



**International Research Journal of Interdisciplinary & Multidisciplinary Studies (IRJIMS)**

A Peer-Reviewed Monthly Research Journal

ISSN: 2394-7969 (Online), ISSN: 2394-7950 (Print)

Volume-II, Issue-VI, July 2016, Page No. 78-87

Published by: Scholar Publications, Karimganj, Assam, India, 788711

Website: <http://www.irjims.com>

## **Influence of Nāṭyaśāstra on Abhinayadarpaṇa of Nandikeśvara (gestures of head, neck and eye)**

**Sayanika Goswami**

R/scholar, Department of Sanskrit, Gauhati University, Assam, India

### **Abstract**

Bharata considers that different types of plays rest on this abhinaya i.e. histrionic representation<sup>1</sup>. Nandikeśvara also considers that abhinaya is prime i.e. pradhāna in nṛtya<sup>2</sup>. So, we need to compare those gestures of the two works for better understanding the concept of abhinaya in śāstra s. And so far as the influence of Nāṭyaśāstra on Abhinayadarpaṇa is concerned a comparative study of both the works may be taken into consideration. The chapter viii to xiii of Nāṭyaśāstra deals with āṅgika abhinaya where in gestures of major and minor limbs of an actor are depicted. And whole of the short treatise Abhinayadarpaṇa dealt with the āṅgika abhinaya. Bharata accepts thirteen numbers of head gestures viz. ākampita, kampita, dhuta, vidhuta, parivāhita, udvāhita, avadhuta, añcita, nihañcita, parāvṛtta, utkṣipta, adhogata and lolita<sup>3</sup>. While, Nandikeśvara provides nine divisions of it viz. sama, udvāhita, adhomukh, ālolita, dhuta, kampita, parāvṛtta, utkṣipta, and parivāhita. Thus, it is seen that the names of six head gestures viz. kampita, dhuta, parivāhita, udvāhita, parāvṛtta and adhogata are common in both works. Most of those are even similarly defined and their applications also frequently same in the hands of two authors.

*Eye glances:* After the head gestures, both the works present discussion on eye glances. Bharata accepts thirty six number of it. Whereas, Nandikeśvara considers only eight. Bharata classifies those glances into three groups. First eight glances express eight sentiments. The second eight glances express eight permanent moods. And at the end, he discusses those twenty glances which express sañcārī bhāvas. The eight eye glances as listed by Nandikeśvara have no common name and feature with Nāṭyaśāstra.

*Neck gesture:* Bharata considers nine kinds of neck gestures whereas Nandikesvara accepts only four. The nine of Bharata are sama, naṭā, unnatā, tryasrā, recitā, kuñcitā, añcitā, valitā and nivṛttā. The four as given by Nandikeśvara are viz. sundarī, tiraścīnā, parivartitā and prakampitā. So in case of neck gestures also Nandikeśvara does not seem to follow Bharata.

<sup>1</sup> Nāṭyasāstra ch.8.v.9

<sup>2</sup> c.f tatra tvabhinayasyeiva prādhānyamīti kathyate/ Abhinayadarpaṇa v. 38

<sup>3</sup> c.f ākampitaṁ kampitaṁ ca dhutaṁ vidhutameva ca... (Nāṭyaśāstra.viii.v.17,18)

A study of both works can make someone easily confused that which work is the earlier one. Because, regarding the elaboration of gestures, Nāṭyaśāstra is more developed than Abhinayadarpaṇa. Their applications are also more in number in Nāṭyaśāstra. But confusions regarding the prior existence of Abhinayadarpaṇa before Nāṭyaśāstra seem to be meaningless as Nandikeśvara himself expresses his gratefulness to Bharata or the followers of Bharata (of bharata-tradition) by using the phrases like *kathito bharatottamaiḥ*<sup>4</sup> ‘*yujyate bharatādibhiḥ*<sup>5</sup>, *kīrtito bharatāgamaiḥ*<sup>6</sup> and *vijñeyo bharatāgamakovidaiḥ*<sup>7</sup> etc. Though influence of Bharata is notable; Nandikeśvara has own minute observation regarding the analysis of gestures.

Attraction to art and literature is the general tendency of human being. Because of that may be without having this quality, the person devoid of feelings is regarded as an animal by Bhartrhari<sup>8</sup>. Bharata considers that those people who are suffering from sorrow and despondency and hardwork can get relief through watching *nāṭya*.

c.f. *duḥkhārtānām śramārtānām śokārtānām tapasvīnām /  
viśrāntijananaṁ kāle nāṭyametaḥ bhaviṣyati // Nāṭyaśāstra ch.1.v.114*

Thus, people get entertainment or pleasure from other art forms also. This source of entertainment is used as a tool to educate the society that is in the darkness of ignorance, by the scholars like Bharata through composing *śāstras* on the art forms like *nāṭya* (i.e. *Nāṭyaśāstra*) which is also regarded as *pañcamaveda*. In the time of Bharata, the concept of *nṛtya* was not so clear though Indian Classical dances collected elements from *Nāṭyaśāstra* later on. *Nṛtya* as a separate performing art is a later conception found described by Nandikeśvara and some contemporary scholars. But like Nandikeśvara, no other scholar is found to have dealt with this art form so popularly. If it is, *nāṭya* or *nṛtya* the purpose of both the *śāstras* i.e. *Nāṭyaśāstra* and *Abhinayadarpaṇa* are almost same as they throw light on same subject i.e. *abhinaya*. But sometimes they differ from each other as Bharata discusses *āṅgika* for the application of *nāṭya* but Nandikeśvara concentrated on *nṛtya*. Nandikeśvara's *Abhinayadarpaṇa* has a great influence on the history of Indian classical dances as like the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata. Various Classical dance forms like Bharatnatyam, Kathak, Kucchipudi, Odissi and Satriya are found to use the gestures and postures analysed in the *Abhinayadarpaṇa*. The analysis of gestures, given by Nandikeśvara is very popular and easy to understand. Though various gestures of *Abhinayadarpaṇa* have

<sup>4</sup> *Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.102

<sup>5</sup> *Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.121

<sup>6</sup> *Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.125

<sup>7</sup> *Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.128

<sup>8</sup> c.f. *sāhityasaṁgītakalāvihinaḥ sākṣāt paśuḥ*

*puśchaviṣṇāhinaḥ*

*ṛṇam nakhādannapi jīvamānastad*

*bhāgadheyam paramam pathunām Nitiślokavimśati. Bhartrhari v.12*

similarities with those of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Nandikeśvara's addition of gestures and minute observation of gestures are notable. As like Bharata, Nandikeśvara being the author of *Abhinayadarpaṇa*, has played a great role in the formation of various classical dances as they are practiced today. Because of following these *śāstras*, above mentioned dances are come to be known as *śāstriya*. Whatever it is, *abhinaya* is the prime factor for both *nṛtya* and *nāṭya*. Bharata considers that different types of plays rest on this *abhinaya* i.e. histrionic representation<sup>9</sup>. Nandikeśvara also considers that *abhinaya* is prime i.e. *pradhāna* in *nṛtya*<sup>10</sup>. So, we need to compare those gestures of the two works for better understanding the concept of *abhinaya* in *śāstras*. And so far as the influence of *Nāṭyaśāstra* on *Abhinayadarpaṇa* is concerned a comparative study of both the works may be taken into consideration. The chapter viii to xiii of *Nāṭyaśāstra* deals with *āṅgika abhinaya* where in gestures of major and minor limbs of an actor are depicted. And whole of the short treatise *Abhinayadarpaṇa* dealt with the *āṅgika abhinaya*. Presenting the grammatical analysis of *abhinaya*, Bharata says that by adding the prefix *abhi* with the verbal root *ni*, the word *abhinaya* has been formed. The root *ni* means caring the performances (*prayoga*) of a play and *abhi* means towards<sup>11</sup>. Thus the term *abhinaya* means the performances carrying towards the audience. Nandikeśvara in his work *Abhinayadarpaṇa* mentions the term *abhinaya* for the first time with reference to *nṛtya*. Dance is performed after finishing the *purvaramga*. He defines four types of *abhinaya* .viz. *āṅgika*, *vācika*, *āhārya* and *sātvika* but never provide any definition regarding the term *abhinaya*<sup>12</sup>. He follows the largest part of *Nāṭyaśāstra* when defining those along with his own minute observations. *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the earliest available work dealing with *abhinaya* i.e. histrionic representation. There were some earlier treatises prior to Bharata as mentioned by Panini like *Nāṭyaśūtras* of śilālin and Kṛṣāsva. But the contents of these treatises are exactly not known to us. In the eighth chapter of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* Bharata clearly shows the importance of *abhinaya* in *nāṭya* by accepting it as the important part of a dramatic composition. Bharata presents the grammatical analysis of *abhinaya* that by adding the prefix *abhi* with the verbal root *ni* the word *abhinaya* has been formed. The root *ni* means caring the performances (*prayoga*) of a play and *abhi* means towards<sup>13</sup>. Thus the term *abhinaya* means the performances carrying towards the audience. Viśvanātha Kavirāja also defines *abhinaya* as imitation of situations<sup>14</sup>. When *naṭa* imitates the situations of Rāma, Yudhisthira etc that is *abhinaya*.

<sup>9</sup> *Nāṭyaśāstra* ch.8.v.9

<sup>10</sup> tatra tvabhinayasyeiva prādhānyamīti kathyate /*Abhinayadarpaṇa* v. 38

<sup>11</sup> c.f abhipurvastu ni dhāturābhimukhyārtha nirṇaye /

yasmāt prayogaṃ nayati tasmādabhinayaḥ smṛtaḥ // *Nāṭyaśāstra*.ch.8.v.6

<sup>12</sup> tatra tvabhinayasyeiva prādhānyamīti kathyate *Abhinayadarpaṇa* v. 38

<sup>12</sup> c.f abhipurvastu ni dhāturābhimukhyārtha nirṇaye /

yasmāt prayogaṃ nayati tasmādabhinayaḥ smṛtaḥ // *Nāṭyaśāstra*.ch.8.v.6

<sup>12</sup> c.f bhavedabhinayoavasthānukāraḥ sa caturvidhaḥ /

āṅgiko vācikaścaivam āhāryaḥ sātvikastathā // *Sāhityadarpaṇa* ch.6.v.

Viśvanātha's definition of *abhinaya* is influenced by Dhanañjaya. Viśvanātha just has replaced the word *abhinaya* in place of *nāṭya* of Dhanañjaya. Dhanañjaya considers *nāṭya* as the imitation of situation<sup>15</sup> that means except the word *nāṭya* Viśvanātha defines the same. Dhanika comments on it that when generalisation is done by imitating *dhirodātta* etc. conditions described in the *kāvya* with four fold *abhinaya*, that is *nāṭya*<sup>16</sup>. Dhanika says *anukaraṇa* is done through four types of *abhinaya*. So we may say it as *anukaraṇa* i.e. imitation *abhinaya*. Abhinavagupta is against the *anukaraṇa* concept of *nāṭya*. But generally if we observe *abhinaya* as imitation following Bharata, Dhanañjaya and Viśvanātha etc. scholars they were right. Because the actor i.e. *naṭa* present himself as Rama, the original character by only imitating him. If someone argue that, how *sātvika* is imitated as it is a matter of heartiest feelings, then the answer will be that, though the *naṭa* present the *sātvika abhinaya* after a deep feelings of those *bhāvas* in his heart, those are not actually belongs to him but to the original Rama. So he has to imitate those first. The standard of living of Rama if he is in *rājmahala* or *vaṇa*, his love affection to Sitā, the sorrow in separation with her everything can be presented on the stage by *naṭa* only after imitating the original character with his great talent. May be for such reason Abinavagupta also viewed as impossible to imitate the character like Rāma. But the point is, it is true that the imitation of other person or a great person like Rāma etc. is not so easy but it is not to be said as impossible. The *naṭa* may have some fault in sometimes but a talented *naṭa* does his best in imitating the original character. Along with the imitation done by *vācika*, *āhārya* and *sātvika* the *naṭa* shows some gestures to indicate different objects following the rules of *śāstras* which is not definitely done by the original character Rama. In modern concept of drama also imitation is there, but the *sastrik āṅgika* is mainly absent. Whether it is dance or drama it will not be successful until and unless evoking of *rasa* in spectators mind taken into consideration. Such observation is found in the hand of Mallinātha, the famous commentator who defines *abhinaya* as movements for suggesting *rasa* and *bhāva*. *Abhinaya* disclose manifold pleasurable aspect to spectators which cannot be enjoyed by simply reading the text, actually *nāṭya* means the four fold *abhinaya*. Viśvanātha Kavirāja also defines *abhinaya* as imitation of situations<sup>17</sup>. *Abhinaya* is four fold viz. *āṅgika*, *vācika*, *āhārya* and *sātvika*. But here only *āṅgika* will be discussed. *Āṅgika abhinaya* is expressed by the limbs of a body which are divided into major and minor parts. *Ācarya* Bharata and also Nandikeśvara classifies the human body into three types-

- (i) *aṅga*
- (ii) *pratyāṅga* and
- (iii) *upāṅga*

<sup>15</sup> c.f. avasthānukṛtir nāṭyam *Daśarūpaka*. 1

<sup>16</sup> c.f. kāvyopanivaddhadhirodāttādyāvasthānukāraścaturvidhābhinayena tādātmyapattirnāṭyam *Daśarūpaka*. 1

<sup>17</sup> c.f. bhavedabhinayo'vasthānukāraḥ sa caturvidhaḥ /

āṅgiko vācikaścaivamāhāryaḥ sātvikastathā// *Sāhityadarpaṇa* ch.6.v.2

**Aṅga-** *Aṅga* means the major limbs of the body. It includes main parts of the human body like head, hands, waist, breasts, sides and feet. Bharata and Nandikeśvara accept the same six major limbs as mentioned above<sup>18</sup>.

**Pratyāṅga** - *pratyāṅgas* are the subordinate parts of the body, which join the limbs. Though they do not operate independently, they connect the limbs. Neck, arms, back, stomach, chest and thigh are included in the list of *upāṅgas*. Nandikeśvara mentions six *pratyāṅgas* but Bharata does not do so. Those are blades, arms, back, belly, thigh, and shanks<sup>19</sup>. According to Nandikeśvara some scholars include wrist, elbows and knees and some other limbs also into the same category. Probably he does not separately mention those as he recommends that when the major limbs move the minors also follow<sup>20</sup>.

**Upāṅga-** Those are the tiny parts of the major limbs of the body which operate independently. The twelve *upāṅgas* or minor limbs as accepted by Bharata are eyes, eye brows, nose, lower lips, kapola and chin. Nandikeśvara adds another six to those viz. souldier, eyeballs, jaw, teeth, tongue and face<sup>21</sup>.

Regarding the influence of *Nāṭyaśāstra* on *Abhinayadarpaṇa* one has to furnish a comparative discussion on both works. *Nāṭyaśāstra* is famous as the earliest available work on *nāṭya*. But some of the scholars opine that *Nāṭyaśāstra* is a later creation than *Abhinayadarpaṇa*. So, a brief discussion is needed to analyse the *abhinaya* treated by both the scholars, which we hope, will help to remove the confusion regarding relative chronology of both the works. Following is the discussion presented on the gestures of head, neck and eye glances analyzed by both the dramaturgists.

## The *śirobhedaḥ* i.e. head gestures

### The head gestures:

According to Bharata head gestures are connected with facial gesture, support many sentiments and permanent moods (*sthāyī bhāva*). So, it is the most important gesture used in dance and drama, because like the *kāvya*, delineation of sentiment is the prime purpose of performing art too. Bharata accepts thirteen numbers of head gestures viz. *ākampita*, *kampita*, *dhuta*, *vidhuta*, *parivāhita*, *udvāhita*, *avadhuta*, *añcita*, *nihañcita*, *parāvṛtta*,

<sup>18</sup>c.f tasya śirohastorhpārśvakaṭipādātāḥ ṣaḍaṅgāni..... *Nāṭyaśāstra*..viii-v-13  
..... aṅgānyatra śiro hastauvakṣaḥ pārśvau kaṭītaṭau /

pādāvīti ṣaḍuktānigrīvāmpyapare jaguḥ/ *Abhinayadarpaṇa* v.42,43

<sup>19</sup>c.f pratyāṅgānyatha ca skandhau vāhū pṛṣṭham tathodaram /

urū jaṅghe ṣaḍityāhurapare maṅibandhakau/

jānūnī kūrparāvetat trayamapyadhikam jaguḥ / *Abhinayadarpaṇa* .v.43,44

<sup>20</sup>c.f aṅgānām calanādeva pratyāṅgopāṅgayorapi // *Abhinayadarpaṇa* .v.48

<sup>21</sup>c.f drṣṭibhrūputātārāśca kapolau nāsikā hanū//

adhara daśanā jihvā cubukam vadanam tathā /

upāṅgāni dvādaśaiva śiraṣyāṅgāntareṣu ca// *Abhinayadarpaṇa* -v.45.46

*utkṣipta, adhogata and lolita*<sup>22</sup>. While, Nandikeśvara provides nine divisions of it viz. *sama, udvāhita, adhomukh, ālolita, dhuta, kampita, parāvṛtta, utkṣipta, and parivāhita*. Thus, it is seen that the names of six head gestures viz. *kampita, dhuta, parivāhita, udvāhita, parāvṛtta* and *adhogata* are common in both works. Most of those are even similarly defined and their applications also frequently same in the hands of two authors. The corresponding gestures are observed as follows.

**Āpampita and kampita kinds of head gestures:** The up and down movements of head is regarded as *kampita* by Nandikeśvara .c.f. ‘*urdhvadhobhāgacaltam tacchiram kampitam bhavet*’. (*Abhinayadarpaṇa.v.60*). With regard to the same movement in slow and fast speed Bharata provides two kinds of head gestures .The slow one is *ākampita* and the copious is called as *kampita*<sup>23</sup>. According to Bharata, *ākampita* head is used in giving a hint, teaching, and enquiry, addressing in an ordinary way, and used to give an order too<sup>24</sup>. *Kampita* is applied in doing anger, argument, understanding, asserting, threatening, sickness, and intolerance<sup>25</sup>. Nandikeśvara suggests using this gesture *kampita* in the offence taken, saying do stop, enquiry, hinting, calling from near, inviting the deities and in threatening<sup>26</sup>. It is seen that Nandikeśvara includes some applications from Bharata’s *ākampita* into his *kampita* and also adds some new ones in *kampita*

**Dhuta and vidhuta head gesture:** After *ākampita* Bharata analyses *dhuta* and *vidhuta*. This classification is also based on speed of the movements of head. Because doing *recana* slowly by head is regarded as *dhuta* while if the same is done i.e.*recana* in higher speed then that is *vidhuta* as viewed by Bharata<sup>27</sup>. Nandikeśvara views that the head moving from left to right is called *dhuta*<sup>28</sup>. According to Bharata *dhuta* head is applied in unwillingness, sadness, astonishment, confidence, looking two sides, emptiness<sup>29</sup> and *vidhuta* is used to denote the attack of cold, terror, panic, fever and first stage of drinking liquor<sup>30</sup>. Nandikeśvara is silent about *vidhuta* and like the *ākampita* he includes various applications

<sup>22</sup> c.f. *ākampitam kampitam ca dhutam vidhutameva ca...* (*Nāṭyaśāstra.viii.v.17,18*)

<sup>23</sup> c.f. *śanairāpampanādūrdhvamadhaścākampitam bhavet/ drutam tadeva vahuṣaḥ kampitam kampitam śiraḥ //* (*Nāṭyaśāstra.viii,v.19*)

<sup>24</sup> c.f. *saṁjñyopadeśapṛccheṣu svabhāvabhāṣaṇe tathā/ nirdeśavāhane caiva bhavedākampitam śiraḥ //* (*Nāṭyaśāstra.viii.v.20*)

<sup>25</sup> c.f. *roṣe vitarke vijñyāne pratijñyāne’tha tarjane/ vyādhyamarṣasamśayoścaiva śiraḥ kampitamiṣyate//* (*Nāṭyaśāstra.viii.v.21*)

<sup>26</sup> c.f. *roṣe tiṣṭheti vacane praśne saṁkhyopahūtayoh / āvāhane tarjane ca kampitam viniyuḥyate//* (*Abhinayadarpaṇa.v.61,62*)

<sup>27</sup> c.f. *śiraṣo recanam yattu śanaistad dhutam iṣyate/ drutamārecaṇādetadvidhutam tu bhavecchiraḥ//* (*Nāṭyaśāstra viii,v.22*)

<sup>28</sup> c.f. *vāmadakṣiṇabhāgeṣu calitam taddhutam śiraḥ /* (*Abhinayadarpaṇa.v.57*)

<sup>29</sup> c.f. *anīpsite viṣāde ca viṣmaye pratyaye tathā pārśvāvalokane śuṇye pratiśedhe dhutam śiraḥ //* (*Nāṭyaśāstra viii v.23*)

<sup>30</sup> c.f. *śītagraste bhayārte ca trāsīte jvarite tathā/ pītamātre tathā gadye vidhutam tu bhavecchiraḥ //* (*Nāṭyaśāstra viii.v.24*)

from *dhuta* and *vidhuta* of Bharata into his single *dhuta*<sup>31</sup>. Only following applications are of his own –it does not exist, discouraging other, battle effort, revenge glancing at one's own limbs and calling one from sides. Nandikeśvara does not include here some applications proclaimed by *Nāṭyaśāstra* like confidence, emptiness etc.

**Parivāhita and udvāhita head gesture:** *Parivāhita* head is similarly defined in both works. This head is turned alternately to the two sides<sup>32</sup>. Nandikeśvara compares this *parivāhita* head with the movement of *chauri* (i.e. *ścāmaramiva*). Bharata views that *parivāhita* head is used to denote demonstration, surprise, joy, cogitation, cover up and (amorous) sporting. Nandikeśvara includes only two applications from Bharata like cogitation and concealment in his list. And other applications as mentioned by him are fascination, yearning for separated lover, uttering the praise of deity, satisfaction and approval.

According to Bharata the *parivāhita* head once turned upward is called *udvāhita*. c.f. *sakṛdudvāhitam cordhamudvāhitamīti smṛtam* / (*Nāṭyaśāstra*, viii-v.25). It is used to denote pride, showing height, looking high up, self esteem and the like<sup>33</sup>. Nandikeśvara never shows any connection of *udvāhita* with *parivāhita* like Bharata. He simply defines the *udvāhita* as rising up of the head<sup>34</sup>. According to Nandikeśvara it is used by wise people to denote a flag, the moon, the sky and skywards<sup>35</sup>. Thus *parivāhita* head is applied to observe the objects being in high altitude. Nandikeśvara's *udvāhita* head is quite similar with the *utkṣipta* head of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. According to Bharata when the face remains rose up, *utkṣipta* head is found. It is used to indicate lofty objects and application of divine weapons<sup>36</sup>. Nandikeśvara analyses the *utkṣipta* as the head turned aside and then raised up. c.f. *pārśvordhvabhāgacalitamutkṣiptam kathyate śirah*/ (*Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.63). It is used to denote the command or request like 'take this' or 'come', supporting something, and acceptance<sup>37</sup>.

<sup>31</sup> c.f. nāstīti vacane bhūyaḥ pārśvadeśāvalokane

janāśvāse viṣmaye ca viṣādea' nīpsite tathā

śītārte jvarite bhīte sadyaḥ pītāsave tathā

yuddhe yatne niṣedhāvarṣe svāmṅvīkṣaṇe //

pārśvāhvāne ca tasyoktaḥ prayogo bharatādibhiḥ // (*Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v-57,58,59)

<sup>32</sup> c.f. pārśvāyaśaḥ pārśvagataḥ śirah syāt parivāhitam (*Nāṭyaśāstra* viii.v.25)

pārśvayoścāmaramiva tat cet parivāhitam/ (*Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.64)

<sup>33</sup> c.f. garvecchādarśane caiva tathā cordhvaniṛkṣaṇe/

udvāhitam tu kartavyamātmāsambhāvanādiṣu// (*Nāṭyaśāstra* vii.v.27)

<sup>34</sup> c.f. udvāhita śiro jñeyemūrdhvabhāgonnatānanam (*Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.63)

<sup>35</sup> c.f. dhvaje candre ca gagane parvate vyomagāmiṣu

tuṅgavastuni saṃyojyamudvāhitaśiro budhaiḥ// (*Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.53)

<sup>36</sup> c.f. utkṣiptam cāpi vijñeyanunmukhāvasthitam śirah/

prānsudivyaṛthayogeṣu syādutkṣiptam prayogataḥ// (*Nāṭyaśāstra* viii-v.33)

<sup>37</sup> c.f. ....grhānāgacchetyādyarthasūcane paripoṣaṇe//

aṅgikare prayoktavyamutkṣiptam nāma śirśakam /... (*Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.63,64)

**Parāvṛtta head gestures:** Turning round of the face is accepted as *parāvṛtta* head by both the authors<sup>38</sup>. Bharata suggests using this head to turn away the face or looking back<sup>39</sup>. Along with that Nandikeśvara adds some new applications of it like to give command like that should be done, anger, shame, slighting hair and a quiver<sup>40</sup>.

**Adhogata or adohmukha head gesture:** Bharata views that when the head with the face looking downward, than *adhogata* head is the result c.f. *adhomukham sṭhitam cāpi śiraḥ prāhuradhogatam* (Nāṭyaśāstra.viii,v.4). According to Nandikeśvara when the face is cast down that is called as *adhomukha* head c.f. *adhastānnamitam vaktramadhomukhamitīritam/* (Abhinayadarpaṇa viii,v.54). According to Bharata it is used in showing shame, bowing in salutation and also to show sorrow<sup>41</sup>. Nandikeśvara accepting the uses mentioned by Bharata adds some new like anxiety, fainting, indicating things placed below, and plunge in water<sup>42</sup>.

**Parilolita and ālolita head gesture:** Bharata defines that the head moving in all sides is *parilolita*. c.f. *sarvato lolanāccāpi śiraḥ syāt parilolitam* (Nāṭyaśāstra viii.v.35) This *parilolita* may become *ālolita* head in the hand of Nandikeśvara with slight difference in its characteristics. He defines *ālolita* as the head moving round. c.f. *maṇḍalākāramudbhṛntamālolitam śiro bhavet.* (Abhinayadarpaṇa.v.55). Bharata suggests applying it in fainting, sickness, power of intoxication, being possessed by an evil spirit, drowsiness and the like<sup>43</sup>. Excluding drowsiness Nandikeśvara considers all applications of Bharata. He adds only two new, first is travelling and the second is uncontrolled laughing<sup>44</sup>. Bharata analyses some peculiar head gestures viz. *añcita* and *nihanācit*. *Añcita* is analysed as the neck slightly is bent on one side and if the same thing is done with raising up of shoulders then the *nihanācita* head is found. This *nihanācita* head is said to be used only by women. After *parilolita* head Bharata concludes that there are innumerable head gestures based on popular acting which are said to be used by him depending on popular practice. Thus Nandikeśvara also adds one new head viz. *sama* as motionless condition of head neither bent nor raised up.

**Eye glances:** After the head gestures, both the works present discussion on eye glances. Bharata accepts thirty six number of it. Whereas, Nandikeśvara considers only eight. Bharata classifies those glances into three groups. First eight glances express eight

<sup>38</sup> c.f. *parāvṛttānukaraṇāt parāvṛttam śiraḥ smṛtam/* (Nāṭyaśāstra viii,v.32)

*parāmmukhikṛtam śirṣam parāvṛttamīritam/* (Abhinayadarpaṇa.v.61)

<sup>39</sup> c.f. ... *tat syānmukhāpahaṛaṇe pṛsthtaḥ prekṣaṇādiṣu....* (Nāṭyaśāstra viii.v.32)

<sup>40</sup> c.f. *tat kāryam kopalajjādikṛte baktrāpasaraṇe /*

*anādare kace tunyām parāvṛttaśiro bhavet//* (Abhinayadarpaṇa.v.62)

<sup>41</sup> c.f. *lajjāyām ca preṇāme ca duḥkhe cādhogataḥ bhavet/* (Nāṭyaśāstra.v.34)

<sup>42</sup> c.f. *lajjākhedapraṇāmeṣu duścintāmurchayostathā*

*adhasthitārthanirdeṣe ujjateam'mbau majjane /* (Abhinayadarpaṇa.v.54)

<sup>43</sup> c.f. *murchāvādhimadāveśagrahanidrādiṣu smṛtam* (Nāṭyaśāstra viii.v.35)

<sup>44</sup> c.f. *nidrodvegagrahāveśamadāmurchāsutanmatam/*

*bhramaṇe vikaṭoddāmahāsyē cālolitam śiraḥ//* (Abhinayadarpaṇa.v.56)

sentiments viz. *śāntā*, *bhayānakā*, *hāsyā*, *karuṇā*, *adbhutā*, *raudrā*, *vīrā* and *bībhatsā*. The second eight glances express eight permanent moods viz. *snijgdhā*, *hṛstā*, *adbhutā*, *vīrā* and *bībhatsā*. And at the end, he discusses those twenty glances which express *sañcārī bhāvas* viz. *śuṇyā*, *malinā*, *śrāntā*, *lajjānvitā*, *glānā*, *śaṃkitā*, *viṣamā*, *muktā*, *kuñcitā*, *abhitaptā*, *jihmā*, *lolitā*, *vitarkitā*, *ardhamukulā*, *vibhrāntā*, *vipulā*, *ākekarā*, *vikoṣā*, *trastā* and *madirā*. The eight eye glances as listed by Nandikeśvara are viz. *sama*, *ālokita*, *sācī*, *pralokita*, *nimilita*, *ullokita*, *anuvṛtta* and *avalokita* will be discussed later on. Thus it is seen that no common name and feature are found in case of eye glances in both works. Regarding the eye glances he is probably influenced by some other predecessors. Because, though he never identifies any one of them, sometimes he simply expresses his gratefulness with the expression –*ucyate nāṭyakovidaiḥ, proktaḥ nṛtyakarmaviśāradaīḥ* etc.

**Neck gesture:** Bharata considers nine kinds of neck gestures whereas Nandikeśvara accepts only four. The nine of Bharata are *sama*, *naṭā*, *unnatā*, *tryasrā*, *recitā*, *kuñcitā*, *añcitā*, *valitā* and *nivṛttā*. The four as given by Nandikeśvara are viz. *sundarī*, *tiraścinā*, *parivartitā* and *prakampitā*. So in case of neck gestures also Nandikeśvara does not seem to follow Bharata. According to Bharata these neck and head gestures are interrelated and reflect each other. Because of that some neck gestures of Bharata may be turned into head gestures in the hands of Nandikeśvara. For example, the *naṭā* and *unnatā grīvā* of Bharata are almost same with the *udvāhita* and *adhomukha* head of *Abhinayadarpaṇa*. The influence of Bharata on *Abhinayadarpaṇa* can be observed on such points too. As *Nāṭyaśāstra* is an elaborated text on dramatic art, like the other elements of dramatic art Bharata discusses various gestures in detail with minute observations. He analyses gestures of minor limbs like eyelids, eyebrows, eyeballs, nose, cheeks, lower lip, chin, mouth and face. Nandikeśvara never deals with those minor limbs. Somewhere he proclaims that minor limbs spontaneously moves with the movements of major limbs. So he probably defines chief parts of those limbs which are utilized in *nṛtya*. c.f. *nṛtyamātropayogīni kathyante lakṣaṇaiḥ kramāt* (*Abhinayadarpaṇa* v,48).

**Conclusion-** Thus, it is seen that these two works are similar in many aspects. As *Abhinayadarpaṇa* is known to be a later work, he might follow Bharata. But study of two works can make someone easily confused that which work is the earlier one. Because, regarding the elaboration of gestures, as it is seen above *Nāṭyaśāstra* is more developed than *Abhinayadarpaṇa*. Their applications are also more in number in *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Thus, *Nāṭyaśāstra* seems to be the follower. As it is seen in Sanskrit *alaṃkāraśāstra*, concepts are more developed and numerous in later works. For example, *Samgītaratnākara*, a follower of *Nāṭyaśāstra* provides more number of gestures with more modification and analysis than the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. In this way, *Nāṭyaśāstra* has only four *alaṃkāras* which developed in its number and variety in later *alaṃkāraśāstras*. Thus, the number of *nāyikā* is only four in *Nāṭyaśāstra*, this increased to sixteen in the hands of Dhanañjaya in *Daśarūpaka*. Such observations provide us place for presumption that the source of *Abhinayadarpaṇa* might be earlier than the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. But confusions regarding the prior existence of *Abhinayadarpaṇa* before *Nāṭyaśāstra* seem to be meaningless as Nandikeśvara himself

expresses his gratefulness to Bharata or the followers of Bharata (of Bharata-tradition) by using the phrases like *kathito bharatottamaiḥ*<sup>45</sup> ‘*yujyate bharatādibhiḥ*<sup>46</sup>, *kīrtito bharatāgamaiḥ*<sup>47</sup> and *vijñeyo bharatāgamakovidaiḥ*<sup>48</sup> etc. Though influence of Bharata is notable; Nandikeśvara has own minute observation regarding the analysis of gestures.

## Bibliography:

### Original Works

1. *Abhinayadarpaṇa* of Nandikesvara (A manual of gestures and postures used in Hindu dance and drama) ed. by Manmohan Ghosh .Firma K.L Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta, 1957.
2. *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata muni ,ed. by Manmohan Ghosh ( a treatise on ancient Indian Dramaturgy and Histrionics) Vol.-1 Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series office, Varanasi,2007
3. *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharatamuni ed. by Pushpendra Kumar translated by M.M.Ghosh. New bhartiya book corporation , 2006.
4. *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharatamuni ed. by Sudhakar Malaviya.
5. *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of Viśvanātha Kavirāja
6. *Daśarūpaka* of Dhanañjaya ed. by Baijanatha Pandeyah

### Modern Works

7. A.B. Keith, History of Sanskrit literature, Motilal Banarasi Das.
8. A.B. Keith, The Sanskrit Drama in its origin, development, theory and practice, Motilal Banarasi Das.
9. A.K Coomaraswamy and Duggirala Gopalakrishnayya, Mirror of gesture, Cambridge, Mass, 1917.
10. Ragini Devi, Dance Dialects of India, Motilal Banarasi Das.

---

<sup>45</sup> *Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.102

<sup>46</sup> *Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.121

<sup>47</sup> *Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.125

<sup>48</sup> *Abhinayadarpaṇa*.v.128