differences in the lip movements described by Someśvara and Bharata. Of the ten lip movements indicated by Someśvara, only three of them are found in Bharata's list which contains six movements. This indicates that a lot of innovations were made after Bharata's time. The six movements of the lips discussed by Bharata are Vivartana, Kampana, Visarga, Viniguhana, Samdaṣṭaka and Samudgaka. Of these only Kampana, Samdaṣṭaka and Viniguhana have been considered by Someśvara and of these three, Samdaṣṭaka and Viniguhana follow Bharata's description. Kampita has not been described in the Nṛtya Vinoda. The other seven lip movements described by Someśvara are Mukula, Kūṇita, Āyāta, Vikāsi, Recita, Udvṛtta and Prasārita. In the available text of Nṛtya Vinoda the description of Recita and usages of udvṛtta are missing. But they are found in Bharata kośa wherein Ramakrishna Kavi has quoted Someśvara. The Prasārita lip movement of the Nṛtya Vinoda is somewhat similar to the Visarga movement, stated in the Nāṭyaśāstra, whereas Mukula, Kūṇita, Āyāta Vikāsi as well as Recita and Udvṛtta are unique with reference to Nāṭyaśāstra. Someśvara's reference to the learned (Budhaihi) in the Sloka 1098 describing Kūṇita is certainly not to Bharata.

The chin movements and then the teeth movements, are

explained independently in the Nṛtya Vinoda. But Bharata has said that the actions of the teeth, lips and tongue produce chin movements. Except Vyādhir<sup>and Samhata</sup>, none of the chin movements mentioned by Someśvara, can be connected with chin movements stated by Bharata. Only Vyādhir<sup>and Samhata</sup> corresponds to Bharata's description of Cukkita<sup>and Sama</sup>. Certainly the reference to the learned (Buhaihi) in the Nṛtya Vinoda ślokas 1112 and 1113 must be to persons other than Bharata.

In the teeth movements Mardana and Khaṇḍana given by Someśvara, agree with Kuttana and Khaṇḍana respectively as described by Bharata. Chinna, Sama, Daṣṭa and Lehita of Bharata have been eliminated and in its place, Someśvara has given Kartana, Dhāraṇa and Niṣkarṣaṇa. The experts (Viśārdaihi) to whom Someśvara ascribes the teeth descriptions to, in ślokas 1115, 1116 and 1119 must refer to some authorities other than Bharata.

Coming to the last Upāṅga in the Nṛtya Vinoda, Someśvara has described five movements of the tongue. They are Rjvi, Vakra, Nata, Lola and Promnata. Bharata has not spoken of tongue movements. But while describing chin movements, he speaks of Lehini which concerns the tongue as well. Whereas Śārṅgadeva and others have included Lehini in their list of tongue movements Someśvara does not mention it. Someśvara

---

1 Bharatakośa, pp.559, 78. .

has acknowledged that the tongue movements described by him, have been prescribed by the learned (Budhaihi) but cannot possibly include Bharata.

The subject of facial colours is closely related to the Upāṅgas which is therefore, taken up by both Someśvara and Bharata before winding up the discussion on Upāṅgas. Both writers agree on this subject.

After the discussion of Upāṅgas, Someśvara proceeds with the description of Pratyāṅgas, beginning with eight movements of the arms and then four movements of the wrists. Bharata has enumerated ten movements of the arms, but does not describe them, and he also does not mention about wrist movements.

It is the subject of hand gestures which occupies a lot of place in the Nṛtya Vinoda as well as Nāṭyaśāstra. As mentioned earlier, Bharata has described hand gestures in the category of Aṅgas, whereas Someśvara describes them in the category of Pratyāṅgas. Twenty four single hand gestures and thirteen combined hand gestures are found in both the texts and then there are twenty-nine Nṛtta hastas in Nāṭyaśāstra, whereas there are only twenty seven Nṛtta hastas in Nṛtya Vinoda. Despite this variance, both Bharata and Someśvara say that the total number of hand-gestures are sixty four.

Someśvara has eliminated Lalita and Valita mentioned by Bharata. This is probably, because as clearly stated by Jāya Senāpati in the Nṛttaratnāvali, Lalita corresponds to Pallava and Valita corresponds to Latā.

Bharata has stated, that the usages of the Single hand and combined hand gestures mentioned by him, are not the only possibilities and it is for the dancer to use the gestures in the manner as will be most suitable to convey the meaning. Someśvara has also made a similar remark. It is true that it would be difficult to cover all possible usages of these hand gestures. Considering that there are innumerable possibilities of expression through hand poses it is not surprising that some of their usages listed by Someśvara are not found in Nāṭyaśāstra.

Some striking similarities are to be seen in the definitions of Kāṅgūla, Alapadma, Urṇanābha, Samdamśa and Khatakā-mukha discussed in both the works. In certain instances, Someśvara has gone further than Bharata, by giving the exact positions of the hand as well, such as in Ardhaçandra, Mṛgaśira and Padmakōśa. Regarding Muṣṭi also, Someśvara describes an additional Muṣṭi, wherein the thumb is beneath the other fingers. Arāla has been presented wrongly in the Nṛtya Vinoda. Instead of stretching the index finger, the index finger is required to be bent as described by Bharata,

since the meaning of Arāla is 'bent.' Owing to this mistake in Arāla, Śukatunḍa is also wrong, because Someśvara has derived Śukhatunḍa from the wrong Arāla position. Once the correction is made in Arāla, Śukhatunḍa automatically will be corrected.

Next in the field of combined hand gestures, the descriptions of the first two gestures, Añjali and Kapoṭha seem to have got interchanged by Someśvara. A new variation of Karkāṭa is an interesting feature rendered by Someśvara wherein the fingers are interlaced inwards. He has prescribed it, for usage in anxiety. The definition of Utsaṅga in the Nāṭyaśāstra does not agree with the Utsaṅga definition in the Nṛtya Vinoda. According to the Nāṭyaśāstra, when the Arāla hands are contrarily placed and are upturned and bent, the Utsaṅga hand will be the result. Instead of Arāla hands, Someśvara has recorded the use of Sarpaśira hands. Niṣadha is probably the most controversially defined hand gesture. Different authors have given definitions for Niṣadha which are disparate. In the G.O.S. edition of Nāṭyaśāstra there are four definitions of Niṣadha. In the introduction the editor has said that the third definition of Niṣadha is the original one. According to it, the left hand holding the (right) arm above the elbow and the right hand similarly touching the left arm with a clenched fist, will make the Niṣadha hand. It is to indicate patience, intoxication, pride, elegance,

eagerness, valour, arrogance, self-conceit, haughtiness, motionlessness, steadiness and the like. Manmohan Gosh has also given this definition in his translation to the Nāṭyaśāstra. Besides this, Jāya Senāpati has indicated in the Nṛttaratnāvalī that this definition was the one given by Bharata. He has also noted the definitions given by Abhinavagupta and Kīrtidhara and in this regard it is significant to note that Someśvara follows Abhinavagupta's views and not Bharata's views. For the Makara hand gesture, Someśvara has specified the use of different positions for expressing different meanings, none of which have been described by Bharata. A comparison between both the texts with reference to other combined hand gestures, reveal no major discordance except that Mṃgśīra is used in Vardhamāna of Nṛtya Vinoda whereas Hamsapakṣa is mentioned for Vardhamāna of Nāṭyaśāstra.

Among the Nṛtta hastas, Arālakhatākāmukha, Avidhavaktra, Sucyāśya, Dandapakṣa, and Pallava described in the Nṛtya Vinoda differ from their corresponding definitions in the Nāṭyaśāstra. Regarding certain other Nṛtta hastas there are minor differences in both texts. For instance Someśvara prescribes in place of Patāka hasta the use of Tripatāka hasta in Nitamba, Keśabandha and Latā hastas, and Arāla hasta to be applied in Urdhvamaṇḍalin and Pārśvamaṇḍalin and Uromaṇḍalin. A slight disparity is to be seen between the Sucyāśya

hasta described by Someśvara and the corresponding Sūcīmukha hasta explained by Bharata. Not only are the names different, but the movements themselves are varied. Thus, with regards to Nṛtta hasta, Someśvara has to some extent followed Bharata and has at the same time, deviated from the Bharata tradition.

After having described hand gestures, both Someśvara and Bharata have taken up the explanation of the four hand movements (Hasta Karaṇas). These Hasta karaṇas are closely connected with the hand gestures and they were even used in the description of some of the Nṛtta hastas. Since the descriptions of the four Hasta karaṇas are almost identical in both the texts, references in the Nṛtya Vinoda to experts in hand movements (Hastasya Kovidaihi) in Śloka 1273, to dancers (Nartakaihi) in śloka 1274, to those skilled in dance (Nartana Kovidaihi), in śloka 1275, and to those having knowledge of Nṛtta (Nṛttatattvagñaihi) could probably include Bharata.

Someśvara then mentions seven kinds of knee movements. Bharata has not described knee movements independently, but he describes five shank movements as arising out of the manipulation of the knees. Someśvara has also described five shank movements, but these do not resemble any of the shank movements found in Nāṭyaśāstra. Thus, the learned mentioned in śloka 1283 and 1285, who according to Someśvara have prescribed

the five knee movements and five shank movements cannot include Bharata.

The feet movements come up next for discussion in the Nṛtya Vinoda. Nine feet movements are described in the Nṛtya Vinoda whereas ~~five~~ feet movements are described in the Nāṭyaśāstra. There is one major difference between these two sets of feet movements. In the Nāṭyaśāstra the feet movements indicate floor contacts and placing the feet in a particular position. But in the Nṛtya Vinoda, except for Sūci and Nija, all other feet movements, consist of actual movements, which arise out of the combinations of the basic feet positions, mentioned by Bharata. For example, Ghaṭṭita, Ghaṭṭitosedha, Tādita and Pārṣniga are all combinations of Añcita and Kuñcita feet positions. As mentioned earlier Sūci and Nija are only static positions. They correspond to the descriptions of ~~xxxxxxx~~Sūci and Sama respectively, as given by Bharata. Agraga and Pārśvaga are the only other two feet movements indicated by Someśvara which bear distinctive features, not noticed in the Nāṭyaśāstra. Closely connected with the movements of the feet are the movements of the toes. Someśvara has described five toe movements and this information is not found in the Nāṭyaśāstra. The description of the toe movements completes the description of Āṅgika Abhinaya in the Nṛtya Vinoda. Almost all the limbs from head to toe, which have a

bearing on the technique of dance have thus been analysed. But the movements of the eyeballs, eyelids, mouth, neck and thighs which have been explained in the Nāṭyaśāstra are absent in the Nṛtya Vinoda.

The matters that follow next in the Nṛtya Vinoda are the postures (Sthānakas), feet movements (Cāris) and movements involving jumps (Utpluti Karaṇas). One distinguishing feature which these three aspects discussed in the Nṛtya Vinoda share in common is that they are totally divergent from the Sthānakas, Cāris and Karaṇas described by Bharata, to the extent that they are beyond comparison and contrast. The Sthānakas, Cāris and Karaṇas of Someśvara must be treated as additions or supplements to the Sthānakas, Cāris and Karaṇas indicated by Bharata.

Thus, a comparative study of the Nṛtya Vinoda with Nāṭya Śāstra reveals that Someśvara partially followed Bharata in matters relating to Āṅgika Abhinaya, whereas he completely deviated from Bharata in matters concerning Sthānakas, Cāris and Karaṇas. Someśvara's utilization of Nāṭya Sastra can therefore said to be limited to certain aspects of Āṅgika Abhinaya alone.

Abhinavagupta

Abhinavagupta the Kashmiri scholar of the 9th century A.D. has in his commentary to the Nāṭyaśāstra indicated certain parallel practices which had also gained recognition. A number of alternate names or alternate movements and explanations are described by him in a number of places in his commentary, specially, in relation to Hastas and Karaṇas. Some of these different features are noticed in the Nṛtya Vinoda also and particularly in one instance the influence of Abhinavagupta is clearly visible. This occurs in the definition of the Samyuta hasta called Niṣadha, wherein the reference to the learned in hand poses (Hasta lakṣaṇa pāragaihi) and learned in Nāṭya (Nāṭya vedibaihi) must be anonymous acknowledgements to Abhinavagupta because, Someśvara follows his explanation very closely. Leaving aside the definition given by Bharata and views of Kīrtidhara and others, Someśvara says that when the Kapittha hand encircles the Mukula hand, it is known by the name of Niṣadha by those learned in hand poses. Again, he says that according to the learned in Nāṭya, Niṣadha is used to show collecting, cutting, time, speaking the truth and relief from suffering. This happens to be the same explanation offered by Abhinavagupta.

In the case of Nitamba, Keśabandha and Latā hastas, Abhinavagupta states that there are writers other than

Bharata, who approve of Tripatāka hasta in place of Patāka hasta. Someśvara, has followed this view and has therefore introduced Tripatāka hasta in place of Patāka hasta for use in Nitamba, Keśabandha and Latā.

Besides those mentioned above, there are many more different views expressed in the Nr̥tya Vinoda which has not been mentioned by Abhinavagupta earlier. The major discordance is to be seen in the varied explanations provided by Someśvara for Arālakṣatakāmukha, Pallava, Sucyāśya, Avidhavaktra, Urdhvamaṇḍalin, Pārśvamaṇḍalin and Uromaṇḍalin. It could be possible that these concurrent practises had gone unnoticed by Abhinavagupta or it maybe possible that they may have been post Abhinavagupta innovations. As far as Deśī material is concerned, Abhinavagupta does not provide any information. So none of the Sthānakās, Cāris and Karaṇas described by Someśvara can be traced to Abhinavagupta. Thus not much has been borrowed by Someśvara from Abhinavagupta's commentary on the Nāṭyaśāstra.

### Matāṅga

Matāṅga is known to have been one of the earliest writers on Deśī music and dance. Just as the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata had acquired cannonic authority for matters related to Mārgi, the Br̥haddeśī of Matāṅga was recognized by later

writers as a standard and authoritative treatise for matters concerning Deśī. In dance the Sthānakas, Gāris, karanas, Aṅghāras and Recakas expounded by Bharata are called Mārgī and the later developments and innovations are defined as Deśī. Though Kohala, who is dated chronologically earlier to Maṭaṅga is believed to have treated Deśī music and Deśī dance in relation to the Uparūpkas (drama forms which developed in times subsequent to Bharata), it appears that Maṭaṅga is the first writer, who had codified and elaborated on Deśī music as well as Deśī dance. In his treatise the Brhaddeśī, as suggested by its name itself and as gleaned from later references, seems to have contained an exposition on all three aspects of Sangīta. It is, however, unfortunate that what is available of Brhaddeśī today is only a fraction of Maṭaṅga's labour. The text printed as Brhaddeśī in TSS.XCIV is incomplete, erroneous, corrupt and intermingled with some other texts as well. In this text, as available today, the chapters on Vādyā and Nṛtya are completely missing. But the fact that the Brhaddeśī had a chapter on dance is borne out by the references made by writers like Kumbhakarna and Jāya Senāpati. In the Nṛtya ratnakośa, Kumbhakarna has mentioned (in Śloka 513-514) seven additional hastas as given by some followers of the Brhaddeśī (सप्तैते हस्तकास्सप्त बृहदेशीविदां मते । Jāya Senāpati mentions Maṭaṅga and the dance chapter of the Brhaddeśī and also quotes him. Jāya sets forth the sixteen

foot movements (Pādas) of Deśī-dance as given by Mataṅga.

मिहोक्तान् देशीनृत्तशोभाविधायिनः । पादान् पौडससंख्याकान् कथयामोऽद्युना वयम् ॥

Jāya also quotes a line from the end of Mataṅga's

treatment of Pādas which are a kind of leg movements and

have been included under Deśī cārīs by some writers. VII.53-59 .

देशीनृत्तस्य संक्षेपं बृहदेश्यां निरूपयन् । मलङ्कोऽकथयत् पादलक्षणवसितीं यथा ॥

स्वबुद्ध्या कल्पयित्वा मन्थानपि समाचरेत् ।

The Nṛtta section of the Brhaddeśī is referred to, by

Jāya Senāpati in VII.21, while speaking of the two kinds of

Vādyā Paddhati. अथ पात्रस्य नृत्तार्थं कथ्यते वाद्यपद्धतिः ।

मलङ्कोस्य मते प्रोक्ता बृहदेशीमिधानतः ।

नृत्तप्रकरणे रक्षा विचित्रा चेति सा विधा ॥

Someśvara has not mentioned Mataṅga by name while

elucidating on the Deśī aspects, and neither has he speci-

fically referred to the dance chapters of the Brhaddeśī.

But he has spoken of Mataṅga with reference to Vṛttas in

music. He says he has listed the Vṛttas in the manner earlier

rendered by Mataṅga. This indicates that Someśvara was aware

of Mataṅga and that he also shared the views of Mataṅga. It

is therefore most likely that general references to experts

while describing the Deśī Sthānakas, Cārīs and Karaṇas are

anonymous attributions to Mataṅga. Following is a list of the

references which can neither be identified conclusively with

Mataṅga, because of the non-availability of the Brhaddeśī,

nor can the possibility of their being references to Mataṅga

be altogether rejected. They are Budhaihi in Śl.1311, 1380,

1389, Viduhi in Śl.1313, Nṛtya Kovidaihi in Śl.1314, Nṛtya

Vādyā Vicakṣanaihi in Śl.1315, Nartana Kovidaihi in Śl.1316,

1365, Sthāna lakṣaṇa Vedibhihi in Sl.1320. Maniṣibhihi in Sl.1336 and 1139. Nāṭya Kovidaihi in Sl.1341, 1360, 1361, 1391, Sūribhihi in Sl.1346, 1366, Nāṭyapanditaihi in Sl.1371, ~~Sūribhihi in Sl.1346, 1366, Nāṭyapanditaihi in Sl.1371,~~ Budhottamai in Sl.1372, Cāri Viśārdaihi in Sl.1375, Utpluti Kovidaihi in Sl.1384, Viduhu in Sl.1392, and Viduhu in Sl. 1398. Since, it is quite certain that the Brhaddeśi dealt with Deśi dance and that Someśvara has mentioned Mataṅga by name earlier in music, the possibility of Someśvara's access to and utilization of the Brhaddeśī for the compilation of the Nṛtya Vinoda is a possibility.

#### Latter writers

After examining the extent of Someśvara's utilization of other texts, it will be worthwhile to consider how useful Someśvara's Nṛtya Vinoda had been to writers subsequent to him. This will help to judge the importance of the work, its contributions, the influence it has wielded on later writers and the degree of acceptance and recognition achieved by Someśvara, as an authority on dance.

No sooner had the Nṛtya Vinoda been written, its worth was acknowledged by the great writer on Sangīta, Śārṅgadeva, in his work the Sangītaratnākara. Śārṅgadeva was followed by Pārśvadeva and Jāya Senāpati who entertained respect for Someśvara not as a king, but as a powerful writer on dance.

Four centuries later Basava Bhūpāla seems to have been inspired to write a book called the 'Śiva tattva ratnākara' to show his virtuosity in wielding the pen along with the sword just as Someśvara had achieved. This book is on the same lines as Someśvara's Mānasollāsa from which work he has borrowed freely, including matters concerning dance, which however has not been acknowledged.

Śārṅgadeva, Pārśvadeva, Jāya Senāpati and Basava Bhūpāla all belonged to the region of Someśvara and so the proximity in place and time must have also contributed to their having easy access to the Mānasollāsa with its Nṛtya Vinoda. The availability of the Manuscripts of Mānasollāsa in Devanāgarī script, outside south India is an indication of its dissemination in other parts of the country also. The importance of Nṛtya Vinoda however to the writers of dance belonging to Karnāṭaka and its vicinity is a matter which requires to be investigated, because it was this area and south of it which remained for a long time and to a great extent outside the Muslim influence. The Hindu culture and arts were less affected here by Muslim traditions. As a result the tradition set forth by Someśvara, could continue and develop in Karnāṭaka without any break.

To reveal the continuity and the usefulness of Nṛtya Vinoda to later Karnāṭaka writers it will be necessary to

make a comparative study of Nṛtya Vinoda. with the works of Śārṅgadeva, Pārśvadeva, Jāya Senāpati and Basava Bhūpala.

### Śārṅgadeva

Śārṅgadeva was perhaps the most significant mediaeval Indian writer on music. His all-comprehensive work on this subject, the Sangītaratnākara, ranks high and it is considered as the standard book for understanding ancient and medieval Indian Music. Written in the 13th century A.D. under the patronage of Yādava King Singhana, the Sangītaratnākara contains a thorough, analytical and exhaustive exposition of Gīta, Vādyā and Nṛtya incorporating the older tradition laid down by Bharata and the innovations noticed by Someśvara and others, to which he has added fresh material as observed by himself. In the seventh and the last chapter of the Sangītaratnākara, Śārṅgadeva has treated at great length, the subject of dance. Most of it is fundamentally based, on the Nāṭya-sāstra and Abhinavagupta's commentary on it. A comparative study of the chapters on dance of Sangītaratnākara and Nṛtya Vinoda of the Mānasollāsa reveals that Śārṅgadeva has also used the Nṛtya Vinoda for Āṅgika Abhinaya and more so for Deśi material.

Śārṅgadeva has respectfully acknowledged Someśvara in the beginning of the Sangītaratnākara. He places Someśvara

amongst the list of great authors like Rudraṭa, Nānyabhūpala and Bhoja.<sup>1</sup>

In the chapter on dance, Śārṅgadeva has made anonymous references to Someśvara in the following instances. In VII.35-7, Śārṅgadeva has said that other people include the shoulders in the list of Aṅgas. It is Someśvara who has spoken of shoulders and its movements which are identical to those listed by Śārṅgadeva. In the same verse Śārṅgadeva mentions that there are other experts who include wrists, knees and ornaments worn on the limbs, in the category of Pratyāṅgas. Someśvara has incorporated wrists and knees in the description of Pratyāṅgas. Again the movements listed under wrists and knees in the Sangītaratnākara show perfect concordance with the corresponding material in the Nṛtya Vinoda. As far as our knowledge based on available texts goes, the Nṛtya Vinoda is the earliest to which this material not found in Bharata can be traced.

In the description of hand gestures, the innovations noted in the Nṛtya Vinoda have been incorporated in the Sangītaratnākara. It is in the Nṛtya Vinoda that Someśvara has described two kinds of Karkatā hasta, arising out of the interlacing of fingers outside and inside. The purposes for which they are employed, also appear to have been borrowed by Śārṅgadeva from the Nṛtya Vinoda.

---

1. रुद्रो नान्यभूपालो भोजभूवक्रभस्तथा ।

परमर्दी च सोमेशो जगदिकमहीपतिः ॥ १८ ॥ प्रथमः स्वराजताध्याय ।

In Ch.VII:198-201 Śārṅgadeva has given several varieties of Utsaṅga hasta according to the views of different experts. Of these, the first variety of Utsaṅga hasta requiring the use of Arāla hasta, is from Bharata and the last variety requiring in its place, the use of Sarpaśira hasta is from Someśvara. The two intermediary varieties are the ones to be found in the commentary of Abhinavagupta. Thus, for the last variety, Śārṅgadeva must have consulted the Nṛtya Vinoda of Someśvara directly, since Abhinavagupta does not mention it. Three of the usages for Utsaṅga hasta also seem to have been borrowed from the Nṛtya Vinoda. They are embrace, cold and bashfulness of women.

In Ch.VII:202-4 the usages of Khatakāvardhamānaka hasta as rendered by Bharata, Someśvara and Abhinavagupta have been presented by Śārṅgadeva. After putting forth Bharata's view, Śārṅgadeva states that "according to another view", (Matāntare) Khatakāvardhamānaka hasta is used to indicate stringing flowers, speaking the truth, etc. This statement is a reference to Someśvara, who has given both these usages as well as another one in his description of Khatakāvardhamānaka hasta.

Though normally, Śārṅgadeva gives the version of Bharata first and then the opinions of other experts, in Ch.VII:209-11 Śārṅgadeva has indicated his preference for the definition laid down by Abhinavagupta which is accepted by Someśvara.

These verses describe the Niṣadha hasta.

The many varieties in the usages of Makara hasta, when employed at different levels and the use of Mrgaśira hasta in Vardhamāna hasta mentioned in the Nr̥tya Vinoda by Someśvara, have not been acknowledged or commented upon by Śārṅgadeva. Perhaps the usages of Mākara hasta may have been omitted, because they are very extensive and Śārṅgadeva has given limited usages for all hastas, normally taking a few, each from different authorities. But regarding definitions, Śārṅgadeva has incorporated the different views of various experts with some exceptions such as the conflicting descriptions of Vardhamāna hasta in the Nr̥tya Vinoda and Niṣadha hasta given in the Nāṭyaśāstra.

In the context of Nr̥tta hastas, Śārṅgadeva has given the views of Bharata, Abhinavagupta, Someśvara as well as that of other experts.

In Ch.VII: 218-20, the second kind of Udvr̥tta that has been set forth by Śārṅgadeva on the basis of the views of others (pare) is similar to the definition of Udvr̥tta found in Nr̥tya Vinoda.

In Ch.VII:224-9, the last description of Arālakhatākā-mukha hasta ascribed to others (Anye) is the description found in Nr̥tya Vinoda.

Four varieties of Pallava hasta have been explained individually in Ch.VII:239-42 by Śārṅgadeva, of these the third variety, agrees perfectly with the Pallava described by Someśvara. Therefore, the word others (Pare) in the third definition of Pallava in the Saṅgītaratnākara must include Someśvara.

In Ch.VII:244-46, the definition of Uttānavañcita hasta is described according to the explanation given by Abhinavagupta after which the version of Bharata which is the one, Someśvara follows is also acknowledged by Śārṅgadeva.

In Ch.VII:246-47, after describing the Latā hasta, Śārṅgadeva, like Abhinavagupta has stated, that some writers (Kecid ācārya) prescribe Tripatāka hasta for use in Latā hasta, as well as for Keśabandha and Nitamba hastas. Someśvara, has prescribed only Tripatāka hasta, for use in the above mentioned Nr̥tta hastas.

In Ch.VII: 259-60 Śārṅgadeva mentions about two divergent views regarding Garudapakṣa, which even Abhinavagupta had noticed. After describing Garudapakṣa in accordance with Abhinavagupta's version, he reiterates Abhinavagupta's statement that there are 'some who mention' (Kaiścid ukto) the use of Tripatāka hasta (in place of Patāka hasta) and this is not acceptable to Muni (Bharata). This would mean that the Garudapakṣa with Tripatāka hasta given by Someśvara in

the Nr̥tya Vinoda was being practised despite the fact, that it was not according to the tradition of Bharata.

Śārṅgadeva has in Ch.VII: 260-61, 262-3, 264-7 described Ūrdhvamaṇḍalin, Pārśvamaṇḍalin and Ūromaṇḍalin hastas respectively, with Patāka hasta and has also noted in the end, that some mention Hamsapakṣa hasta in place of Patāka hasta. He does not acknowledge the use of Arāla hasta, for use in the above mentioned Nr̥tta hastas, which happens to be the one prescribed by Someśvara. Perhaps, Śārṅgadeva has felt, that the use of the Arala hasta is not an acceptable practise.

In Ch.VII 272-6, Śārṅgadeva has described, Nalinīpadma-kośa hasta in four ways. The third description of Nalinīpadma-kośa, is similar to the one described by Someśvara.

Thus with regard to Nr̥tta hastas Śārṅgadeva has followed Someśvara's description in most cases, but in a few instances he has failed to comment on them.

In Ch.VII:307-12 Śārṅgadeva, has enumerated five positions of the hips, of which one of them is Vivṛtta. This term Vivṛtta has been given by Someśvara, unlike Bharata who uses the term Nivṛtta. The usage given by Śārṅgadeva, is also similar to that prescribed by Someśvara. The descriptions and usages of Udāhita hip movement is very similar, both in the Sangītaratnākara and the Nr̥tya Vinoda and they differ

from the description of Udvāhita found in the Nāṭyaśāstra. After Nisadha hasta, this is the first instance when Śārṅgadeva has excluded Bharata's description and has given in its place Someśvara's explanation.

In Ch.VII: 312-25 Śārṅgadeva has described six foot poses on the lines of Bharata. Then he goes further to explain seven foot movements as presented by others (Paraihi). These seven foot movements correspond to seven of the nine foot movements set forth by Someśvara. The other two footmovements rendered by Someśvara, are already included in Bharata's list.

In Ch.VII: 326-29, all the five shoulder movements indicated by Śārṅgadeva are from Someśvara. Bharata does not mention shoulder movements at all. In place of Samlagna and Ekānta which are the terms used by Someśvara the words <sup>and Ekocca</sup> karmalagna are used by Śārṅgadeva.

Śārṅgadeva has described some of the arm movements presented by Someśvara, after giving the descriptions of the arm movements mentioned in the Nāṭyaśāstra. In Ch.VII:355-52, Śārṅgadeva has given totally sixteen arm movements, ten of which are from Bharata and six from other sources including Someśvara. Actually, Someśvara has given in the Nr̥tya Vinoda eight arm movements; of these, only two namely Sarala and Kuñcita are found in the Sangītaratnākara. The descriptions are almost alike. According to Someśvara stretching the arms

in front and at the sides is called Sarala, while according to Śārṅgadeva, the stretching of arms side-wise, upwards and downwards is Sarala. Both have mentioned that this arm movement is to be used to imitate wings and for measuring. In place of trembling and embracing, which are the other two usages given by Someśvara, Śārṅgadeva has prescribed its use for pointing out the things on the ground. The description and usages of Kuñcita as given by Śārṅgadeva, is almost similar to its description given by Someśvara. The other six arm movements indicated by Someśvara are also found in the Sangītaratnākara, but they bear different nomenclatures. Thus his descriptions of Promata and Nyañcita correspond to Urdhvasta and Adhomukha, given in the Sangītaratnākara. Lalita arm movement found in Nr̥tya Vinoda, fits in with the description of Namra given in the Sangītaratnākara and even two usages, which are praising and holding a garland are alike in both the texts. As far as Lolita of the Nr̥tya Vinoda is concerned, the same movement is described in the Sangītaratnākara, but is designated as Āndolita, which has the same meaning as Lolita. Concordance is also noticeable in the descriptions of Calita, given by Someśvara and Maṇḍalagati found in the Sangītaratnākara. Calita has been described, as turning and moving the elbows and Maṇḍalagati has been explained as the arm turned round in all directions. When the arm is thus

turned, the elbows are automatically turned and so they appear to be the same. Brandishing a sword, which is the only usage mentioned for Calita, is also the only usage mentioned by Śārṅgadeva for Maṅḍalagati, making it all the more probable, that Calita and Maṅḍalagati are the same movements. The arm reaching the back, is described by Someśvara as Parāvṛtta and the same is called Prsthānusārin by Śārṅgadeva. The two usages prescribed for Prsthānusārin have been mentioned earlier by Someśvara for Parāvṛtta. Thus Śārṅgadeva, has incorporated all the eight arm movements described by Someśvara, with changes in the names of six of them.

Śārṅgadeva, has in Ch.VII:353-56, described the movements of the belly and the back simultaneously, since they are interrelated. Śārṅgadeva has first given these three belly movements and has then pointed out, that there are experts who have given a fourth belly movement, called Riktapūrṇa. This Riktapūrṇa is found in the Nṛtya Vinoda of Someśvara and so it is definitely Someśvara, whom Śārṅgadeva must have referred to here.

In Ch.VII:361-68 ten kinds of shank movements, have been set forth by Śārṅgadeva, of which, the first five are from Bharata and the second set of five shank movements, agrees with Someśvara's Nṛtya Vinoda which consists of Nihasṛta, Parāvṛtta, Tiraścīna, Bahirgata and Kampita. Though, it is

Someśvara who has first enumerated these five shank movements, it is Śārṅgadeva who has described them clearly. It would have been however more instructive if Śārṅgadeva had included all the usages for the various shank movements which Someśvara has elaborated on.

It is Someśvara, who had specified the wrist and knees as separate limbs and included them in the category of Pratyāṅgas. Śārṅgadeva, has added these additional limbs, along with the Pratyāṅgas mentioned by Bharata. In Ch.VII: 369-72 five wrist movements are explained by Śārṅgadeva of which four of them are found in Nṛtya Vinoda. They are Nikuñcita, Ākuñcita, Sama and Bhrāmita. The extra wrist movement, contained in the Sangītaratnākara is Cala. Cala is not actually a new movement but it is only a combination of Nikuñcita and Ākuñcita. Śārṅgadeva and Someśvara differ in the descriptions for the Nikuñcita and Ākuñcita movements. Śārṅgadeva has said, that the wrist bent outwards is Nikuñcita and the wrist bent inwards is Ākuñcita. Someśvara has not mentioned either the definition or usages of Nikuncita, but from the description and usages of Ākuñcita as given by Someśvara, it can be said, that according to him Nikuñcita must be the wrist bent inwards. Ākuñcita has been explained by Someśvara as the wrist bent outwards and is employed for use in pushing away people. Despite their differences in

definition of the Aकुञ्चिता hand, Śārṅgadeva has given the same usage given by Someśvara. Someśvara's definition seems to be the correct one and it is Śārṅgadeva, who seems to have got the definitions of Nikuञ्चिता and Āकुञ्चिता interchanged. The usages given for Nikuञ्चिता by Śārṅgadeva are indicating gift and giving refuge. He probably means receiving of a gift.

In Ch.VII:372-76 Śārṅgadeva has mentioned that knee poses are said to be of sevenkinds by the learned (Buddhaihi): Samhata, Kuञ्चिता, Ardhakuञ्चिता, Nata, Unnata, Vivṛta and Sama. All these seven knee movements, have been previously indicated by Someśvara, and they are not found in the Nāṭya-sāstra. So it is probable, that the learned referred to by Śārṅgadeva here, refers to Someśvara. In the available text of Nṛtya Vinoda, it is unfortunate that the descriptions of Unnata, Nata and Kuncita are missing and the definition of Ardhakuncita is corrupt. But it is possible, that Śārṅgadeva had access to the correct definition of Ardhakuञ्चिता as well as the definitions of the other three poses given by Someśvara. With regards to the definitions of Samhata, Vivṛta and Sama, Śārṅgadeva follows Someśvara closely. The usages prescribed by Śārṅgadeva for Nata, Kuञ्चिता, and Sama are identical with their usages mentioned in Nṛtya Vinoda.

The glances come up first in the discussion of the Upāṅgas in the Śaṅgītaratnākara. It is probably from

Someśvara that Śārṅgadeva adopted the idea of indicating the purposes for which the glances based on Sañcari bhāvas, must be used. The usages have been rendered almost alike by both. At certain places, it must be accepted that Śārṅgadeva has added some more usages.

The Sangītaratnākara has described ten lip movements in Ch.VII:488-96. Six of them are from Bharata and for the remaining four, Śārṅgadeva owes them to Someśvara. Vivartita, Kampita, Visr̥ṣṭa, Vinigūhita, Samdaṣṭaka and Samudga are the six varieties of lip movements, which have come down from Bharata and Udvr̥tta, Vikāsin, Āyata and Recita are the new varieties for which, the earliest existing source is Someśvara.

In Ch.VII:507-512, the eight movements of the chin, share a lot of similarity with the eight movements of jaw described in the Nṛtya Vinoda. Śārṅgadeva has however, altered the names of Śithila, Pracala and Prasfura to Śvasita, Calita and, Sphurita respectively, Both Śithila and Śvasita mean loosened or relaxed, Pracala and Calita mean moving and Prasfura and Sphurita mean unsteady. Thus, the meanings conveyed by the alternate terms are the same. The movements described for these terms, though expressed slightly differently correspond to a great deal. Thus, for Śithila, Someśvara has said, that the jaw should be slipped by an aṅgula and it is to be employed to indicate sleeping, eating, fatigue and seeing

with wonder. Śārṅgadeva follows this discription closely, though he has not incorporated the last usage. Similarly, the definition of Pracala given by Someśvara, has been reproduced by Śārṅgadeva for Calita and has incorporated two of the usages rendered for Pracala. The definition for Sphurita given by Śārṅgadeva appears to be a simplified version of Someśvara's description of Prasfura. Someśvara has said that moving the jaw fast and opening it a little is Prasfura. Śārṅgadeva, has simplified it by saying, that the trembling chin is Sphurita. Prescribing it for indicating fever with cold fits, also appears to have been borrowed from Someśvara. All the other five chin movements in the Sangītaratnākara, correspond in nomenclature and definition with the jaw movements given in Nṛtya Vinoda. Even the usages, for example in Vakra and Samhata are identical in both texts. The usage (Nāri cumbane) provided by Śārṅgadeva for Calasamhata is similar to the usage (strībhoge) provided by Someśvara. All the usages given by Someśvara for Vāyādhira and Lola have not been incorporated by Śārṅgadeva, but one in each has been utilized, such as yawning for vyādhira and chewing for Lola.

Śārṅgadeva has given eight movements of the teeth in Ch.VII:496-502, of which two appear to have been borrowed from Someśvara. They are Grahana and Niskarsana. Someśvara has used the term Dhāraṇa and the explanation given for it is used in a summarised form by Śārṅgadeva for Grahana.

Similarly, the definition given for Niskarsana by Śārṅgadeva is an abridged version of its definition, rendered by Someśvara. Śārṅgadeva, has given only one usage for it, which is to indicate crying of monkeys which is found in the Nr̥tya Vinoda.

In Ch.VII:503-506, six tongue movements have been described in the Saṅgītaratnākara. Three of these movements share common nomenclature with the tongue movements mentioned in the Nr̥tya Vinoda. As such, Śārṅgadeva who has largely based his work on Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra, must have had to depend on other texts for describing tongue movements, since Bharata has not described tongue movements. Only Lehini, which was included in the teeth movements by Bharata has been included by Śārṅgadeva. R̥jvi has been described alike by Śārṅgadeva and Someśvara. But there is non-conformity between them in relation to the description of Vakra. According to Śārṅgadeva, Vakra is the tongue with the tip turned up in a gaping mouth and it is to be employed to portray the man-lion (Narhari). This definition does not agree with the definition of Vakra rendered by Someśvara, according to whom Vakra is the tongue licking the corners of the mouth. Śārṅgadeva, has however noted this definition of Someśvara and has given it under another term called Sr̥kkānuga. Also, the usages given by Someśvara for Vakra, have been prescribed by Śārṅgadeva for Sr̥kkānuga. So it is Sr̥kkānuga and not Vakra

of the Sangītaratnākara, which coincides with the Vakra of Nr̥tya Vinoda. The Lola tongue movement described in the Sangītaratnākara, corresponds to its description in the Nr̥tya Vinoda, except for the different usages prescribed in both of them.

In Ch.VII:521-2, all the five toe movements explained by Śārṅgadeva, are reproductions of the toe movements presented by Someśvara. There is a marked similarity in the order of enumeration, the definitions and the usages of the toe movements found in both the texts. Even, Someśvara's statement, that the movements of the toes are to be employed for the big toe as well, has been faithfully reproduced by Śārṅgadeva. The only difference that is noticed in this context, is that whereas Śārṅgadeva describes the toes as an Upāṅga, and the feet as an Aṅga, Someśvara describes the feet and toes together as one, in the category of Pratyāṅgas.

In the purview of Deśī material, all that has been said by Someśvara in the Nr̥tya Vinoda, has been included by Śārṅgadeva. The twenty one Deśī Sthānakas, the twenty six Deśī earthly Cāris, the sixteen Deśī aerial Cāris and the eighteen Utpluti Karaṇas of the Nr̥tya Vinoda are all described in the Sangītaratnākara without introduction of any change in their movements. The Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata and Abhinavagupta's commentary being of no use for Deśī

references, it is for this subject that Śārṅgadeva, owes the most to the Nṛtya Vinoda of Someśvara.

### Pārśvadeva

Āchārya Pārśvadeva, author of the Sangītasamayāsāra was a Jaina of the Digambara sect which prevailed largely in Karnāṭaka. He is believed to have lived around the 13th century A.D., and to have graced several courts, including the Cālukyan court at Kalyāṇi. Pārśvadeva has revealed through the Sangītasamayāsāra, his close acquaintance with the music texts written by the Cālukyan Kings, Permardi (Tribhuvanmalla), Someśvara and Jagadekamalla. Besides mentioning the names of these kings, he also quotes extensively from the Nṛtya Vinoda of Someśvara and the Sangīta Cūḍāmaṇi of Jagadekkamalla. No work attributed to King Permardi is available today, but several references made to him by writers on music, lead one to believe that he wrote a work on music. Perhaps, Pārśvadeva may have quoted from this work also.

The Sangītasamayāsāra of Pārśvadeva, consists of nine chapters, of which the first five deal with Gīta. The sixth chapter deals with Vādyā, the seventh with Nṛtya, the eighth with Tāla and the ninth with general matters, relating to these three subjects.

The Nṛtya chapter of the Sangītasamayāsāra is very small in which Pārśvadeva's exposition of Āṅgika Abhinaya is extremely brief since it does not cover all aspects. All the six Āngas according to Bharata are described, but a number of their movements found in the Nāṭyaśāstra and Nṛtya Vinoda are missing. Only nine movements of the head, four movements of the chest, sides and waist have been described. But all the movements of the hands and feet described in the Nāṭyaśāstra are mentioned by Pārśvadeva and similarly the four Hasta karaṇas and ten arm movements are mentioned in connection with the hastas. The only Upāṅga that Pārśvadeva has discussed, is the pupils whose movements correspond to those of its kind mentioned in the Nāṭyaśāstra. With this, Pārśvadeva finishes the discussion of Āṅgika Abhinaya and enters the field of Deśī. Beginning with the Deśī Sthānakas, corresponding to those mentioned by Someśvara, Pārśvadeva describes twenty five Pālas (which are similar to the Deśī Cāris), utpluti karaṇas, Bhramaris, Deśī Āngas and four Deśī dances-peraṇi, Preṅkhana, Goṇḍali and Rāsa.

The usefulness of the Sangīta Chapters of Someśvara's Mānasollāsa to Pārśvadeva, is seen throughout the Sangīta-samayāsāra. In the very beginning Pārśvadeva mentions Someśvara, along with Dattila, Kohala, Ānjaneya, Tumburu, Bhoja, Mataṅga and Kaśyapa as well-known experts, who have elaborately treated the subject of music.<sup>1</sup> Another reference

1. लोके दक्षिणकोटलालिसुतासोमेधरस्तुम्बुरुः ।  
शास्त्रं भीजमत्तुत्तरयपमुखा व्यातेन्दुरेते पुत्र । प्रथम अध्याय ।

to Someśvara is made by Pārśvadeva in the third chapter of the Sangītasamayāsāra which describes the varieties of Tāyas. Here Someśvara is addressed along with Bhoja, as having given the technical terms of music in the Bhāṇḍika Bhāṣa. According to Dr. Raghavan, "this Bhāṇḍika Bhāṣa is a vernacular and very highly musical one and a grammar of it is available in the Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Library. In that grammar a beautiful story of the origin of that vernacular is given. It is said that when Krishna danced the Rāsa along with the Gopis, from all parts of India, and when each sang in her own tongue, there arose, in that beautiful medley, the very musical language of the Bhāṇḍika".<sup>1</sup>

Someśvara's name appears once again in the Sangītasamayāsāra, in the beginning of the eighth chapter which elucidates on the subject of Tāla. Here, Someśvara is considered along with Dattila, as an experts who has discussed the subject of Tāla in its entirety.<sup>2</sup>

There is also one place, where Someśvara has been quoted verbatim in the Sangītasamayāsāra. In Ch.II:82-92, pp.40-41, and 42 of Sangītasamayāsāra edited by Āchārya Brhaspati and published by Kunda Kunda Bharati, Delhi, all ten slokas are reproduced verbatim from the Nṛtya Vinoda of Someśvara. These verses refer to the kinds of songs, which are liked by different categories of people.

1 Sangeet Nāṭaka Academy Bulletin - 6, 1957, May, p.26.

भाज्जिक भाषयोद्विषा भाजसोमेश्वरादिभिः । ताया लक्षणतः केचिद् वक्ष्यन्ते लक्ष्यसम्भवाः ॥ १ ॥  
2. श्री सोमेश्वर इति प्रभृतिभिस्तान् स्वरूपं पुरा ।

In the chapter on dance in the Sangītasamayāsāra, Pārśvadeva has neither mentioned Someśvara by name nor quoted him, but he seems to have accepted Someśvara's views by including certain matters from the Nṛtya Vinoda. <sup>For</sup> Karihasta Pārśvadeva has followed Someśvara's pattern which is totally divergent from Bharata's description. Abhinavagupta in his commentary to the Nāṭyaśāstra, has not commented on the alternate practice of Karihasta according to which both hands in Tripatāka approach the ears. Śārṅgadeva, who has incorporated both the old tradition (from Bharata) and the new tradition (from Someśvara and others) also has not taken into account this divergent view. It is only Pārśvadeva, who in spite of agreeing closely with Bharata, for the controversial hastas like Utsaṅga, Niṣadha and Sucīmukha, has used Someśvara's description for Karihasta.

It is in the sphere of Deśī, that Pārśvadeva has shown his wider interest, and it is in his treatment of Deśī that some influence of Someśvara's views are discernible. Twenty one Deśī sthānakas have been described by both, of which, all but six Sthānakas are common to both the writers. Samhata, Ekajānunata, Prṣṭhottānata, Brāhma, Śaiva and Vṛṣabhāsana are the six Sthānakas found in the Nṛtya Vinoda and these have been omitted by Pārśvadeva. Instead, he has given Kūrmāsana, Nāgabandha, Tribhaṅgi, Padmāsana, Antarapadmāsana and

Viṣṇupadmāsana. The remaining fifteen sthānakas are described on the same lines as in Someśvara's Nṛtya Vinoda. Thus the references made by Pārśvadeva to Viśārdaihi in Sl.134, Kovidaihi in Sl.135, Viduhu in Sl.138, Sthānaka Kovidaihi in Sl.140, Buddhāihi in Sl.141, 146, and Vickasana in Sl.147 can be attributed to Someśvara, considering that his descriptions of Nandryāvarata, Vardhamānaka, Svastika, Vaiṣṇava, Parāvṛtta, Gāruḍa, Ekapāda and Caturasra show close concordance to Someśvara's views. Though no expert is referred to, by Pārśvadeva in the descriptions of Pārṣṇividdha, Pārṣṇiparśvakam, Parāvṛtta, Khaṇḍasūci and Samasūci, they are almost similar to Someśvara's descriptions of these sthānakas. Regarding Samapāda, Ekapārṣṇi (Ekapārśvagata in Nṛtya Vinoda) and Viṣamasūci, Pārśvadeva gives some additional information, which does not however alter the features of these sthānakas. Thus, there is no deviation from the views of Someśvara.

After the discussion on Sthānakas, the next topic in the Saṅgītasamayāsāra is the Pālas. These pālas are feet movements similar in concept to Cāris. In Ch.VII:171 while describing the Damaruka pāla, Pārśvadeva refers to the experts in Bhāṇḍikabhāṣa (Bhoja and Someśvara). However Pālas have not been described by Someśvara in the Nṛtya Vinoda. A Damaricāri has been described therein, but it does not correspond to the Damaruka Pāla.

For the expatiation of the Utpluti Karaṇas, it is possible that Pārśvadeva had consulted and used the Nṛtya Vinoda. Thirteen of the Utplutikaraṇas described by him are found in the Nṛtya Vinoda bearing same descriptions.

Then, there is a vast amount of Deśī material in the Sangītasamayāsāra discussed under the topics of Deśī bhramaris, Deśī aṅgas and Deśī dance. For information on these aspects, as also in the case of Deśī pālas, Pārśvadeva must have consulted some other source materials, because Nṛtya Vinoda does not elucidate on these features. Yet, the usefulness of the Nṛtya Vinoda to Pārśvadeva appears to have been more in the area of Deśī, rather than in the area of Mārgī.

#### Jāya Senāpati

Jāya Senāpati, who lived under the patronage of the Kākatiya ruler, king Gaṇapatideva, wrote an important work on dance called the Nṛttaratnāvalī in the year 1253-54 A.D. In this book, Jāya Senāpati has given an exhaustive exposition of both the Mārgī as well as Deśī aspects of dance. For this purpose, he has utilized the works of several authors including Someśvara.

The Nṛttaratnāvalī consists of eight chapters of which, the first four, deal with the Mārgī aspect and the remaining

four are concerned with the Deśi aspects. Someśvara's name appears in both these areas. First in Ch.II:89 Jāya Senāpati mentions Someśvara.<sup>1</sup> This occurs in connection with the total number of Hastas. Someśvara has discussed sixty-four hastas unlike Bharata and others who have explained sixty six hastas, but maintain that there are only sixty four hastas. Jāya-Senāpati offers an explanation as to how Someśvara solved this issue and managed to keep the total number of hastas to sixty four. He says, that since Lalita corresponds to Pallava and Valita corresponds to Latā, both Lalita and Valita have been excluded by Someśvara. Thus Someśvara has given twenty seven Nṛtta hastas (unlike others who give twenty nine) and maintains the view of Bharata, that the total number of hastas is sixty four (though Bharata as mentioned earlier has listed sixty six hastas). This shows that Jāya Senāpati has examined Nṛtya Vinoda in detail and has interpreted it in his own work.

Another place where Jāya Senāpati mentions Someśvara, is while describing the Gondali dance, which is a Deśi dance form. According to him, this dance style was set into proper form by Someśvara after having been captivated by the performance of a huntress (Bhilli), who sang and danced opposite his camp, during the Bhūtamātrka festival.<sup>2</sup>

There are other places in the Nṛttaratnāvalī, where

- 
1. पल्लवादेव ललितौ ललाख्यौ चलिताविति ।  
निश्चित्य नृत्तस्थितेषु द्वित्वा ललितयं पुनः ।  
सोमेधशय्यः क्लृप्त सप्तदशनिमूचिरे ॥ ८९ ॥ द्वितीयाध्याय ।
  2. सप्तमाध्यायः श्लोक १६१-६२ see p. 29 of this thesis.

Jāya Senāpati has drawn upon Someśvara anonymously. Most of the material in the Nṛtya Vinoda that is not found in Bharata has been noticed by Jāya Senāpati. These, he has incorporated as additions as in the following cases :

After describing six lip movements as indicated by Bharata, Jāya Senāpati in Ch.II: 43-5 has set forth four movements that were indicated by others (Matāntaraihi). These four lip movements are Āyata, Recita, Udṛtta and Vikāsi. All these four have been mentioned by Someśvara and the descriptions of Āyata, Udṛtta and Vikāsi are similar to his explanations. As mentioned earlier, the Recita lip movement is missing in the present text of the Nṛtya Vinoda. But Someśvara's description of Recita has been mentioned by Ramakrishna Kavi in Bharatakōśa which corresponds to Jāya-Senāpati's description.

In Ch.II: 55-7 of the Nṛttaratnāvalī eight movements of the Jaw have been explained. They are Vyādhir, Calita, Lola, Ślatha, Calasamhata, Samhata, Sphurita and Vakra. Calita and Ślatha are only alternate names for Pracala and Śithila respectively, which are the terms used by Someśvara. The descriptions of Vyādhir and Calita are missing in the Nṛttaratnāvalī, whereas the descriptions of the other six jaw movements coincide with their corresponding movements found in Nṛtya Vinoda. Since neither Bharata nor Śārṅgadeva, have

given the jaw movements, they must have been borrowed from Someśvara.

In Ch.II: 58-61 Jāya Senāpati has described six movements of the tongue on the lines similar to Śārṅgadeva. It has already been mentioned while discussing Śārṅgadeva's indebtedness to Someśvara that Rjvi, Srkkānuga (Vakra in Nṛtya Vinoda) and Lola are the three tongue movements which appear to have been borrowed, from Someśvara. So here Someśvara's influence may not be direct but probably through Śārṅgadeva.

In Ch.II: 62-69 of Nṛttaratnāvali five teeth movements have been described. These five teeth movements are not mentioned in the Nāṭyaśāstra and it is the Nṛtya Vinoda which mentions them. Except for Nisakarsana, all the other four teeth movements bear different nomenclature from the four corresponding teeth movements in Nṛtya Vinoda. Thus, Carvaṇa, Chedana, Piḍana and Grahana are only alternate names for Mardana, Khaṇḍana, Kartana and Dhāraṇa that are mentioned by Someśvara. The usages for these are almost similar in both texts.

In Ch.II: 312-5 Jāya Senāpati has given seven movements of the knees which correspond in name, to the seven knee movements described by Someśvara. These movements are not available in the Nāṭyaśāstra, and after Someśvara, it is Śārṅgadeva who mentions them. As a source of reference for

the knee movements therefore Someśvara's Nṛtya Vinoda must have been useful to Jāya Senāpati.

After describing five movements of the Shanks on the basis of the Nāṭyaśāstra, Jāya Senāpati goes further and describes another set of five shank movements that have been spoken of by others (Paraihi). Of these five shank movements mentioned in Ch.II: 320-27 four have been spoken of by Someśvara in the Nṛtya Vinoda. Only in place of Someśvara's Parāvṛtta, Jāya Senāpati has given Bhṛāmīta. Except for this discrepancy, the other shank movements are similar to those of Nṛtya Vinoda.

Again in Ch.II: 339, the word (Pare) 'others' must be a reference by Jāya Senāpati to Someśvara. After having described the feet positions according to Bharata, he gives ten more feet movement according to the views of others. According to Someśvara there are nine feet movements, all of which have been incorporated by Jāya Senāpati. Nija feet movement, is incorporated within the first five movements. Thus, except for Aṅguli Prṣṭhaga and Talahati which are new additions, all the eight movements in the second list, reflect Someśvara's influence.

Regarding the movements of the toes described in Ch.II: 338-340, Jāya Senāpati has followed Someśvara's descriptions but has altered the names of Prasārita and

Samlagna to Stabdha and Svābhāvaya.

Jāya Senāpati has consulted and used Someśvara's Nṛtya Vinoda in his exposition of Deśī also. All the twenty one Deśī sthānakas, twenty-six Deśī earthly cāris, sixteen Deśī aerial cāris and eighteen Utpluti Karaṇas dealt with by Someśvara, have been incorporated by him. He even uses the word Kapālasparśana Karaṇa as rendered in the Nṛtya Vinoda instead of Kapālacūraṇa given by others. The above account indicates that Jāya Senāpati has acknowledged Someśvara's proficiency in both Mārgī and Deśī. He appears to have studied the Nṛtya Vinoda in detail since he has incorporated a lot of information from it, specially for interpreting Bharata and rendering the subject of Mārgī more comprehensively on the one hand and for developing the subject of Deśī on the other hand.

#### Basava Bhūpāla

Basava Bhūpāla (1684 A.D. to 1710 A.D.) alias Basappa Nāik of the Kelaḍi dynasty, who ruled from Keladi over large parts of Karnāṭaka is the author of the Śivatattvaratnākara. Like the Mānasollāsa, the Śivatattvaratnākara is also an encyclopaedic work in Sanskrit, dealing with varied branches of knowledge. Here the author has mentioned that the work is written in answer to his son Somashekhara's request to learn all knowledge (Sarvavidyā). It consists of hundred and eight

Taraṅgas (ripples) or subsections distributed into nine Kallolas ~~ie~~ (waves) or main sections. The third, fourth, fifth and sixth taraṅgas of the sixth Kallola are devoted entirely to the subject of dance. A large number of verses have been taken verbatim from the Nṛtya Vinoda, such as in Ch.IV:22-3 describing Utsāha dr̥ṣṭi, in Ch.V: 100 describing Avanitta hasta and in Ch.VI:66-7, 67-8, 76-7, 82-3, 83-4, 84-5 describing Sampāda, Svastika, Ekapāda, Samacūci, Viṣamasūci and Khaṇḍasūci respectively. Besides these, most of the descriptions given by Basava Bhūpāla have been paraphrased from the Nṛtya Vinoda. For instance the description of Pūrṇa cheek in Ch.IV:99, shows striking similarity with its description given by Someśvara. Regarding the Nṛtta hastas such as Arālakātakē-mukha, Nitamba, Keśabandha, Latā, Pakṣavañcita, Pakṣapradyotaka, Garudapakṣa, Daṇḍapakṣa, Ūrdhvamaṇḍalin, Pārśvamāṇḍalin, Muṣṭikasvastika and Nalinīpadmakōśa for which there are many divergent views, the opinions of Someśvara have been mentioned. Thus the reference to experts in hand movements (Hasta viśe-shagnaihi) in Ch.V:33 can be attributed to Someśvara. Similarly, his views have been utilized by Basava Bhūpāla to describe the controversial Samyuta hastas such as Utsāṅga, Niṣadha and Gajadanta. The usages of the glances based on Sañcari bhāvas have been listed separately in Ch. IV:46-61 of the Śivatattva Ratnākara. These usages are not mentioned in the Nāṭyaśāstra and it is probable that this idea and matter may have come down

from Someśvara, since they bear a lot of similarity with the usages given by him.

However, in the entire work Basava Bhūpāla has never mentioned Someśvara by name. There should be a strong reason for it. It is probably because Basava Bhūpāla wanted to make himself known as a greater scholar than Someśvara. But a comparison of the two works shows that Someśvara's Nṛtya Vinoda is far superior than the dance chapters of Śivatattva Ratnākara<sup>which</sup> is only a minor reproduction of it.

There are other writers on dance and allied subjects who have acknowledged Someśvara as an authority on the dance and music and this indicates that they must have made use of the Nṛtya Vinoda. They are Śāradātānyā\*, author of Bhāvaprakāśam, Kumbhakarṇa\* author of Sangītarāja, Hammīra†, author of Sṛngarahara and Catura Damodara†, author of Sangīta Darpaṇa.

To sum up, the Nṛtya Vinoda had been an important source of reference for Śārṅgadeva, Pārśvadeva, Jāya Senāpati and Basava Bhūpāla. Though, all these writers have based their works primarily on the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata, it is Someśvara's Nṛtya Vinoda which has provided the basis for post-Bharata innovations. Thus, Someśvara's most important contribution is his treatment of the Deśi material relating to Sthānakas, Cāris and Utpluti Karaṇas, for which his Nṛtya

---

† vide Bharata kośa pp. viii, 971  
S. D. pp. 28, 29 Sl. 171 - 182.

Vinoda is the earliest extant source. But his treatment of the Mārgi material should not be disregarded merely on the ground of the subject matter, being handed down by earlier texts, because even here, Someśvara has shown his versatility by incorporating some diverse traditions as well. It is because of these additional features, that the Nṛtya Vinoda had always been in the limelight and was considered by later writers as a work of merit.

\* उत्तरास्ता वत्तयः साङ्गा भोजसौमैधरादिभिः ।  
 तस्मादासां स्वरूपं तु दिग्मात्रं समुदाहृतम् ॥ २१ ॥  
 भावप्रकाशम् ; प्रथमोऽधिकारः ।

भट्टाभिनवगुप्तार्यपादैरेतत्प्रकाशितम् ।  
 इतः परं विशेषास्तु भोजसौमैधरादिभिः ॥ ६ ॥  
 भावप्रकाशम् ; सप्तमोऽधिकारः ।

श्री सौमैधरभोजराजराजितान् ग्रन्थान् विलोक्य त्यम् ।  
 तत्साहेजं समुच्चितं कुरुते श्री कालसेनो नृपः ॥ ४० ॥  
 संगतिराजा ; प्रथमः पाठ्यश्लोकेशः ।