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 Bhūloka-malla Somesvara III. It comprises of four hundred and fifty-five ślokas within which Somesvara 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 Somesvara has incorporated those laksāṇas (features) of earlier centuries which were faithfully continued, but has eliminated those laksāṇas which were discontinued in the practise of dance in the subsequent years. In order to give the correct picture of the dance scene in Karnātaka 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 Nrtya 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 Nātya, Tāṇḍava, Lāsyā, Lāghava, Viṣama and Vikata. Next, the descriptions of Nāta, Nartaki, Nartaka, Vaitālika, Gārāṇa and Kolāṭīka 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 Āṅga (major limbs), Upāṅga (features), and Pratyāṅga (minor limbs), Someśvara gives the details of their movements and their usage in dance. With the exception of few dissimilarities, the treatment of Āṅgika Abhinaya in the Nrtya Vinoda is to a large extent in concordance with the Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata. The subjects covered under Āṅga, Upāṅga and Pratyāṅga are as follows:

I. Āṅgas (Major limbs)
(a) Thirteen head movements comprising of Akampita (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 sidewise), Nyañcita (shoulders raised to touch the head), Parivāhita (circular movement), Parāvṛttta (turned away), Utkṣipta (turned upwards), Adhogata (turned downwards), and Lolita (turned in all directions).

(b) Five shoulder movements namely Ucchrita (raised), Srasta (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 Apaṣta (reverting back to the front).

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

(a) Seven varieties of eyebrow movements - Utksipta (raised), Patita (lowered), Bhrūkti (knitted), Catura (pleasing), Kūncita (bent), Sphurita (quivering) and Sahaja (natural).

(b) Three groups of eye movements based upon Rasa, Sthāyi Bhāva and Saṅcaribhāva.

In the first group are Kāntā (erotic), Bhayānaka (fearful), Hāsya (humorous), Karuna (sorrowful), Adbhuta (wonderous), Raudra (furious), Vīra (heroic), and Bibhatsa (fearful).

In the second group are Snigdha (affectionate), Hṛṣṭa (rapturous), Dīna (distressed), Kṛuddha (cruel), Drpta (proud), Bhayānvita (fearful), Jugupsita (disgust), and Vismita (surprise).

In the third group are Śunya (vacant), Malina (impure), Śrānta (drooping), Lajjānvita (bashful), Gāna (languid), Sankṣīta (doubtful), Viśānna (depressed), Mukula (bud-like), Kūncita (curved), Abhitapta (distressed), Jimha (athwart), Lalita (graceful), Vitarkita (pondering), Ardhamukula (half-opened bud), Vibhṛanta (distracted), Vipluta (Scattered), Keśkara (squinting), Vikośa (wide open), Trasta (timid), and Madira (intoxicated).
(c) Seven kinds of nose movements - Nata (closed), Manda (slightly pressed), Vikrṣṭa (fully blown), Socchvāsa (breathing out), Vikūṇita (compressed) and Svabhāviki (natural).

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

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

(f) Eight kinds of jaw movements - Vyādhir (opened), Śithila (slackened), Vakra (crooked), Sambata (joined) Calasamhata (joined and moving), Pracaila (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 Niskarsana (drawing out).

(h) Five varieties of tongue movements - Rijvi (straight), Vakra (crooked), Nata (lowered), Lola (swinging) and Pronnata (raised).
Lastly, four fascial colours are described, namely Sahaja (natural), Prasanna (clear), Rakta (red) and Syama (dark).

III Pratyangas (minor limbs)

(a) Eight movements of the arms - Sarala (simple), Pronnata (raised), Nyača (lowered), Kučita (bent), lalita (graceful), Lolita (swinging), Galita (shaken) and Parāvr̥tta (turned back).

(b) Four movements of the wrists - Ākučita (moving out), Nikučita (moving in), DhraMITa (circular) and Sama (natural).

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

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

(e) Five movements of the shanks - Nihasr̥ta (stretched forward), Parāvr̥tta (keōt backwards), Tiraścina (side touching the ground), Kampita (tremulous) and Bahikr̥nta (moving outwards).

(f) Nine movements of the feet - Ghaṭīta (striking with the hēel), Ghaṭītotsedha (striking with the toe and
heel), Mardita (sole rubbing the ground), Tādita (striking with toes), Agraga (slipping the foot forward), Pāṛṣṇiga (moving backwards on the heels), Pāṛśvaga (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), Kuṇcita (contracted), Prasarīta (stretched) and Samlagna (joined).

After dealing with Āṅgika Abhinaya, Somesvara takes up the subject of the Sthānakas (postures), Gāris (feet movements) and Karaṇas (jumps) relating to Deśi 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 Āṅga, 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, Gāris and Utpūlti Karaṇas. For this Somesvara must have in all probability utilized the Brhaddeśī (Magnum opus of Deśī Art) of Matanga. This is not a mere conjecture, but
based on Someśvara's own statement in the previous chapter of Gīṭa Vinoda, that he subscribes to the views of Mataṅga.

In the Nrtya Vinoda, Someśvara has at several instances acknowledged the views of scholars in general, but has not specifically named any of them. The terms 'Nrtya Nāṭya ca Kovidaihi, Nāṭya Vedibhihi, Budaihi, Nāṭya Viśāradaihi, Nāṭya Kovidaihi, Nipunaihi, Vicakṣanaihi, Maṇiśibhihi, Niyoktribhihi, Viśārdaihi, Kavibhihi, Hastalakṣaṇapūragaihi, Kara Karana Kovidaihi, Hastalakṣaṇavedibhihi, Hastaprayoktrubhihi, Nrtya Viśāradaihi, Nrūta vidyā Vicakṣanaihi, Nāṭyasāstra Viśāradaihi, Hastasya kovidaihi, Nartakaihi, Nartana kovidaihi, Nrūttata- ttvagnaihi, occur at several places throughout the entire length of the Nrtya Vinoda. These, by themselves do not help in revealing the identity of the sources which Someśvara must have consulted for the compilation of the Nrtya 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 Brhaddeśi of Mataṅga (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 Gītā Vinoda, Someśvara has mentioned Bharata and Mataṅga by name. Here, he says that it would be futile to discuss the laksanas 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 concerned, assessing its utility to Someśvara in relation to Nrtya, 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 Nātya Śāstra, commentary to the Nātya Śāstra of Abhinavagupta describing certain parallel practices also requires to be analysed to see how far the opinions of Abhinavagupta have influenced Someśvara.
As mentioned earlier Somesvara makes a direct reference to Bharata in the Gita Vinoda chapter. Before expatiating on the Rāgas, Somesvara makes the following remark about Bharata:

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 Somesvara 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 Āṅga, Uḍāṅga and Pratyāṅga, there are conflicting ideas between Bharata and Somesvara.
Bharata has divided the body into Āṅga and Upāṅga and has also indicated the Pratyāṅgas. In the category of Āṅga 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 Āṅgas 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Āṅgas</th>
<th>Someśvara (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bharata (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palms</td>
<td>Shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hips</td>
<td>Hips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest</td>
<td>Chest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sides</td>
<td>Sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feet</td>
<td>Belly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upāṇga</td>
<td>Someśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bharata (6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Someśvara (8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyes (including eyeballs</td>
<td>Eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and eyelids)</td>
<td>Eyebrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyebrows</td>
<td>Nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose</td>
<td>Cheeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheeks</td>
<td>Lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lips</td>
<td>Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin</td>
<td>Teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tongue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pratyāṇga</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bharata (5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Someśvara (6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>Wrists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belly</td>
<td>Palms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thighs</td>
<td>Knees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks</td>
<td>Shanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Āṅgas 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 Pratyāṅgas. 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 Somesvara 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 Somesvara has stated, that the matters stated by him, are in accordance with the views of experts in Nāṭya (Nāṭyaavedibhihi). Since the plural has been used, it is unlikely that Somesvara 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. Somesvara 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, Somesvara 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 Prasarita, 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 Prasarita definition. Prasarita has been described by Bharata as stretching of the sides. The usages of Prasarita that have been prescribed by Someśvara and the meaning of the word Prasarita itself conveys that this is also what Someśvara had in mind.

The last Āṅga 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 Somesvara 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 Somesvara 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 Nātya (Nātyaviśāradaihi) probably include Bharata.

The Upāngas, beginning with the eyebrows are taken up next in the Nṛtya Vinoda. Seven kinds of eyebrow movements are enumerated, of which utksipta, Patita, Bhrūkuti, Catura, Kuñcita and Sahaja are in the Nātyaśāstra also. The only non-conformity is in the seventh movement, which is Recita in the Nātyaśāstra 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 Somesvara 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 Nāṭya-śāstra. Again it appears that Bharata is drawn upon in Sloka 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 Nāṭya Śāstra. Some manuscripts of the Nāṭya Śāstra have Vilāsa as one of the usages of (Ni) Kuṇcita. 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 Sloka 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, Śthāyibhāvas and Saṃcaribhāvas is in keeping with the Nāṭya Śāstra 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 Hāsyā, Adbhuta, Vīrā, Raudra, Dīna, Krudha, Bhayānvita and Jyagupsita. Striking similarities are also evident in the descriptions of the transitory glances such as Viśadini, Mukula, Jimha and Dalita. One special feature of the glances described in the Nṛtya Vinoda is, that unlike the Nātyaśāstra which has described usages only for glances based on Āsā and Sthāyibhāva, the Nṛtya Vinoda gives usages for glances based on Saṃcāri bhāvas also. These usages relating to Saṃcāri bhāvas might have been borrowed from some other text because Somesvara makes a reference at two places that is, in Śloka 1075 and Śloka 1082, about the experts (Budhaihi, Drstikovidaihi) having prescribed them. In the definition of Raudri glance in Śloka 1050, the first line is almost verbatim to the corresponding line in the Nātyaśāstra and so, the wise (Vicaksana) could perhaps include Bharata.

Next, the Śloka enumerating the nose movements in the Nṛtya Vinoda is identical with the corresponding Śloka in the Nātyaśāstra. 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 Sācchvāsa 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 Socchāvāsa. This definition contradicts the very meaning of the word Socchāvāsa and its usage prescribed by Bharata and Someśvara. Socchāvāsa means exhalting breath. Thus, the definition of Socchāvāsa 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 Āloka 1091, defining Svābhāvīka.

Close adherence to Bharata's views is the distinguishing feature in Someśvara's description of the next Upāṇga 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 Upānga taken up by Someśvara is the lip and in contrast with the earlier Upānga, 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, Samdaśṭaka and Samudgaka. Of these only Kampana, Samdaśṭaka and Viniguhana have been considered by Someśvara and of these three, Samdaśṭaka 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, Kūnita, Āyata, 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, Kūnita, Āyata 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 Kūnita 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 Vyādhira none of the chin movements mentioned by Someśvara, can be connected with chin movements stated by Bharata. Only Vyādhira correspond to Bharata's description of Cukkita. Certainly the reference to the learned (Buhāhi) in the Nṛtya Vinoda ślakas 1112 and 1113 must be to persons other than Bharata.

In the teeth movements Mardana and Khandana given by Someśvara, agree with Kuttana and Khandana respectively as described by Bharata. Chinna, Sama, Daśa and Lehita of Bharata have been eliminated and in its place, Someśvara has given Kartana, Dhārana and Niskaraṇa. The experts (Vīśārdaihi) 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 Upānga in the Nṛtya Vinoda, Someśvara has described five movements of the tongue. They are Ējvi, Vakra, Nata, Loka and Promata. Bharata has not spoken of tongue movements. But while describing chin movements, he speaks of Lehini which concerns the tongue as well. Whereas Sārṅgadeva 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 Somesvara and Bharata before winding up the discussion on Upāṅgas. Both writers agree on this subject.

After the discussion of Upāṅgas, Somesvara 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 Nrtya Vinoda as well as Nrtyaśāstra. As mentioned earlier, Bharata has described hand gestures in the category of Angas, whereas Somesvara 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 Nrṛtta hastas in Nrtyaśāstra, whereas there are only twenty seven Nrṛtta hastas in Nrtya Vinoda. Despite this variance, both Bharata and Somesvara say that the total number of hand-gestures are sixty four.
Somesvara has eliminated Lalita and Valita mentioned by Bharata. This is probably because as clearly stated by Jaya Senapati in the Nṛttaratnavali, Lalita corresponds to Pallava and Valita corresponds to Lata.

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. Somesvara 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 Somesvara are not found in Nātyaśāstra.

Some striking similarities are to be seen in the definitions of Kangula, Alapadma, Urnapabha, Samdamśa and Khatakāmukha discussed in both the works. In certain instances, Somesvara has gone further than Bharata, by giving the exact positions of the hand as well, such as in Ardhaśandra, Mrgaśira and Padmakosa. Regarding Muṣṭi also, Somesvara 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 Arālā is 'bent.' Owing to this mistake in Arālā, Sukhatunda is also wrong, because Somesvara has derived Sukhatunda from the wrong Arālā position. Once the correction is made in Arālā, Sukhatunda automatically will be corrected.

Next in the field of combined hand gestures, the descriptions of the first two gestures, Arjali and Kapotha seem to have got interchanged by Somesvara. A new variation of Larkata is an interesting feature rendered by Somesvara 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 Arālā hands are contrarily placed and are upturned and bent, the Utsaṅga hand will be the result. Instead of Arālā hands, Somesvara has recorded the use of Sarpaśira hands. Niśadha is probably the most controversially defined hand gesture. Different authors have given definitions for Niśadha which are disparate. In the G.O.S. edition of Nāṭyaśāstra there are four definitions of Niśadha. In the introduction the editor has said that the third definition of Niśadha 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 Niśadha 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 Nāṭya-śāstra. Besides this, Jaya Serāpati has indicated in the Nṛttarāmāvalī that this definition was the one given by Bharata. He has also noted the definitions given by Abhinavagupta and Kṛttidhara 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 Manasakṣa is used in Vardhamāna of Nṛtya Vinoda whereas Hamsapakṣa is mentioned for Vardhamāna of Nāṭyaśāstra.

Among the Nṛttta hastas, Ārālakhatakāmukha, Avidhavaktra, Sucyāsyā, Dandapakṣa, and Pallava described in the Nṛtya Vinoda differ from their corresponding definitions in the Nāṭyaśāstra. Regarding certain other Nṛttta hastas there are minor differences in both texts. For instance Someśvara prescribes in place of Pataṅga hasta the use of Tripataṅga hasta in Mitamba, Keśabandha and Latā hastas, and Arāla hasta to be applied in Urdhvaṃdalaṅ and Pārśvaṃdalaṅ and Uromanḍalāṅ. A slight disparity is to be seen between the Sucyāsyā
hasta described by Someśvara and the corresponding Sucīmukha hasta explained by Bharata. Not only are the names different, but the movements themselves are varied. Thus, with regards to Nr̥tta 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 Karanas). These Hasta karanas are closely connected with the hand gestures and they were even used in the description of some of the Nr̥tta hastas. Since the descriptions of the four Hasta karanas are almost identical in both the texts, references in the Nr̥tya Vinoda to experts in hand movements (Hastasya Kovidaihi) in Sloka 1273, to dancers (Nartakaihi) in Sloka 1274, to those skilled in dance (Nartana Kovidaihi), in Sloka 1275, and to those having knowledge of Nr̥tta (Nr̥ttatattvagñaihi) 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 Nr̥tyasāstra. Thus, the learned mentioned in Sloka 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 fifteen feet movements are described in the Nṛtya-Śāstra. There is one major difference between these two sets of feet movements. In the Nṛtya Śāstra 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, Ghaṭṭīṭa, Ghaṭīṭosedha, Tāḍīta and Pāṛṇīga are all combinations of Anḍita and Kuṇḍita feet positions. As mentioned earlier Sūci and Nija are only static positions. They correspond to the descriptions of 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 Nṛtya-Śāstra. 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 Nṛtya-Śāstra. The description of the toe movements completes the description of Nṛgika Abhinaya in the Nṛtya Vinoda. Almost all the limbs, from head to toe, which have
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 Natya Sastra are absent in the Nrtya Vinoda.

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

Thus, a comparative study of the Nrtya Vinoda with Natya Sastra reveals that Somesvara partially followed Bharata in matters relating to Āngika Abhinaya, whereas he completely deviated from Bharata in matters concerning Sthānakas, Cāris and Karanas. Somesvara's utilization of Natya Sastra can therefore said to be limited to certain aspects of Āngika Abhinaya alone.
Abhinavagupta

Abhinavagupta the Kashmiri scholar of the 9th century A.D. has in his commentary to the Nātyaśāstra 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 Karanas. 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 Nisadha, wherein the reference to the learned in hand poses (Hasta laksana pāragaihi) and learned in Nātya (Nātya 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 Nisadha by those learned in hand poses. Again, he says that according to the learned in Nātya, Nisadha 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 Mitamba, Kesabandha and Lata hastas, Abhinavagupta states that there are writers other than
Bharata, who approve of Tripatāka hasta in place of Pataṅga hasta. Someśvara, has followed this view and has therefore introduced Tripatāka hasta in place of Pataṅga hasta for use in Vītamba, Keśabandha and Latā.

Besides those mentioned above, there are many more different views expressed in the Nrtya Vinoda which has not been mentioned by Abhinavagupta earlier. The major discordance is to be seen in the varied explanations provided by Someśvara for Arālakāṭakāmukha, Pallava, Sucyāśya, Avidhavaktra, Urdhvamaṇḍalini, Pārśvamaṇḍalini and Uromaṇḍalini. 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 Desī material is concerned, Abhinavagupta does not provide any information. So none of the Sthānākas, 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.

Matanga

Matanga is known to have been one of the earliest writers on Desī music and dance. Just as the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata had acquired cannonic authority for matters related to Mārgi, the Brhaddesī of Matanga was recognized by later
writers as a standard and authoritative treatise for matters concerning Desi. In dance the Sthāṅkas, Cāris, karaṇas, Aṅgahāras and Recakas expounded by Bharata are called Mārgī and the later developments and innovations are defined as Desī. Though Kohala, who is dated chronologically earlier to Mataṅga is believed to have treated Desī music and Desī dance in relation to the Uparūpkas (drama forms which developed in times subsequent to Bharata), it appears that Mataṅga is the first writer, who had codified and elaborated on Desī music as well as Desī 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 Sangītā. It is, however, unfortunate that what is available of Brhaddeśī today is only a fraction of Mataṅga'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 Vādya and Nrtya 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 Nrtya ratnakoṣa, Kumbhakarna has mentioned (in Śloka 513-514) seven additional hastas as given by some followers of the Brhaddeśī (समीतौ दर्पकार-सन्तिनि बृद्धदेशीविदां मले। Jāya Senāpati mentions Mataṅga and the dance chapter of the Brhaddeśī and also quotes him. Jāya sets forth the sixteen
foot movements (Pādas) of Desī-dance as given by Matanga. Jaya also quotes a line from the end of Matanga's treatment of Pātas which are a kind of leg movements and have been included under Desī Gāris by some writers. VII.53-57 Vādyasāsanaḥ Santosamāraḥ hiṣṇyataḥ | matsyaśāmataḥ pātaḥ-ṣuṣṭiḥañgāyaḥ janāḥ ||

The Nrūtta section of the Brhaddeśi is referred to, by Jaya Senāpati in VII.21, while speaking of the two kinds of Vādyasāsanaḥ Santosamāraḥ hiṣṇyataḥ | matsyaśāmataḥ pātaḥ-ṣuṣṭiḥañgāyaḥ janāḥ ||

Vādyasāsanaḥ Santosamāraḥ hiṣṇyataḥ | matsyaśāmataḥ pātaḥ-ṣuṣṭiḥañgāyaḥ janāḥ ||

Somesvara has not mentioned Matanga by name while elucidating on the Desī aspects, and neither has he specifically referred to the dance chapters of the Brhaddeśi. But he has spoken of Matanga with reference to Vṛttas in music. He says he has listed the Vṛttas in the manner earlier rendered by Matanga. This indicates that Somesvara was aware of Matanga and that he also shared the views of Matanga. It is therefore most likely that general references to experts while describing the Desī Sthānakas, Gāris and Karānas are anonymous attributions to Matanga. Following is a list of the references which can neither be identified conclusively with Matanga, because of the non-availability of the Brhaddeśi, nor can the possibility of their being references to Matanga be altogether rejected. They are Budhaihi in Sl.1311, 1380, 1389, Viduhi in Sl.1313, Nrtya Kovidaihi in Sl.1314, Nrtya Vādyasāsanaīhi in Sl.1315, Nartana Kovidaihi in Sl.1316,
1365, Sthāna lakaṇa Vedibhihi in Sl.1320. Manisibhihi in Sl.1336 and 1139. Nātya Kovidaihi in Sl.1341, 1360, 1361, 1391, Sūribhihi in Sl.1346, 1366. Nātystalitaihi in Sl.1371, Sūribhihi in Sl.1346, 1366. Nātystalitaihi 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 Somesvara has mentioned Matanga by name earlier in music, the possibility of Somesvara's access to and utilization of the Brhaddeśi for the compilation of the Nṛtya Vinoda is a possibility.

Latter writers

After examining the extent of Somesvara's utilization of other texts, it will be worthwhile to consider how useful Somesvara'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 Somesvara, 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 Sangītaratnakara. Śārṅgadeva was followed by Pārvadeva and Jaya Senāpati who entertained respect for Somesvara not as a king, but as a powerful writer on dance.
Four centuries later Basava Bhūpala seems to have been inspired to write a book called the 'Śiva tattva ratnakara' 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 Mānasollasa from which work he has borrowed freely, including matters concerning dance, which however has not been acknowledged.

Śāṅgadeva, Parsvadeva, Jāya Senāpati and Basava Bhūpala 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 Mānasollasa with its Nṛtya Vinoda. The availability of the Manuscripts of Mānasollasa in Devanāgari 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 Nrtya Vinoda, with the works of Sārāṅgadeva, Pārvavadeva, Jāya Senāpati and Basava Bhūpalā.

Sārāṅgadeva

Sārāṅgadeva 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 Singhēya, the Sangītaratnākara contains a thorough, analytical and exhaustive exposition of Gītā, Vādyā and Nrtya 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, Sārāṅgadeva has treated at great length, the subject of dance. Most of it is fundamentally based, on the Nrtya-śāstra and Abhinavagupta’s commentary on it. A comparative study of the chapters on dance of Sangītaratnākara and Nrtya Vinoda of the Mānasollāsa reveals that Sārāṅgadeva has also used the Nrtya Vinoda for Ādīgika Abhinaya and more so for Deśī material.

Sārāṅgadeva has respectfully acknowledged Someśvara in the beginning of the Sangītaratnākara. He places Someśvara
amongst the list of great authors like Rudrata, Mānyabhūpala and Bhoja.

In the chapter on dance, Ārīragadeva has made anonymous references to Somasēvara in the following instances. In VII.35-7, Ārīragadeva has said that other people include the shoulders in the list of Aṅgas. It is Somaśvara who has spoken of shoulders and its movements which are identical to those listed by Ārīragadeva. In the same verse Ārīragadeva mentions that there are other experts who include wrists, knees and ornaments worn on the limbs, in the category of Pratyāṅgas. Somaśvara has incorporated wrists and knees in the description of Pratyāṅgas. Again the movements listed under wrists and knees in the Šaṅgītaratnākara show perfect concordance with the corresponding material in the Nrtya Vinoda. As far as our knowledge based on available texts goes, the Nrtya 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 Nrtya Vinoda have been incorporated in the Šaṅgītaratnākara. It is in the Nrtya Vinoda that Somaśvara 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 Ārīragadeva from the Nrtya Vinoda.
In Ch.VII:198-201 Sarngadeva has given several varieties of Utsanga hasta according to the views of different experts. Of these, the first variety of Utsanga hasta requiring the use of Arāla hasta, is from Bharata and the last variety requiring in its place, the use of Sarpaśīra hasta is from Someśvara. The two intermediary varieties are the ones to be found in the commentary of Abhinavagupta. Thus, for the last variety, Sarngadeva must have consulted the Nrtya Vinoda of Someśvara directly, since Abhinavagupta does not mention it. Three of the usages for Utsanga hasta also seem to have been borrowed from the Nrtya Vinoda. They are embrace, cold and bashfullness of women.

In Ch.VII:202-4 the usages of Khatakāvarndhamānaka hasta as rendered by Bharata, Someśvara and Abhinavagupta have been presented by Sarngadeva. After putting forth Bharata's view, Sarngadeva states that "according to another view", (Matāntara) Khatakāvarndhamānaka 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 Khatakāvarndhamānaka hasta.

Though normally, Sarngadeva gives the version of Bharata first and then the opinions of other experts, in Ch.VII:209-11 Sarngadeva has indicated his preference for the definition laid down by Abhinavagupta which is accepted by Someśvara.
These verses describe the Nisadha 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 Nrtya Vinoda by Someśvara, have not been acknowledged or commented upon by Śāṅgadeva. Perhaps the usages of Mākara hasta may have been omitted, because they are very extensive and Śāṅgadeva has given limited usages for all hastas, normally taking a few, each from different authorities. But regarding definitions, Śāṅgadeva has incorporated the different views of various experts with some exceptions such as the conflicting descriptions of Vardhamāna hasta in the Nrtya Vinoda and Nisadha hasta given in the Nāṭyaśāstra.

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

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

In Ch.VII:224-9, the last description of Arālakhatakā- mukha hasta ascribed to others (Anye) is the description found in Nrtya Vinoda.
Four varieties of Pallava hasta have been explained individually in Ch.VII:239-42 by Śrīnāgadeva, 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 Sangītaratnakāra must include Someśvara.

In Ch.VII:244-46, the definition of Uttānavaṃcita 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 Śrīnāgadeva.

In Ch.VII:246-47, after describing the Lata hasta, Śrīnāgadeva, like Abhinavagupta has stated, that some writers (Keciś Ścārya) prescribe Tripatāka hasta for use in Lata hasta, as well as for Keśabandha and Hitamba hastas. Someśvara, has prescribed only Tripatāka hasta, for use in the above mentioned Nṛtta hastas.

In Ch.VII: 259-60 Śrīnāgadeva mentions about two divergent views regarding Garudapaksa, which even Abhinavagupta had noticed. After describing Garudapaksa 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 Pataṅka hasta) and this is not acceptable to Muni (Bharata). This would mean that the Garudapaksa with Tripatāka hasta given by Someśvara in
the Nṛtya Vinoda was being practised despite the fact, that it was not according to the tradition of Bharata.

Śāṅgadeva has in Ch.VII: 260-61, 262-3, 264-7 described Urdhvamandalin, Pāravamandalin and Uromandalin hastas respectively, with Pataṅga hasta and has also noted in the end, that some mention Hamsapāka hasta in place of Pataṅga hasta. He does not acknowledge the use of Arāla hasta, for use in the above mentioned Nṛttā hastas, which happens to be the one prescribed by Somesvara. Perhaps, Śāṅgadeva has felt, that the use of the Arāla hasta is not an acceptable practise.

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

Thus with regard to Nṛttā hastas Śāṅgadeva has followed Somesvara’s description in most cases, but in a few instances he has failed to comment on them.

In Ch.VII:307-12 Śāṅgadeva, has enumerated five positions of the hips, of which one of them is Nivṛttā. This term Nivṛttā has been given by Somesvara, unlike Bharata who uses the term Nivṛttā. The usage given by Śāṅgadeva, is also similar to that prescribed by Somesvara. The descriptions and usages of Udāhita hip movement is very similar, both in the Sangitaratnakara and the Nṛtya Vinoda and they differ
from the description of Udvāhita found in the Natyaśāstra. After Nisadha hasta, this is the first instance when Sarnga- 
deva has excluded Bharata's description and has given in its 
place Someśvara's explanation.

In Ch.VII: 312-25 Sarṅga-deva 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 foot movements 
rendered by Someśvara, are already included in Bharata's list.

In Ch.VII: 326-29, all the five shoulder movements 
indicated by Sarṅga-deva are from Someśvara. Bharata does not 
mention shoulder movements at all. In place of Samalagna and 
Ekānta which are the terms used by Someśvara the words 
and Ekocca, karmalagna are used by Sarṅga-deva.

Sarṅga-deva has described some of the arm movements 
presented by Someśvara, after giving the descriptions of the 
arm movements mentioned in the Natyaśāstra. In Ch.VII:355-52, 
Sarṅga-deva 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 Nṛtya Vinoda 
eight arm movements; of these, only two namely Sarala and 
Kuṅcita 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 Śāṇgīnadeva, 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 Somesvara, Śāṇgīnadeva has prescribed its use for pointing out the things on the ground. The description and usages of Kuṇcita as given by Śāṇgīnadeva, is almost similar to its description given by Somesvara. The other six arm movements indicated by Somesvara are also found in the Sangītaratnakara, but they bear different nomenclatures. Thus his descriptions of Pronnata and Nyāncita correspond to Urdhvaṣasta and Adhomukha, given in the Sangītaratnakara. Lālita arm movement found in Urtya Vinoda, fits in with the description of Namra given in the Sangītaratnakara and even two usages, which are praising and holding a garland are alike in both the texts. As far as Lolita of the Urtya Vinoda is concerned, the same movement is described in the Sangītaratnakara, but is designated as Andolita, which has the same meaning as Lolita. Concordance is also noticeable in the descriptions of Calita, given by Somesvara and Mandagati found in the Sangītaratnakara. Calita has been described, as turning and moving the elbows and Mandagati 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 Mandalagati, making it all the more probable, that Calita and Mandalagati are the same movements. The arm reaching the back, is described by Someśvara as Parāvṛttta and the same is called Prsthāṇusārīn by Śārṅgadeva. The two usages prescribed for Prsthāṇusārīn have been mentioned earlier by Someśvara for Parāvṛttta. 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 Nrtya 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 Nrtya Vinoda which consists of Nihaerta, Parāvṛttta, Tiraścīna, Bahirgata and Kampita. Though, it is
Someśvara who has first enumerated these five shank movements, it is Śāṅgadeva who has described them clearly. It would have been however more instructive if Śāṅgadeva 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. Śāṅgadeva, has added these additional limbs, along with the Pratyāṅgas mentioned by Bharata. In Ch.VII: 369-72 five wrist movements are explained by Śāṅgadeva of which four of them are found in Nṛtya Vinoda. They are Nikuṇcita, Ākuṇcita, Sama and Brhāmita. The extra wrist movement, contained in the Sangītaratnakara is Gala. Gala is not actually a new movement but it is only a combination of Nikuṇcita and Ākuṇcita. Śāṅgadeva and Someśvara differ in the descriptions for the Nikuṇcita and Ākuṇcita movements. Śāṅgadeva has said, that the wrist bent outwards is Nikuṇcita and the wrist bent inwards is Ākuṇcita. Someśvara has not mentioned either the definition or usages of Nikuṇcita, but from the description and usages of Ākuṇcita as given by Someśvara, it can be said, that according to him Nikuṇcita must be the wrist bent inwards. Ākuṇcita 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 Akuncita hand, Sarngadeva has given the same usage given by Someśvara. Someśvara's definition seems to be the correct one and it is Sarngadeva, who seems to have got the definitions of Nikuncita and Akuncita interchanged. The usages given for Nikuncita by Sarngadeva are indicating gift and giving refuge. He probably means receiving of a gift.

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

The glances come up first in the discussion of the Upāṅgas in the Śangītaratnakara. It is probably from
Someśvara that Sārṅgadeva 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 Sārṅgadeva 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, Sārṅgadeva owes them to Someśvara. Vivartita, Kampita, Viśrṣṭa, Vinīgūhita, Samdāṣṭaka and Samudga are the six varieties of lip movements, which have come down from Bharata and Udvṛttā, Viṅkāsin, Ayata 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. Sārṅgadeva 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 angula and it is to be employed to indicate sleeping, eating, fatigue and seeing
with wonder. Sarngadeva follows this description closely, though he has not incorporated the last usage. Similarly, the definition of Pracala given by Someśvara, has been reproduced by Sarngadeva for Calita and has incorporated two of the usages rendered for Pracala. The definition for Sphurita given by Sarngadeva 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. Sarngadeva, 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 Sangitaratnakara, 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 cumbana) provided by Sarngadeva for Calasamhata is similar to the usage (strībhoge) provided by Someśvara. All the usages given by Someśvara for Vṛyādhir and Lola have not been incorporated by Sarngadeva, but one in each has been utilized, such as yawning for vṛyādhir and chewing for Lola.

Sarngadeva has given eight movements of the teeth in Ch. VII:496-502, of which two appear to have been borrowed from Someśvara. They are Grahaṇa and Niskaraṇa. Someśvara has used the term Dhrāraṇa and the explanation given for it is used in a summarised form by Sarngadeva for Grahaṇa.
Similarly, the definition given for Niskarsana by Sarngadeva is an abridged version of its definition, rendered by Someśvara. Sarngadeva, has given only one usage for it, which is to indicate crying of monkeys which is found in the Nṛtya Vinoda.

In Ch.VII:503-506, six tongue movements have been described in the Sangītaratnakara. Three of these movements share common nomenclature with the tongue movements mentioned in the Nṛtya Vinoda. As such, Sarngadeva who has largely based his work on Bharata’s Nātyaśāstra, must have had to depend on other texts for describing tongue movements, since Bharata has not described tongue movements. Only Lehnini, which was included in the teeth movements by Bharata has been included by Sarngadeva. Rjvi has been described alike by Sarngadeva and Someśvara. But there is non-conformity between them in relation to the description of Vakra. According to Sarngadeva, Vakra is the tongue with the tip turned up in a gaping mouth and it is to be employed to portray the man-lion (Nārāhari). 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. Sarngadeva, has however noted this definition of Someśvara and has given it under another term called Srkkānuga. Also, the usages given by Someśvara for Vakra, have been prescribed by Sarngadeva for Srkkānuga. So it is Srkkānuga and not Vakra
of the Sangitaratnakara, which coincides with the Vakra of Nrtya Vinoda. The Loka tongue movement described in the Sangitaratnakara, corresponds to its description in the Nrtya Vinoda, except for the different usages prescribed in both of them.

In Ch VII:521-2, all the five toe movements explained by Sarngadeva, 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 Sarngadeva. The only difference that is noticed in this context, is that whereas Sarngadeva describes the toes as an Upānga, and the feet as an Ānga, 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 Nrtya Vinoda, has been included by Sarngadeva. The twenty one Deśī Sthānakas, the twenty six Deśī earthly Gāris, the sixteen Deśī aerial Gāris and the eighteen Upālu Kāranas of the Nrtya Vinoda are all described in the Sangitaratnakara without introduction of any change in their movements. The Nrtya Sāstra of Bharata and Abhinavagupta's commentary being of no use for Deśī
references, it is for this subject that Sarngadeva, owes the most to the Nrtya Vinoda of Someśvara.

Pārvavadeva

Ācārya Pārvavadeva, author of the Sangītasamayasāra was a Jaina of the Digambara sect which prevailed largely in Kārnāṭaka. He is believed to have lived around the 13th century A.D., and to have graced several courts, including the Cālukyan court at Kālyāṇi. Pārvavadeva has revealed through the Sangītasamayasāra, 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 Nrtya Vinoda of Someśvara and the Sangīta Cūḍāmani 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, Pārvavadeva may have quoted from this work also.

The Sangītasamayasāra of Pārvavadeva, consists of nine chapters, of which the first five deal with Gīta. The sixth chapter deals with Vāḍya, the seventh with Nrtya, the eighth with Tāla and the ninth with general matters, relating to these three subjects.
The Nrtya 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 Āṅgas according to Bharata are described, but a number of their movements found in the Nāṭyaśāstra and Nrtya 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 Čāris), utpluti karaṇas, Bhramaris, Deśī Āṅgas and four Deśī dances-prani, Prekhaṇa, 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.1 Another reference

1. [another reference]
to Someśvara is made by Parśvadeva in the third chapter of the Sangītatasamayasaśra 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".

Someśvara's name appears once again in the Sangītatasamayasaśra, 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.

There is also one place, where Somesvara has been quoted verbatim in the Sangītatasamayasaśra. In Ch.11:82-92, pp.40-41, and 42 of Sangītatasamayasaśra edited by Āchārya Brhaspati and published by Kunda Kunda Bharati, Delhi, all ten slokas are reproduced verbatim from the Nrtya Vinoda of Someśvara. These verses refer to the kinds of songs, which are liked by different categories of people.

2 श्री सीमेश्वर मृतिल प्रमुखविद्वान स्वामी श्रीमलालोकराम: ॥ ॥
In the chapter on dance in the Sangītasaṃayasāra, Pārvādeva has neither mentioned Someśvara by name nor quoted him, but he seems to have accepted Someśvara’s views by including certain matters from the Nrtya Vinoda. Karihasta Pārvādeva 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. Ārāṇadeva, 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 Pārvādeva, who, inspite of agreeing closely with Bharata, for the controversial hastas like Utsanga, Niṣadha and Sucīmukha, has used Someśvara’s description for Karihasta.

It is in the sphere of Deśī, that Pārvādeva 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, Prsthottanatala, Brāhma, Śāiva and Vṛśabhāsana are the six sthānakas found in the Nrtya Vinoda and these have been omitted by Pārvādeva. Instead, he has given Kūrmāsana, Nāgabandha, Tribhaṇgi, Padmāsana, Antarapadmāsana and
Viṣṇapadmāsana. The remaining fifteen sthānakas are described on the same lines as in Someśvara's Nrṣya Vinoda. Thus the references made by Pārvavadeva to Viśārdaihi in Sl.134, Kovidaihi in Sl.135, Viduhi in Sl.138, Sthānaka Kovidaihi in Sl.140, Buddhaihi in Sl.141, 146, and Vickaśana in Sl.147 can be attributed to Someśvara, considering that his descriptions of Nandryāvarata, Varāhamānaka, Svastika, Vaisnava, Parāvrutta, Gāruḍa, Ekapāda and Čaturāṣāra show close concordance to Someśvara's views. Though no expert is referred to, by Pārvavadeva in the descriptions of Pārvavīddha, Pārvaparāvakam, Parāvrutta, Khandasūci and Samasūci, they are almost similar to Someśvara's descriptions of these sthānakas. Regarding Samapāda, Ekapāraṇi (Ekapāravagata in Nrṣya Vinoda) and Viśamasūci, Pārvavadeva 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 Sangītasamayasaṣāra is the Pālas. These pālas are feet movements similar in concept to Čāris. In Ob.VII:171 while describing the Damaruṣa pāla, Pārvavadeva refers to the experts in Bhāndikabhāṣa (Bhoja and Someśvara). However Pālas have not been described by Someśvara in the Nrṣya Vinoda. A Damaricāri has been described therein, but it does not correspond to the Damaruṣa Pāla.
For the expatiation of the Utpluti Kāraṇas, it is possible that Pārśvadeva had consulted and used the Nrtya Vinoda. Thirteen of the Utpluti Kāraṇas described by him are found in the Nrtya Vinoda bearing same descriptions.

Then, there is a vast amount of Deśī material in the Sangītasamayasāra 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 Nrtya Vinoda does not elucidate on these features. Yet, the usefulness of the Nrtya 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 Kāratiya ruler, king Gaṅapatideva, wrote an important work on dance called the Kṛttaratanāvalī 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 Somēśvara.

The Kṛttaratanāvalī consists of eight chapters of which, the first four, deal with the Mārgī aspect and the remaining
four are concerned with the Desi aspects. Someśvara’s name appears in both these areas. First in Ch.II:89 Jāya Serapati mentions Someśvara! 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-Serapati 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 Latē, both Lalita and Valita have been excluded by Someśvara. Thus Someśvara has given twenty seven Nṛttta 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 Serapati has examined Nṛtya Vinoda in detail and has interpreted it in his own work.

Another place where Jāya Serapati mentions Someśvara, is while describing the Gondali dance, which is a Desi 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 (Bhillī), who sang and danced opposite his camp, during the Bhūtamātrka festival.2

There are other places in the Nṛttaratnāvalī, where

1. पदार्थालय निषिद्धो पलिनयो जगन्नाधिबंशि ।
   कृत्यित्सम नृतस्यस्विधी निम्नमार्गम कृतस्य ।
   सौमदेशप्रसूं जलील सप्तकस्रसमाधी ॥ ५९ ॥

8. सप्तसदीधाम कुमार १५१-५२ See p. 29 of this thesis.
Jay a Senapati has drawn upon Someśvara anonymously. Most of the material in the Nrtya Vinoda that is not found in Bharata has been noticed by Jay a Senapati. These, he has incorporated as additions as in the following cases:

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

In Ch.II: 55-7 of the Nrtraratnāvalī eight movements of the jaw have been explained. They are Vyādhīr, Calita, Lola, Ślatha, Calasamhata, Samhata, Sphurita and Vakra. Calita and Ślatha are only alternate names for Pracala and Sīthila respectively, which are the terms used by Someśvara. The descriptions of Vyādhīr and Calita are missing in the Nrtraratnāvali, whereas the descriptions of the other six jaw movements coincide with their corresponding movements found in Nrtya Vinoda. Since neither Bharata nor Śarīgadeva, 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 Sarṅgadeva. It has already been mentioned while discussing Sarṅgadeva's indebtedness to Someśvara that Rjvi, Srkkānuga (Vakra in Nrtya 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 Sarṅgadeva.

In Ch.II: 62-69 of Nṛttaratnāvali five teeth movements have been described. These five teeth movements are not mentioned in the Nrtyaśāstra and it is the Nrtya Vinoda which mentions them. Except for Niśakarsana, all the other four teeth movements bear different nomenclature from the four corresponding teeth movements in Nrtya Vinoda. Thus, Carvana, Ghedana, Pidana and Grahana are only alternate names for Mardana, Khandana, 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 Nrtyaśāstra, and after Someśvara, it is Sarṅgadeva 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 (Paraśa). 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 Bhrāmīta. Except for this discrepancy, the other shank movements are similar to those of Nṛtya Vinoda.

Again in Ch. II: 339, the word (Para) '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 Āṅguli Prsthaga 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 Prāśarīta and
Samlagna to Stabdha and Svabhavaya.

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 Karanas dealt with by Someśvara, have been incorporated by him. He even uses the word KāpalasparśamKarana as rendered in the Nṛtya Vinoda instead of Kāpalasādrana 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 Naik of the Kelaţi dynasty, who ruled from Keladi over large parts of Karnātaka is the author of the Śivatattvaratnakara. Like the Mānasollāsa, the Śivatattvaratnakara 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 (Sarvavidya). It consists of hundred and eight
Tarangas (ripples) or subsections distributed into nine Kallolas (waves) or main sections. The third, fourth, fifth and sixth tarangas 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 drṣṭi, in Ch. V: 100 describing Avanittta hasta and in Ch. VI: 66-7, 67-8, 76-7, 82-3, 83-4, 84-5 describing Sampāda, Svastika, Ekapāda, Samacuci, Viṣamaśuci and Khaṇḍaśuci 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 Nrtta hastas such as Aralakatakā- mukkha, Nitamba, Keśabandha, Latā, Pakaśaṇcita, Pakaśapradyotaka, Garudapaksa, Daṇḍapaksa, Urdhvamandalin, Parvamandalin, Mustikasvastika and Nalinīpadmakosā for which there are many divergent views, the opinions of Someśvara have been mentioned. Thus the reference to experts in hand movements (Hasta viś- shagnaih) 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 Utsanga, Nisadha and Gajadanta. The usages of the glances based on Saṅcari bhāvas have been listed separately in Ch. IV: 46-61 of the Śivatattva Ratnakara. These usages are not mentioned in the Nātyaśāstra 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 Nrtya Vinoda is far superior than the dance chapters of Sivatattva Ratnākara, which is only a minor reproduction of it.

There are other writers on dance and allied subjects who have acknowledged Someśvara as an authority on dance and music and this indicates that they must have made use of the Nrtya Vinoda. They are Saradātana, author of Bhavaprakṣām, Kumbhakarna, author of Sangītarāja, Hammīra, author of Sṛgarāhara and Catura Damodara, author of Sangīta Darpana.

To sum up, the Nrtya Vinoda had been an important source of reference for Śrṅgadeva, Pārvadeva, Jaya Senāpati and Basava Bhūpāla. Though, all these writers have based their works primarily on the Natyaśāstra of Bharata, it is Somesvara's Nrtya Vinoda which has provided the basis for post-Bharata innovations. Thus, Somesvara's most important contribution is his treatment of the Deśi material relating to Sthānakas, Gāris and Utpluti Karanās, for which his Nrtya

† vide Bharata kosa pp. viii, 941
Vinoda is the earliest extant source. But his treatment of the Margi 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 Nrtya Vinoda had always been in the limelight and was considered by later writers as a work of merit.