

uniquely musical. It links human harmony with a true order among feelings, granting music alone the power to effect it. True music, correctly designed with an eye towards giving the right temper — or 'tone' — as well as proper organization and orientation to our emotions, could create the desired ethos among human relations, imparting its own balance and *équi*poise and sense of joy to man, polity and society. "Therefore," Confucius says "the ancient kings (in framing their music), laid its foundations in the feeling and nature of men."²⁰ Music, thus, was the rock on which a sure and constant harmony of feelings could be founded: "In music", he says, "we have the expression of feelings which do not admit of any change."²¹

This might appear to be a quaint belief not founded in experience, since the affect of music, notoriously, lasts only as long as the music lasts. But, for Confucius, music, or the *true* music, the music of the sage, was much more than we ordinarily understand by the term, though, to use his own phrase, 'akin' to it. Music, for him, seems to have been the source of a kind of *sādhana*, a *yoga*, or more meaningfully and pointedly, a *karmayoga* in the sense of, '*yogaḥ karmasu kauśalam*, where *yoga* is understood as spiritual mastery over actions. Music could lead to a realisation which ran deeper than any ordinary aesthetic experience, though resembling it. It was certainly pleasure-oriented, but it could be a thing in which, "the sages found pleasure." And so it could lead to a state of the soul akin to that of a *sthita-prajña*, and yet not a withdrawn, emotionless state, but one imbued with a sense of spritual joy or *ānanda*, because the source was music which is pleasure-giving by nature; it was also impregnated with the emotional harmony and impulse for right action. "When", Confucius says in a remarkable passage, "one has mastered completely (the principles of) music, and regulates his heart and mind accordingly, the natural, correct, gentle, and honest heart is easily developed, and with this

²⁰ *Yo Ki*, ii, 10, p. 108

²¹ *Yo Ki*, iii, 1, p.114

development of the heart comes joy. This joy goes on to a feeling of repose. This repose is long-continued. The man in this constant repose becomes (a sort of) Heaven. Heaven-like, (his action) is spirit-like. Heaven-like, he is believed without the use of words. Spirit-like, he is regarded with awe, without any display of rage. So it is, when one by his mastering of music regulates his mind and heart."²²

This, I think, could be said to sum up the deepest *aesthetic* intent of Confucius' understanding of music. The *political* intent and purpose behind his vision of true 'Music', music as 'creating', 'regulating', 'causing' True Order, comes out in another striking passage which, evidently, intends to portray the *form* and *svara*-structure of the ideal music he had in mind. The music has obvious 'overtones' relating it to an ideal hierarchical social and political order. The music was to be formed with the five *svaras* of traditional Chinese music, and of these *svaras*, Confucius says, "(the *svara*) *kung*, represents the ruler; *shang*, the minister; *kio*, the people; *kih*, affairs; and *yu*, things. If there is no disorder or irregularity in these five notes, there will be no want of harmony in the state." *Irregularity* in a *svara*, he adds, will, naturally, cause disorder in the element connected with it. And, "if the five notes are all irregular, and injuriously interfere with one another, they indicate a state of insolent disorder; and the state where this is the case will at no distant day meet with extinction and ruin."²³

Interestingly, the description that we have of the ideal music here has a *rāga*-like structure; indeed, it has a strong kinship with a certain metaphorical way of characterising the relation between *svaras* in a *rāga* which is often repeated in the texts of Indian *saṅgīta-śāstra*, where *svaras* are laid out in a scheme of hierarchy in terms of their importance within a *rāga*, and described as king, minister, followers and enemies. We shall discuss this more specifically a little later. The crucial difference

²² *Yo Ki*, iii, 23, p.125.

²³ *Yo, Ki*, i, 5, p. 94.

between Confucius and the musicology of *rāgas*, however, is that *rāgas* are conceived as many by nature: different *rāgas* have a different scheme of hierarchy among *svaras*. The 'king' of one *rāga* can be a mere 'follower' in another, or even, perhaps, an 'enemy'. What Confucius had in mind was a *unique*, unchanging, *rāga*. But being *rāga*-like his structure characterises the desired relation between *svaras qualitatively* and not quantitatively in such a way that the structure cannot be reduced to a single form, and thus it cannot, in principle, be mapped through a musical score or notation;²⁴ or, to put it in other words, it can be scored in innumerable ways, provided different renderings maintain the given *quality* of the relation between the *svaras*. It is like an ideal *concept* of polity expressed as music, an *idea*, which can be expressed through very different words, and in many different ways, provided the *qualitative relation* between concepts which constitute the idea, remain the same. It also seems, curiously, that in Confucius' *rāga*, his two ideals, pulling him in two contrary directions, the moral, seeking a unique goal, and the aesthetic, bent towards plurality, achieve a kind of musical togetherness.

In our own country, during ancient times, much more anterior to that of Confucius, the transcendental in music was nurtured more pronouncedly as a path to spiritual realisation. The intent was also more singularly *ādhyātmika*, rather than social and action-oriented. It did have a kind of action-orientation, but this was purely ritualistic, since music was

²⁴ It may be interesting to note here that the emergence of the *rāga* form took place in a milieu which did notate musical structures. The Vedic people had been using a system of notation for ages before the *rāga*-form took shape. Yet the musicology of the *rāga* never thought of defining or characterising a *rāga* through notations. On the contrary, it broke away from the *sāma* system which practically *defined* its musical structures in notational terms.

Notations, however, have been used for centuries, down to our present times, for *indicating* possible or generally-made movements within a *rāga*, or pointing out dominant *parts* of a *rāga*-structure, but a *rāga*, as a whole, is not thought to be a kind of structure that can be notated. Such an attempt would amount to what can be called a confusion of categories.

integral to the *yajña*-ritual. Plato and Confucius can be said to have been looking for a music of *dharma*. In India such an association with music is difficult to find. But since the early Vedic period music was made part of a spiritual vision and *sādhanā*, giving rise to a distinct spiritual tradition and stream of thought.

Indian culture, in fact, is the only culture where transcendental revelation has taken the form not only of words but also of music: pure music undiluted by words. The Vedic music, called *sāma*, to which the texts of many Vedic *mantras* are sung, is *apauruṣeya* (or transcendental) *in its own right* and not *through* the *mantras*, and as subsidiary to them. *Sāma*, indeed, was thought to have a revealed transcendental logos of its own, a logos considered in *sāma*-singing circles as higher than the one manifested through the 'word'. This singular esteem for the *sāma* finds an echo in the *Gītā*, too, when the Lord Himself says: "*vedānām sāmavedo'smi* — Among the *Vedas*, I am the *Sāmaveda*."

The literature especially devoted to *sāma* is vast, and includes a significant body of texts which are obviously musicological in the narrower sense of the term, analysing, describing, arranging and notating the music. But more outstanding and profound is the independent tradition which reflects on the deep ritual and the deeper spiritual logos of *sāma*. This tradition, evidently, took root in Vedic circles from very early times. The *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* are quite early (dating, perhaps to the period between 1000 and 800 BC), and already remarkable examples of this literature. One of the essays collected here, 'Ancient Music And The Concept Of Man', can provide the reader with an idea of this vein of thought, its uniqueness and independence from the revealed word, and its feeling for *sāma* as an *upāsana*, a pathway to the spirit. The well-known *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, 'the *Upaniṣad* of the singers of *sāma*', is a key text of this tradition of thought, but the others that we have named, are in many ways even more distinctive. My essay in this collection

makes some detailed use of the otherwise lesser-known, *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*. The Vedic ṛṣis of this tradition, evidently, believed that *sāma*, having descended from the spirit could also lead to the spirit. Echoes of this ancient spiritual logos according a unique value to the discipline of music, can be discerned in thought concerning music throughout the history of Indian culture, down to our own times.

Music, however, is not usually *isolated* from a sung text, especially in a liturgy such as *sāma* also was. But the *sāma*-tradition pointedly does this. No wonder, then, that there is an ancient controversy in India on the issue of the independence of *sāma*. The controversy is punctuated by the position taken by Mīmāṃsakas, the proclaimed arbiters of correctness concerning Vedic ritual, who believe that *sāma* is *subsidiary* to the *mantra* text. Given this issue, it might be interesting to take up the case of the *independence* of *sāma* in some detail here. I will do this in the context of Professor Daya Krishna's comments on the article in this collection, referred to above, 'Ancient Music And' The Concept of Man'.

Professor Daya Krishna is a distinguished philosopher who has raised many new and significant questions concerning Mīmāṃsā and other schools of Indian thought, as well as the Vedic corpus in general. Many of his articles, concerning this aspect of his interests, have been collected in his book, *Indian Philosophy, A Counter Perspective*. One of the articles is entitled, 'The Vedic Corpus: Some Questions'. It raises searching questions regarding the ancient notions of *anṛca* and *aśarīra sāma*, conceived in the *sāma*-singing tradition, as it has been articulated in the *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* and described in my article. These notions, I have argued, reveal the idea of *sāma* as independent of the sung *mantra*. Prof. Daya Krishna's comment (pp. 71-73 of his book) on my formulation deserves reflection.

The relevant passage which he quotes from my article reads:

"*Sāma* was a revealed form in its own right, just as the *ṛcas*. Further, in many cases, *sāma* was valued for music alone. An

example is that of the *anṛca-sāma*. *Anṛca-sāma* was a form of *Sāma* that had no *ṛk* base and was sung to meaningless syllables."

The *anṛca-sāma*, mentioned in this passage, is described in the *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, where another interesting word, *aśarīra-sāma*, also occurs. In my article, I have taken these two words to be synonyms, meaning the same forms of *sāma*, consisting of pure music without words. (Though, as we shall see, a meaningful distinction *can* be made between *anṛca* and *aśarīra sāmas*.)

Quoting this passage, Professor Daya Krishna remarks: "The term *anṛca*, literally speaking, can only mean a melody which is not sung to a *Ṛk mantra*. Dr. Lath has, however, taken it to mean a melody which is sung to no text whatsoever. This is an arbitrary interpretation, the justification of which is supposed to lie in the *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* where, in the *Prathama Khaṇḍa* of the fourth *Anuvāka* of the first *Adhyāya*, it is said that *Samnānṛcena svargam lokam prayātet*; and in the second *Khaṇḍa* of the sixth *Anuvāka* of the third *Adhyāya* it is said that *sa me śarireṇa sāmna śarirānyadhunot*. The identification of *Anṛca* with *Aśarīra*, though not entirely unjustified, rests on the assumption that *Ṛk* alone can be the body of *Sāma*. But this obviously is a questionable assumption."

There are two questions here. One, whether *anṛca* could mean *sāma* with a text other than a *ṛk*; and, two, whether *anṛca* and *aśarīra* can be identified, if so with what justification. As to the first question, as Professor Daya himself remarks, there was an assumption — an assumption rooted in Vedic culture and the milieu of *yajña*, of which *sāma* singing was an integral part — that *sāma* could be sung to *ṛk* alone. The passage in the *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* which speaks of the *anṛca*, describes it as leading the gods to heaven *in contrast* to the *sāma* which was sung to *ṛk*. It is also said in the passage — in a line not quoted in the article, as I had written it originally, assuming that *ṛk* alone could be a text for *sāma* — that: "They (the gods) shook off *ṛk*-words, the bodies (*śarirāṇi*) [of the *sāma*] as they

proceeded [towards heaven], and they became victorious over the world of heaven: *ta etāni ṛkpadāni śarirāṇi dhurvanta āyan. te svargam lokamajayan*" (*Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, 1,4,1.).²⁵ We notice immediately that *śarira* here is clearly equated with *ṛk*. The implicit assumption in this passage patently is that the text of a *sāma* could not but be a *ṛk*, and that the *ṛk* alone formed the 'body' of the *sāma*. So deep-rooted was the assumption that it seems to have needed no explicit statement. The *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* speaks of the 'shaking off' of *ṛk* words (*ṛkpadāni*) from *sāma*. But if *ṛk* formed the text of *sāma*, the *sāma* would then have no text left. And hence an *aśarira sāma* was the same as an *anṛca sāma*: without any text whatsoever. But one might reasonably argue here that by '*śarira*' the *Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* really meant a 'meaningful' text, since no singing can, after all, avoid using some 'text', meaningful or not. An *aśarira sāma*, hence is a *sāma* using meaningless words, but words all the same.

This is how Dayaji does understand *śarira*, for he further comments, "he (Mukund Lath) seems to assume that only meaningful words and/or sentences could be said to form the body or *śarira* of music. But there is no reason for this assumption. The term 'body' here merely means *āśraya* or base and that could be provided by anything, meaningful or meaningless".

I would like to discuss the implications of the notion of *āśraya* in Dayaji's usage, and whether a meaningful and a meaningless *āśraya* can be the same thing. The first consideration is, I think, obvious: we obviously do not need words, meaningful or meaningless, as *āśraya* for instrumental music, unless we stretch the meaning of 'words' to absurd limits. The matter, however, can lead to interesting reflection.

Playing on the *sitār*, the *sāraṅgi*, the flute or any other instrument, requires a friction in order to produce sound of

²⁵ The edition I refer to, as in the article discussed here, is the Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyāpīṭha, edition of the text : ed. Billikoth Ramachandra Sharma, Tirupati, 1967.

which a variety is available to the musician, depending on the instrument, the techniques available and the kind of music desired. Music needs sound, and this is what Indian musicology knows as the *āhata-nāda*, or 'friction-born sound'. When the instrument for producing the *āhata-nāda* is the throat, the sound produced is conditioned by what the throat can do. But the *āhata-nāda* in the throat also produces sounds which are put together as words rather than music. Further, these sounds can be put together *both* as words and music. This possibility of combining in the human voice *svara* with the production of words is, indeed, what makes it possible for us to sing with words, as no other instrument can do. But it would be wrong to speak of an *āśraya-āśrayi-bhāva* here, with words as the *āśraya* and *svaras* as based on them. As we utter words, the voice spontaneously travels over the octave, and if we pay attention, tonal relations can be identified. In dramatic speech attention is, in fact, paid to the tone accompanying the voice, as Bharata clearly recognised long ago, indeed, he articulates the rise and fall of dramatic speech on the basis of *svaras*, specifically naming them in describing the process.²⁶ Dramatic speech is emotion-laden speech, and we can see that Bharata, like Confucius, recognised the essential relation between *svara* and the 'affections', using the relation to his own *rasa*-producing ends. But *svaras* in speech, even dramatic speech, remain vague and subsidiary; unrecognised as *svara*, though when we speak of certain voices as musical, one reason is the clarity with which they naturally enunciate *svara*.

Given this natural relation in the human voice of *svara* and speech, either of them can, in a sense, be spoken of as the *āśraya* of the other and we might call them, *paraspara-āśraya*, sharing a mutuality of *āśraya*-hood. But the *āśraya* of *svara* in speech is *not*, really speaking, word, but friction-produced sound, *āhata-nāda*. If by 'word' we are to understand any sound whatever,

²⁶ See *Nāṭyaśāstra*, the section on *pāṭhya*, where the concept of *kāku*, paraphrased above, is described: G.O.S edition, vol. 2, *adhyāya* 17, p. 385-399.

which accompanies a *svara* but can be distinguished from it in some sense, then to term 'words' as the *āśraya* of *svara* and music would become an empty truism. The question rather should be: can we think of the *āhata-nāda* arising in the human voice as being more naturally and essentially related to sounds that produce words and language rather than to *svara* and music? For only in such a case can words be an *āśraya* of sung music in any worthwhile sense.

Let me try to further clarify. The *āhata-nada* or the friction-produced range of sounds in the human voice, as I have said, contains sounds of two distinct kinds: those that can be articulated as words and those that form *svaras*. Both these sounds are produced together in such a way that we can meaningfully speak of a relation of mutual or *paraspara āśraya* between those sounds that form words and those that form *svaras*. One or the other partner in this *paraspara āśraya* can be made to become dominant, a process leading either to speech or to music. The *āhata-nāda* in the throat, when articulating speech is dominated by *varṇas* or *syllables*: vowels, consonants and the like; but in making music, which, though it also uses *varṇas*, the main intention of using the voice is to turn itself into a musical instrument and articulate pitch and the web of *svaras* created by modulations of pitch. Modulations of pitch, however, are not *absent* in articulating *varṇas*. The question is what is more *natural* to the voice as *āhata-nāda*, *varṇa* or *svara*? Or, in other words, in the given *paraspara āśraya* between *varṇa* (which forms words), and *svara* (which forms music), which is the *essentially* dominant partner? Even on a simple reflection, we cannot fail to see that the relation between *svara* and the *āhata-nāda* in our throat has a much more essential quality than the relation between that *nāda* and words. The throat-born *varṇas* used in pronouncing words are also used in intoning music. The *varṇas*, however, appear as more naturally related to words and language than to music. We are tempted, therefore, like Professor Daya Krishna to call 'words' as *āśraya* of music. But the relation of the *āhata-nāda* with music is much stronger than

it is with words. Because *āhata-nāda* as such, whether in the human voice or in animals, or even inanimate nature, has a natural *anuraṇana* or a sympathetic after-sound which makes it produce or echo other sounds at other pitches. This is what gives rise to *svaras*, and makes *svaras* something given in nature, a series of pitches, related to each other through what has been called a *saṁvāda* or harmony. It was this 'given' relation which Pythagoras, to his profound surprise, discovered to be governed by simple arithmetical ratios. There is no such natural relation between the *āhata-nāda* and the vowels and consonants, or *varṇas*, which are produced in the human voice alone and which we use for uttering words.²⁷ In fact, when we produce *varṇas*,

²⁷ This has been recognised in Indian scientific thinking for many centuries. The *Prāśastapāda Bhāṣya* on the *Vaiśeṣika Sūtras* (c. 4th-5th centuries AD) recognises the peculiarity of sound as an object of the senses. Though sound is a *pratyakṣa*, Prāśastapāda observes, that is, a 'sensible', or some 'thing' perceived, there is no 'thing' or object perceived in this *pratyakṣa*. Indeed, what is perceived is the end-product of a series of *waves*, each of which is destroyed immediately after giving rise to the next wave in the series till it reaches the ear. The series of waves which constitute sound, is born of friction between 'things' when they come in contact or break apart (*saṁyogavibhāgaśabdajah*, the concept used by Prāśastapāda for what in *saṁgīta-śāstra* is known as *āhata-nāda*). Sound, interestingly, is divided by Prāśastapāda into two major categories: *dhvani* and *varṇa*, that is, sound in general, one might say, and phonemes or syllables. *Varṇas*, according to Prāśastapāda, are units of speech such as the vowel, 'a'; and *dhvani*, on the other hand, is produced by instruments such as the conch, the flute, etc.: *śabdo'mbaraguṇaḥ śrotagrahyah, kṣaṇikah, kāryakāranobhayavirodhi, saṁyogavibhāgaśabdajah, pradeśavṛttiḥ, samānāsamānajāṭṭyakāraṇah. sa dvividho varṇalakṣaṇo dhvanilakṣaṇaśca. tatra ākāradirvarṇalakṣaṇah, saṅkhādinimitto dhvanilakṣaṇaśca.* (I quote from the Ganganath Jha Granthamālā edition of the text, ed. Bhagīratha Prāsāda Śāstrī, Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, Varanasi, 1977, pp. 692-93). I have made a precis of the text in the essay above, including only those points which were of interest here without translating the whole text, which has other points of interest, too, but which are not quite relevant here. *Varṇas*, in contrast to *dhvani*, Prāśastapāda further seems to suggest, are produced through human effort: *tatra varṇalakṣaṇasyotpattirātmamanasoḥ saṁyogāt smṛtyapekṣād varṇocāreccchā, tadanantaram prayamaḥ ...* (ibid, pp 693-94). Although the examples given by Prāśastapāda illustrating *dhvani* imply a similar human effort, he does not *speak* of such an effort in this case, and, patently, the concept of *saṁyoga-vibhāga* indicates that sound may be produced by friction

which are more contingent and conditioned sounds, through our voice, we at the same time, and more necessarily, produce *svaras*, too. Many languages, such as Vedic Sanskrit for example, indeed use *svaras* in forming and distinguishing words. So if we at all want to speak of an *āśraya-āśrayi-bhāva* between *svara* and words, *svara* seems to be a more reasonable choice as an *āśraya*.

There are other considerations in this context which we could also reflect on. A word, forgetting its loose sense as a combination of *varṇas*, cannot really be called 'word' without a meaning. A meaning, however, can have an entirely different string of sounds as *āśraya*, or an *āśraya* not in sound but in script. And, if we think of meaningful words as necessarily tied up with other words and with language as a whole, we would perhaps have to speak of a complex relationship of *paraspara-āśraya*, between language, meaning and sound, the sense of *āśraya* being different for each of the different relations. *Svara* may be said to be the *āśraya* of music in a sense analogous to the relation between a (meaningful) word and language: words depend on a language, within which they are words; similarly *svaras* in order to be significant and expressive for us and not mere sounds related in a certain natural way, assume music. How, one might ask, can the relation between *svara* and meaningless vocal sounds be characterised? Is the relation the same

alone, without any human effort: these could only be sounds of the *dhvani* category. Other, later, texts make the distinction clear. The author of the *Śabdaratna*, whose views are summarised in the *Nyāyakośa*, differentiates between *śabda* which is knowingly and wilfully produced (*buddhihetukaḥ*) and that which is not so produced (*abuddhihetukaḥ*), and is 'natural': such as the sound made

by clouds: *sa ca śabdo dvividhaḥ buddhihetukaḥ abuddhihetukaśca. tatra abuddhihetuko meghādiśabdaḥ*. See *Nyāyakośa*, compiled by Bhīmācārya Jhalakīkar, pub. the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1978, under 'śabda'.

Intriguingly, though the distinction which Praśastapāda makes between *varṇa* and *dhvani*, is obviously made with language and music in mind, he does not take up the phenomena of *svara* and its relation to *dhvani* for any significant exposition, concentrating, rather, on the relation between *varṇa* and words or language. *Śabda* or language was for him important as a category of *pramāṇa* — to which he denied a separate category, including it under *anumāna* — but *svara* or music, clearly, did not interest him in its own right.

as that between a meaningful word and the sounds used to utter it? It does not seem to be so, unless one were to believe, like some do in the west, that a *written* musical score is as much or even 'purer' music than that which is sung or played; but the notion of the reducibility of music to writing strains our imagination beyond belief, and cannot be equated with the use of script in language. Music, which is made with *svaras* is necessarily friction-produced, or uses *āhata-nāda*, to employ the meaning-loaded ancient concept in the sense we have seen above. The *anāhata nāda* (sound produced without friction), another meaningful ancient concept, considered the transcendental ground of *āhata-nāda*, is not open to our senses and is not what music uses; though words, one could think, may be called *anāhata*, meaningfully, since they need not be heard. The relation of music to sound, indeed, specific sound, is much more intimate than the relation of meaning to sound, as is also clear from the fact that music is not translatable.

The *āhata* sounds in the human voice, have two given relations: one with *svara* and the other with words, through *varṇas*. This possibility of the same *āhata-nāda* to be related to both *svara* and words, makes it possible for us to *sing* words, something other musical instruments cannot do. *Svara*, we have argued, is more essentially related to *āhata-nāda*. Yet, since we use language more naturally, and in a sense more essentially than music, we tend to think of human sounds more basically as words rather than *svara* and music. This rather uncritically maintained idea, also seems the basis of Prof. Daya's assertion that music must have an *āśraya* in words, whether meaningful or not. Bharata, too, with a similar contention in mind speaks of *pada*, 'word', in music as either with or without meaning.²⁸ But as Bharata also makes us realise, the relation of music with the

²⁸ *Nāṭyaśāstra*, 32, 28 (G.O.S edition, vol, 4, p. 302) : *yat syādakṣarasambaddham tat sarvaṃ padasamjñitam* — 'whatever is [made up] through a correlation of syllables is termed 'pada'.' Bharata says this in the context of describing the sung 'texts' of *gāndharva*, which included meaningless strings of syllables, besides meaningful ones. He has, for his own peculiar purpose, stretched the meaning of 'pada' beyond the limits acceptable to both ordinary and śāstric usage : for which *pada* was necessarily meaningful.

two kind of *padas*, meaningful and meaningless, has an entirely different intent, and cannot really be equated. When 'words' are meaningless, we are making music, not words, because there are really no words. What we call 'words', in such a context, namely vowels and consonants, or, in other words, *akṣaras* or *varṇas*, can, I think, be better described as *parts* of *svaras*, rather than their *āśraya*. Like strokes on instruments they help manifest the *svara* in a certain manner, becoming a *sāmagrī*, an integral ingredient, of its expressive quality, its intonation; and it is *svara* as expression that constitutes music. The role of *akṣaras* or *varṇas* is quite different in language. They are *parts* of speech, but they are not integral to meaning.

But when a song *has* meaningful words, we have a large and complex spectrum of possibilities. The relationship can be either word-dominated or music-dominated. One could evoke Bharata once again in this context. He describes two kinds of music, the one, pure, called *gāndharva*, the other theatrical or programmatic, called *gāna*, they lie for him at the two ends of the possible relations between *pada*, that is, meaningful words, and *svara*, music, with music dominating in *gāndharva* and words in *gāna*. Our own music today has examples of both the *svara* and the *pada*-dominated forms, with other forms lying more at the centre of the spectrum, and containing a more even balance between *pada* and *svara* such as in the *thumri* or the *jāvalī*. From Bharata we can also form an idea of how words usually get to be treated when music dominates: the syllables are pulled, pushed, drawn out, broken, distorted, and treated in ways that they would not be treated if conveying meaning was the purpose. The production of music takes over and vocal sounds become more like strokes on the instrument that is the voice, and hence closer to meaningless 'words'. In forms dominated by meaningful words, we can, perhaps, relevantly speak of words as the *āśraya* of music. The music 'rests' on the words, moulding itself to them. But in music-dominated forms, such a concept of *āśraya* seems meaningless, since words even when meaningful tend to become vocables.

This is what had clearly happened in *sāma*. *Sāma* is sung to both meaningful and meaningless words, with most *sāmas* having words that are meaningful. *But* the words are treated as if they are not words but tools to make music with. They are distorted and pushed around in various ways, the distortions are obviously made with music and not meaning in mind.

The passage I had quoted above from the *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, speaks of the '*śarīra*' being shaken off from *sāma*, this *śarīra* being the *ṛk*. It also suggests that this was done without loss to *sāma*, making it, on the contrary, 'lighter' — more subtle and pure, and hence, fit for being 'uplifted' to heaven. But if the *śarīra* could be dispensed with, it cannot really be taken to be synonymous with '*āśraya*', if *āśraya* is to be understood as the indispensable base for the music.

Sāma, thus, was clearly music-dominated, though this is not generally realised, because our thought is dominated by the Mimāṃsā view of *ṛk* as the ruling partner. But the *ṛk* as sung in *sāma* almost invariably undergoes extensive distortions, obviously made for the sake of music, with meaning plainly becoming a casualty.²⁹ These distortions are called *sāma-vikāras*, 'the modification/mutilation a text undergoes in singing *sāma*'. The Sāmavedins have carefully studied this musical phenomenon, which is, in fact, common, in a lesser or a greater degree, depending on the musical intent, in singing any text. The *vikāras* have been analysed in detail and classified into, mainly, six types. The exercise is unique in the history of musicology, important not only for *sāma*, but for understanding of texts in general as *sung*. Unfortunately, the idea of *sāma-vikāra* is little-known outside *sāma* circles, even to modern Indian music-critics and musicologists, who are otherwise quite preoccupied with the

²⁹ There are, of course, those who think of the *ṛk mantra* primarily as a *varṇānukramī*, a fixed string of syllables. For those who believe so, it is even more difficult to demonstrate the dominance of *ṛk* in *sāma* singing as has been pointed out by Sāmavedins. Because, *sāma-vikāras*, as we shall see, inevitably change the *ṛk varṇānukramī* and hence what is sung can no longer be called a '*ṛk*' *mantra*.

relation of text with music. (There is a short article in this collection, 'Words And Music', which makes some use of the notion of *sāma-vikāra* in a modern context). It may, therefore, be useful to illustrate the phenomenon from the *Sāmaveda*. I will quote the example that Satyavrata Sāmaśramī has given in his edition of the *Sāmaveda*, with Sāyana's *Bhāṣya*.

Before proceeding, let me point out that the notion of *āśraya* or its synonym, *ādihāra*, was also used by the Sāmavedins. The sung *ṛk* was thought of in two ways: either as the *yonī*, the 'source', of the *sāma*, or as its *āśraya*, or sometimes as its *mūla*, 'root', meaning the same as 'source'. The two notions, of *yonī* and *āśraya*, are obviously not the same. The notion of *yonī*, clearly, does not imply the idea of a base as does that of *āśraya*. But the Sāmavedins do not seem to have made any real distinction between the two notions, taking them both in the same sense as '*āśraya*' or 'base'. This concept, we shall see, leads them into strange, almost absurd, directions, when the sung text was not *ṛk* but a meaningless string of *varṇas* to which *sāmas* were also sung.

The *ṛk āśraya*, or *yonī*, of the *sāma* to be illustrated for *vikāras* is as follows:

agna āyāhi vītaye grṇāno havyadātaye/

'Agni, come for the libation, sung by us, carry the offering'.

nihotā satsi barhiṣi.

'You are the priest, sit on the grass-mat'.³⁰

(I have given a rough literal translation, following the word-order of the original, so that the *vikāras* to be illustrated may be more clearly seen).

This *ṛk*, the first in the *chanda-ārcika*, the primary or basic collection of *ṛks* for *sāmas*, can be sung to three different *sāma* compositions, revealed to two different *ṛṣis*, to Gotama, who sang two of them, and to Kaśyapa. In the first version, which is

³⁰ All our reference to the *Sāmaveda Saṃhitā* are to the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1871-1878 edition, editor, Satyavrata Sāmaśramī Bhaṭṭācārya; reprinted by Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1983. For the present passage see Vol. I, p. 94.

by Gotama, the *sāma* has the following 'text' (the oblique marks in the 'text' to follow indicate punctuations in the music, not the meaning. I omit the musical notations which accompany the *sāma*. Though a necessary part of the song, indicating how it should be sung, they are not really needed here to understand the notion of *vikāras*, and will only clutter the text):

*ognāyi / āyāhi / vīyitoyāyi / toyāyi / grṇānoha / vyadāto yāyi / toyāyi / nayiho tasa / tsāyi / vā au hovā / hisi /*³¹

One can plainly see that the *ṛk* now is unrecognisable. The *vikāras* have transformed it, so much so that the meaning can no longer be grasped without reference to the original. Satyavrata Sāmaśramī identifies and names the various *vikāras* the *ṛk* is considered to have undergone. The words, *agni*, *vītaye*, *ā yāhi*, have undergone the *vikāra* termed *vikṛti*, that is, 'distortion' or 'modification' of individual words (the general term *vikṛti*, a synonym of *vikāra*, being used here in a particular sense). The word *vītaye* has undergone other *vikāras* besides *vikṛti*. One is *viśleṣa*, or separation, in that a part of it, an already *vikṛta* part, *toyāyi*, has been detached from it. The word has also been 'pulled', that is, subjected to *vikarṣaṇa*: dragged out into a *yāyi* at its end. We further see an *abhyāsa* or a 'repetition' of a part of the already distorted word: in *vīyitoyāyi / toyāyi /*. There is also a *virāma* to be seen in this *sāma*: *virāma* being a pause which goes against the meaning. In this instance, it breaks the words, *grṇāno havyadātaye* into two meaningless segments: *grṇānoha / vyadāto yāyi/*, the *virāma* here coming at 'ha', instead of 'no' where it should. We also see a *lopa*, or an 'omission': of the syllable 'r' (the *repha*) in the *sāma* form of the last word in the *ṛk*, namely, *barhiṣi*.³²

Another important thing that has happened is the *addition* of extra syllables, which are not in the *ṛk*. Such an addition is a

³¹ Ibid. The *vikṛta sāma* form given here is recorded just below the *ṛk*, in the book we quote from.

³² See Sāyana's *avataraṇikā* or introduction to the *Saṃhitā*, vol. 1, p. 12. Note, especially, Satyavarata Sāmaśramī Bhaṭṭācārya's footnote (on the same page), where he illustrates the *vikāras*. Our example and exposition follows him.

marked characteristic of a great deal of singing, whether Vedic or not. The added syllables in the above *sāma* are, / *vā au hovā* / . Such added syllables were known as *stobha*. The phenomenon of *stobha* is important for understanding the notion of *anṛca* and the *aśarīra sāmās*. A *stobha* has been defined simply as: 'extra syllables not in the *ṛk*' (*adhikatve sati ṛgvilakṣaṇavarṇaḥ stobhaḥ*), but the notion is more complex than the simple, though suggestive, definition implies. We have seen that extra syllables have already been added through other *vikāras*. These, however, are considered as transformations, not additions. *Stobhas* are syllables not traceable to the *ṛk* through any *vikāra*. The concept of the *stobha*, as we shall see, reveals that in a deep sense, for *sāma*-singing, the only text that was really a meaningful text was a *ṛk*. The *vikāras*, mapped above, have shown that *sāma* treated the words of the *ṛk* more as vocables than as units of meaning. The illustration given here is not exceptional; indeed, the *ṛk* in most *sāmās* is equally unrecognisable, often to an even greater degree. Modern *khyāl*-singers, who obviously care more for music than for meaning, get chastised for a much lesser degree of *vikāra*-formation. *Stobhas*, we just saw, have been defined simply as 'syllables not in the *ṛk*'. This simple definition veils the fact that *sāma* could be independent of the *ṛk*, not only through the introduction of meaningless texts but also of meaningful ones, for syllables not in the *ṛk* need not be meaningless.³³ The truth is that there were *sāmās* sung only to *stobhas*, both meaningless and meaningful.

And this, appropriately, brings me to the point that Professor Daya Krishna has made about *anṛca sāma*. He is right, I must confess, in suggesting that '*anṛca*' need not mean a meaningless *sāma*. Non-*ṛk*, but meaningful words are found as the texts of quite a few *stobha sāmās*. Professor Daya's intention was, no

³³ For quite another kind of musical *vikāras*, where meaning is paid more crucial attention to see *The Hindi Padāvali Of Nāmadev* by Winand. M. Callewaert and Mukund Lath, Motilal Banarasi Dass Publishers Pvt. Ltd. Delhi, 1989, pp.63-82 These we have called *geya-vikāras* to distinguish them from *sāma-vikāras*.

doubt, to make a logical or analytical point: '*anṛca*' can only mean 'having no *ṛk*'; it cannot mean 'having no meaningful text'. But what he says is *actually* true, as I discovered on looking up the *Sāmaveda*, where there are a significant number of *sāmās* which are sung to a meaningful yet *anṛca* texts. These, in the present edition of the *Sāmaveda Saṁhitā*, are termed *stobha sāmās*.

Sāmavedins tell us that *sāma* is sung either to *ṛk* or to *stobha*, and, indeed, most often to both, as we have seen in the illustration above. *Sāmās* sung to *stobha* alone, the *stobha-sāmās*, intriguingly, include both meaningless and meaningful texts. Let me give examples. The *āraṇya gānas*, though placed in a '*pariśiṣṭa*' of the *chanda-ārcika* of the *Sāmaveda Saṁhitā*, are yet an integral part of the *Saṁhitā*. They include a number of songs sung to *stobha* alone. Among these we have examples of both meaningful and meaningless texts. Strikingly, the famous Vedic lines beginning with, '*aganma jyotiḥ amṛtā abhūma* — 'we shall find the light and become immortal', are sung as *sāma*. The *sāma* is described as a *stobha sāma* and is an *āraṇya-gāna*. Its text as a *mūla*, that is what would otherwise be called its *yoniform*, if it were a *ṛk*, is recorded in a curious manner, plainly different from the earlier example from the *Ṛgveda*; it is given as follows, and it is termed a *mūla* or *yonī*:

u / aganma / jyotiḥ / amṛtāḥ / a / mṛtāḥ / abhūma / antarikṣam / pṛthivyāḥ / adhi / a / āruhāma / avidāma / devān / sam / u / devaiḥ / aganmahi ³⁴

['We shall find the light and become immortal. From the earth we shall ascend to the skies, and from the skies to the heavens, and we shall know the gods, and walk with them.']

We have a clear example here of an *anṛca sāma*, which has a meaningful text. We could, perhaps, see a useful distinction in such instances between the ancient terms *anṛca* and *aśarīra*: for this *sāma*, though *anṛca*, need not also be described as *aśarīra* if

³⁴ See vol. II, pp. 465-466. There are some musical symbols written above many letters, these I have again omitted since the point I am making does not need their presence.

śarīra be taken as a meaningful text. We cannot say, however, whether the ancient *sāma*-singers had also thought of such a distinction between *anrca* and *aśarīra*. If they did, *aśarīra*, for them, could have meant any *rk*-less *sāma*, whether sung to a meaningful or to a meaningless text. This seems reasonably imaginable, and it can, I think, be argued that what are now recorded as *stobha sāmās*, began in the earliest singing tradition as *aśarīra sāmās*, even though, as far as I know, such a connection has not actually been thought of.

To come now to the text of this *stobha sāma*, we notice that every word is segregated from the other; no running text is given in this instance, as it is when recording a *rk* as a *yoni*: we have seen this in the first example I gave of the *sāma*, 'agna āyāhi vītaye'. The text of the present song, as we can see from the manner in which it is written above — every word being segregated from the others with an oblique sign of separation — is not recorded as a continuous meaningful text containing words conjoined into phrases or sentences, but rather as a series of independent, disconnected string of syllables, or in other words, *stobhas* not really meant to be 'words'. This impression is strengthened if we take a look at the complete list of *stobhas* to be found at the end of the *chanda-ārcika* as another *pariśiṣṭa*:³⁵ this includes the meaningful words of this *sāma*, each recorded separately, along with words which in principle are considered meaningless, like the / *vā au hovā* /, of the earlier *rk-sāma*. We also notice elements in this *stobha sāma* which are not be found when a *rk* is recorded as *yoni* or, in other words, as a meaningful text without the *vikāras*. We have in the present case the additions of the meaningless 'u' and the 'a' sounds as *part* of the *mūla text* itself. We also have a repetition or *abhyāsa*, which is otherwise a *vikāra*, included as *part* of the text. It is an *abhyāsa* which, perversely, seems to turn the meaning around in a self-contradiction: / *amṛtāḥ* / *a* / *mṛtāḥ* /, turning 'a' into a *stobha*, and separating it, and thus associating *amṛtāḥ* with its contradiction, *mṛtāḥ*.

³⁵ See *Sāmaveda Saṁhitā*, Vol. II, pp.519 to 542.

What is even more intriguing is that the above series of *stobhas* was not considered the form for actual singing but only a kind of basic text; it was subjected to further *vikāras* in actual singing. As sung this *sāma* had the following form (I again omit the *svara*-notations, except for those which appear to be recorded as *part* of the text):

Auhovāuhovāuhovā / *aganmajyotiḥ* / 2 / *aganmajyotiḥ* / *amṛtāabhūma*/2/*amṛtāabhūmā*/*tarikṣamprthiviyāadhyaṛuhāmā*/2/*tarikṣamprthiviyā-dhyaṛuhāma* / *divamantarikṣādadhyaṛuhāma* /3/*avidāmadevān*/3 *samudevairaganmahi*/3/*auhovāuhovāuhovā*/*suvarjyoti* ³⁶

We again notice interesting changes which can only be called *vikāras*. There is, for one, the *addition* of both meaningful and meaningless syllables: 'au, ho, vā' as well as 'suvarjyoti'. This amounts, in the *Sāmavedins'* own terms, to adding *stobha* to *stobha* since what we have is already a *stobha sāma*. Even more interestingly, we have passages with only *svaras*, / 2 /, / 3 /, which I have not omitted, because they stand like *stobhas* as integral part of the the sung *text*, and not as notations *added* separately, as is done elsewhere in recording *sāma*, particularly those with a *rk yoni*. One wonders what vocable or vocables these *svaras* were sung to, for these *svaras* must have used some vocal syllables in order to be intoned. One also wonders whether such lone-standing *svara* signs are to be classed as *stobha*. If not, how are they to be categorised? ³⁷

³⁶ The same textual reference as in fn. 34.

³⁷ In recording the text of a *sāma* as sung, a text whether composed of *rk* or of *stobhas*, the method usually employed in the available *Sāmaveda Saṁhitās* is to indicate the *svaras* above the *varṇas*: a¹ganma²jyo^{1m}tiḥ², the numbers pointing at *svaras* and 'ra' indicating a prolongation by a *mātrā* of a syllable (see, *Kauthūma-Sākhyaḥ ūhagānam, ūhyagānam*, referred to in detail below, introduction, pp. 27-29 and 35-36). A *svara* is not separately given as in this and similar cases.

Prof. Daya Krishna recently pointed out to me an article by Prof. Wayne Howard where he describes a kind of *sāma*, sung by the Nambudiri *yājñikas*, called *anirukta sāma*: See 'The Music Of The Nambudiri Unexpressed Chant (*Aniruktagāna*)' by Wayne Howard in *Agni: The Vedic Ritual Of The Fire Altar*, ed. Frits Staal, pub Motilal Banarasidass, New Delhi, 1984 (Indian Edition), vol. II, pp. 311-342. But the 'anirukta', translated not too happily as, 'unexpressed',

Strange as the above conception of *stobha* added to *stobha* may appear, the additions, however, do come across as

by Howard, points really at no more than a special kind of *stobha* singing. Also it does not, as I had hoped, afford a clue to the meaning and use of lone-standing *svaras* within a text. We also find that the ancient term used to describe what is today known as 'anirukta' among the Nambudiris, was, indeed, 'stobha'.

What occurs in *anirukta*, as it is described by Howard, is that the meaningless syllables *o vā* or a series of *bhakāras* are substituted for *rk varṇas*. When a *bhakāra*, that is, the syllable 'bha' is substituted for a *rk varṇa*, this is done in such a way that the *mātrā*, that is, the vowel value of the *bhakāra* corresponds with the *mātrā* of the original. Writing about two decades before Howard, Pandit A.M. Ramanath Dikshit in his introduction (in Sanskrit) to *Kauthumaśākhāyāh ūhagānam, ūhyagānam*, Kashi Hindu Vishvavidyalaya, Varanasi, 1967, had described the practice in some detail, referring in this context to a *brāhmaṇagrantha*, which he does not, however, name (see his introduction, p.45). The example Ramanath Dikshit gives, makes the phenomenon clear enough. To take his example, for the *rk* phrase, 'adugdhā iva dhenavaḥ iśānamasya jagataḥ', the following series of *bhakāras* are substituted: *bha-bhu-bhā bhi-bha bhe-bha-bha bhi-bhā-bha-bha. bha-bha-bha*, the *bhakāras* thus retain the *mātrā*-structure of the original. Though Dikshit has not named any specific *Brāhmaṇa* work here, I found a description of the phenomenon in one of them, the *Samhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, pub. Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, (Tirupati series nos. 2-4), Tirupati, 1983, ed. Bellikoth Ramachandra Sharma, with the commentaries of Sāyaṇa and Dvijarāja Bhaṭṭa. This interesting *Brāhmaṇa*, which seems a relatively later text, classes the phenomenon as *stobha*. It is written in *sūtras*. *Sūtras*, 18 and 19 of the second *khaṇḍa* read: *rathantare nvaḥsarāṇi bhakāraṇi* (18), and *svravanti vyañjanāni yathākṣaraṇi darśayet* (19)— 'in the *rathantara sāmā*, *bhakāras* [are substituted] for every syllable' (18), and 'the [*bhakāras*] should [take the place of] the consonants [in the original] and should have the [same] vowels' (19). I have followed the commentator, Dvijarāja, in making my translations, (Sāyaṇa's commentary does not exist for this part of the text), but the *Brāhmaṇa*, as one can see, is unambiguous enough. The next three *sūtras* (nos.20-22) promise and argue for a special merit accruing to both the singers of such *bhakāra rathantara sāmā*s as well as to their *yajamānas*. In *sūtra* 23, the word 'stobha' is plainly used in a manner which suggests that these very *bhakāras* are being named: *rathantarasya stobhā svaravantah prayoktavāḥ* — 'the *stobhas* of the *rathantara sāmā* should be rendered [in singing] with the [right] *svaras*'. The context clearly implies that *stobhas* referred to are the *bhakāras*, and this is how the commentator, Dvijarāja, understands the text, commenting: *rathantarasya bhakāralakṣaṇā stobhā svaravantah prayoktavāḥ*.

There are some notable differences between the modern Nambudiri singing of *anirukta sāmā*s and what is described by Dikshit and the ancient *Brāhmaṇa*: the latter do not speak of a modification in musical structure, and the alternative substitution of *o vā*, for example, but, essentially, the phenomenon can be reasonably classed as 'stobha', and the *Brāhmaṇa*, indeed, does so.

additions, because the original *stobha sāmā* contains meaningful units of syllables. But here now is a really queer example. Look at the following *stobha sāmā* in its what is termed the *yonī*-form: *hu // 2 // 1 // 5*

This *stobha-sāmā* when sung, was given the form: *hau / 3 / ū / 3 / huū / iyāhau / 2 / iyāhau / vā / iṭiḍā //*³⁸

The original contains four segments: a meaningless syllable and three *svaras*; in what sense it is the *yonī* or *āśraya* of what is actually to be sung is difficult to imagine. In any case, if only a *rk* can be the textual *āśraya* — as the Sāmavedins say — of a *sāmā*, the notion of *vikāra* in singing seems meaningful only with *rk*. The *rk*, moreover, has a fixed textual form independent of the *sāmā*, which is plainly recognisable as such. But in the other cases, especially the last one, the very conception of an 'original', a *yonī*, that is, an *āśraya*, is puzzling in the extreme. The 'original' here seems to be a pure *abstraction* made from what was actually sung. Why was it felt necessary to take this step, we do not know. The relation between the *sāmā* and its 'abstract' *yonī* seems transparent in some forms: We can accept 'hu' as the *yonī*, in some sense, of 'hau', 'huū' and 'iyāhau': we can even think of 'vā' and 'iṭiḍā' as *stobhas*, further added to the 'original'. But no stretch of imagination can lead us to think of the *svaras*, /2 /, /1 /, /5 /, as *yonīs* of the *svaras*, /3 /, /3 / and /2 /, occurring in the sung text. Perhaps, one might argue that it was thought necessary that every *sāmā* should have a *yonī* or *āśraya* analogous to the *rk*. But if this was so, it certainly led to queer results, revealing the oddity of thinking in terms of an *āśraya* in cases where the sung 'words' were meaningless.

We have quoted, as I said, the above *sāmā*s from the monumental work of Satyavrata Sāmaśramī Bhaṭṭācārya, the famous Sāmavedin who edited the *Sāmaveda Samhitā* with Sāyaṇa's commentary more than a century ago. He records the above *sāmā* with an editorial comment: "asya mūlāṇi na *rk* api tu

³⁸ *Sāmaveda Samhitā*, vol II, p. 487 (*grāme aranyagāne pañcama-prapāṭhaka*).

stobhah — the base (*āśraya*, *yoni*) of this [*sāma*] is not *rk* but *stobha*.”

We find that the *Sāmaveda Saṅgīhītā*, its *bhāṣyas* and its modern edition, do not use words such as *anṛca* or *aśarira* for the *rk*-less *sāmas*. The concepts of *anṛca* and *aśarira* were developed in the early esoteric circles of ancient *sāma*-singers who were inspired by a purely musical vision and felt the words to which they usually sang their *sāma* as a burden. This seems to have been for them a revolutionary move, since as priests and ritualists they must have felt *rk* to be inseparable from *sāma*. It was their deeper, *ādhyātmika* or spiritual quest which freed the revealed *svara* from the revealed word. Their literature, thus, shows an ambivalent attitude towards *rk*; a rejection of *rk* is bracketed with a respect for *rk* even as they extol *sāma* for itself, and glory in the independence of *sāma*. In the *Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* story, after the gods are said to have shaken off the *rk* from the *sāma*, Prajāpati, the Creator Himself, collects them as they lie scattered in the firmament and offers them His devotion (*tanyā divaḥ prakirṇānyāśeran. āthemāni prajāpatirrkpadāni sañcityābhyarcāt: Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, 1, 4, 1, 6). The *rk* is identified with *śrī*, ‘wealth’, ‘prosperity’, ‘well-being’, which the gods lose since they had shaken it off, and the *asuras* gathered it. In order to win back the lost *śrī*, the gods restore *rk* to *sāma*, singing the *sāma* to the *rk* (Ibid. 1, 4, 2, 1-5). Apparently, for the ancient *sāma* singer, the *sāmas* in which he could realise the luminosity of music in itself was a mystic area, inviting exploration, and yet, somewhat forbidden.

However, the impulse to *svara* was basic in *sāma*. The association of *rk* with *sāma*, even in *rk-sāmas* was, as we have seen, such that meaning was distorted in multiple ways for the sake of music; this seems to have invited the singer to give up meaning altogether. He also, in a step he seems to have felt as equally radical, gave up *rk*, choosing new words for his *sāmas*. The use of *stobha* in the existing literature for both these moves reflects, I think, the fact that for the ancient *sāma*-singer the tyranny of meaning, the tie to an *āśraya* in words outside music,

was associated primarily with *rk*, and once he felt free of *rk*, he could give up meaning altogether, as a step in the same direction. The surviving use of the term *stobha* for both an *anṛca* and a meaningless *sāma* seems to echo this ancient feeling. Associated with this move to make music free of its *rk* — body — *śarira* — was a move towards a profound internalisation of music as something spiritual, as truly ‘*aśarira*’, one might say. This was a counterpart in music of the same internalisation of meaning which was taking place in the realm of ritual as a whole, translating it from the physical to the inner symbolic world, as we see in the *Āraṇyakas* leading to the *Upaniṣads*. No wonder, then, that the *stobha sāmas* we have, have been preserved as forest-songs, *araṇya-geya-gānas*. It is not unlikely that the surviving *stobha sāmas* are only a portion of a much larger corpus. For the *sāmas* that survive are geared mostly to ritual, the inward turn having become peripheral: the *stobha*-songs are recorded as *pariśiṣṭa*, an ‘appendix’ to the *chanda-ārcika* consisting of *rks*.

We do not know how long the tradition of *sāma* as *upāsana* — worship — and as spiritual *sādhanā* continued. But unlike the *sādhanā* inspired by the other *Vedas*, through their *Āraṇyakas* and *Upaniṣads*, and proliferating into and becoming part of the many pathways that spirituality took in India, the *sāma*-inspired, music-oriented *sādhanā* does not seem to have remained fertile for long. Its spiritual motivation seems to have passed into the new music of *gāndharva*, sung to *jātis*, progenitors of the *rāgas*. Like the *sāma*, of which we have spoken, the *gāndharva* was imbued with a spiritual purpose, and was similarly dominated by music rather than words.³⁹ *Gāndharva* does not survive today. *Sāma* does. But it seems to have lost not only its independent spiritual intent but also its musical impulse. There seems to be no real regard for musicianship, no *svara-sādhanā*, in the traditions of *sāma*-singers. *Sāma*, for which The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*

³⁹ Readers interested in more details concerning *gāndharva* may see my *A Study Of Dattilam : The Sacred Music Of Ancient India*, pub. Impex India, New Delhi, 1978.

says: *tasya vai svara eva svam*⁴⁰ — ‘its self is the *svara*’, has, sadly, lost its *svara*. The *bhakti* movement brought back the spiritual motive in music, considering *kirtana* as part of *sādhanā*, but music in *bhakti* is dominated by the word and not *svara*.

⁴⁰ The whole passage is worth quoting : *tasya ha etasya sāmno yaḥ svam veda bhavati hāsya svam tasya vai svara eva svam tasmādartvijyam kariṣyanvāci svaramiccheta tayā vācā svarasampannayārtvijyam kuryāttasmādyajñe svaravantam didrṣanta eva’ atho yasya svam bhavati bhavati hāsya svam ya evametatsāmnaḥ svam veda // 25 // tasya ha etasya sāmno yaḥ suvarṇam veda bhavati hāsya suvarṇam tasya vai svara eva suvarṇam bhavati hāsya suvarṇam ya evametatsāmnaḥ suvarṇam veda //26//: *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, 1,3, 25-26. Even the *ṛvika*, concerned with *ṛk* in the rituals, is advised to imbibe *svara*, which is described as the province of *sāma*. The *suvarṇa* of *sāma* — its ‘gold’, but also its ‘right’ or ‘proper’ syllables — are also, significantly, said to be *svaras*.*

ii. The *Pauruṣeya* Logos, Immanent in Human Seeking

The *sāma* is considered in the Indian tradition to be the progenitor of all later music, as the ancient musicological texts repeatedly tell us. From the *sāma*, they say, was born the *jāti*, the generic name for the *svara* forms of *gāndharva*, and from the *jāti*, was born the *rāga*: thus goes the received genealogy recorded in the *saṅgīta-sāstra*. Noteworthy, however, is the fact that the *jāti* music, which still continues in spirit through the *rāga*, was quite different from its parent, *sāma*, both in form and spirit, though it traces its origin to *sāma*. It had a uniqueness, a logos, of its own, for although like *sāma*, it was considered revealed, and thus ‘fixed’, it yet had space, in principle, for free improvisation.

I have been trying in the last section of these ‘Reflections’, in speaking of Pythagoras, Confucius and the ancient singers of *sāma*, to formulate an idea which, I think, may be described as the different logoi of music perceived in three great ancient cultures. There is, it also seems to me, a vision they share in common: the logos they intuit, is a transcendental logos, looking *beyond* music for an Absolute with music as its centre. The logos, so to say, ventures out of music into things *without* it. Pythagoras seeks the unchanging principle for understanding the essence of nature, and Confucius strives after the essential music for harmonious order in man, society and polity. The *sāma*-singers sought the Transcendental for itself, as an inner realisation, for which the *sāma* provided a path of *sādhanā* and *upāsana*. But in the conception of *rāga* and in its history we seem to perceive a logos very different in intent, a logos that can be felt *within* music itself, as it develops and unfolds. I will try to envision it before you, in brief, in the light of Indian musicology and its evolution. Interestingly, the musicology of the *rāga*

shows an awareness of this, and articulates it self-consciously. The logos of the *rāga* is, indeed, itself a logos of evolution and continuing potentiality; it is *historical* in its very essence, with a dialectic of growth that can perhaps be seen to have a parallel in the process of culture itself. For, like culture, it begins with the constraints of a 'naturally given', which it then continuously transforms through its own creative workings, producing a *cultural* 'given' at every stage of its progress, its logos being one of *process*, so to say.

Music, it is almost axiomatically believed, is made with a 'naturally given' set of tones; even though what is perceived as self-evidently 'given', differs in different cultures. In China, as we saw, the 'given' was a set of five *svaras*. The name in ancient Indian musicology for the set of seven *svaras* considered given, was '*svara-maṇḍala*'. The term *svara-maṇḍala* belongs to the musicology of *gāndharva* and its *svara*-forms with the generic name, *jāti*, and not to *sāma*; yet the *set* of *svaras* in the ancient *svara-maṇḍala*, was more or less common to both, with the important difference that the *jāti svara-maṇḍala* admitted two extra *svaras*, augmented positions of the third and the seventh (*ga* and *ni*), though considering them only as kind of semi-*svaras*. The texts of ancient musicology, which are concerned with the *jātis*, and which still have strong echoes in our own thinking about music, recognised twenty-two tonal distances in an octave, which they thought the ear could distinguish. These were called the *śrutis*, or the 'audibles'. The seven *svaras* of the *svara-maṇḍala* were fixed at tonal distances made up of two, three or four of these 'audible' micro-tones. The *śrutis* in themselves were *non-svaras*; so were other possible groupings of *śrutis*, not contained in the 'given' *svara-maṇḍala*. *Sāma* thinkers do not seem to have had the concept of the *śruti*, but the idea of the intrinsic givenness of the seven *svaras* was common to *sāma*, and *gāndharva* and its *jātis*.

The 'givenness' of a *svara* has two different dimensions, which can be seen as distinct: there is, on the one hand, a natural harmonic relation existing between pitches; Pythagoras, in fact,

tried to spell out and draw upon this *givenness* in mathematical terms. But, on the other hand, there is the *felt* givenness of certain tonal distances as *musical*, and hence constituting *svara*: defined, indeed, as 'that which pleases', *svato rañjayati*. The relation between these two elements of the 'given' are complex, and can be problematic, as we shall further see in the light of Indian musicological thought. Actual music-making reveals an interesting tension between the *svara* as given in nature and given in consciousness. This tension dynamically comes across to us at the articulate level of thought in Indian musicology, especially in the thought concerning the *rāga*-form, becoming more acutely articulate as we reach our own times.

Articulating the concept of fixed *svara*-points in the *gāndharva svara-maṇḍala*, Dattila stipulates that *svaras* are fixed at given distances within a scheme of measurement: they are, as he puts it, *vyavasthita-antara*, spaced-out in an ordered arrangement measured in terms of *śrutis*, and form the *svara-maṇḍala*, so that he who knows the measure of their spacing knows the *svara-maṇḍala*.¹ Dattila, and other ancient Indian theorists, measured the said distances, as we have said, through *śrutis*; but unlike Pythagoras, who noted with profound insight that the relations between *svaras* in a *svara-maṇḍala* can be expressed in terms of simple arithmetic ratios, the *śruti*-measure had no mathematical basis, and was ultimately perceived through the ear. This made the *śruti*, in the final analysis, not only a loose measure, but essentially dependent on a *felt* musical perception, even though it was *considered* as fixed and 'given', and existing on its own, out there. The importance of musical perception in fixing the place of *svaras*, perhaps helped in the later loosening of the idea of the fixity of *svaras*, a loosening, as we shall see, which developed as a distinctive feature of the history of the *rāga*. It is perhaps because of Pythagoras and his mathematical notion of *svara* that the idea of its predetermined givenness remained relatively more intrinsic to western musical culture than to

¹ *A Study Of Dattilam*, by Mukund Lath, *op.cit.*, verses, 12-15, p. 318.

the tradition of *rāga*-making. Pythagoras' 'musicological' vision sought a *nitya* and *apauruṣeya* logos, an unchanging 'given'. The logos of the *rāga* is, on the contrary, essentially and strongly *pauruṣeya* or 'human' in intent, creatively *seeking* its own basis and an ever-new 'givenness', which it keeps modifying; striving for a meaningful ground rather than assuming it as fixed and 'given' once and for all. In this, it is also obviously very different from what Confucius or the ancient Sāmavedins sought in music. It is the logos of a *puruṣārtha*, a *human* seeking, which looks beyond what *is*, namely, the given, even as it keeps formulating and reformulating it in an on-going process.

The seed of the *pauruṣeya* logos inherent in the *rāga*, lies, I would like to suggest, in two distinct but related grounds or principles: the first could be termed the principle of improvisation, and the second — quite contrary, interestingly, to the Confucian ideal of what music ought to be — the motive or principle of pleasure: ordinary human pleasure, and not that of a *sthita-prajña* sage. The principle of improvisation is already to be found in the *svara*-forms of *gāndharva*, namely *jāti*. We have in *gāndharva*, a concept of *svara*, not only as a set of *given* relations of *śruti*-distances, but also as a web of *created* relations called *vādī*, *saṁvādī*, *anuvādī* and *vivādī*. These relations are not given in nature, though they have a basis in natural harmony. They, fundamentally, consist of relations which *we* give to *svaras*, a relation of hierarchy, making one dominant, others subservient or dissonant. They also form the foundations for *rules* with which to construct structures, rules which assume improvisation. The *svaras*, as Pythagoras showed us, may be given to us in 'nature' — or what amounts to the same basic intention — in mathematically measurable ratios, yet, clearly, *the use* of *svaras*, consciously combining them into *music*, as Confucius stressed, is not a given thing. Music, like language, uses, in its own distinct way, a set of given sounds, in order to create patterns of meaning. Sounds are given to language as well as music as *āhata-nāda*, to create their own distinct patterns of significance, though, admittedly, the relation of language and

music to *nāda*, as we have noted earlier, are very different. Music, as we had also noted, seems more fundamentally attached to *svara* as *nāda*, and, for this reason, to be much more obviously rooted in nature and the 'given', than language. This makes the history of *rāga* a revealing pursuit, for it displays *svara* to be as much a creative function of the culture of music, and what might be called its 'thought' or its logos, as of the 'given' in nature.

Dattila, who wrote his treatise, the *Dattilam*, in order to describe the sacred *sāma*-born form called the *gāndharva*, can be taken as a good starting-point for a greater familiarity with the notions of *vādī*, *saṁvādī*, *anuvādī* and *vivādī*, and thus initiating the history we have in mind. Dattila will also, interestingly, take us back close enough in time to Pythagoras, since Dattila was a musicologist who perhaps lived not much after Pythagoras; and even though we may not be able to place him quite as early as the Greek musicologist, it is evident that Dattila had received many of his ideas as an heritage from an older tradition of theory-making, which does seem to go as far back as Pythagoras.

Knowledge of music, Dattila suggests, involves two distinct kinds of *jñāna* — 'cognition', 'knowledge', 'understanding'. A man who knows the *svara-maṇḍala*, as we have already quoted him to say, is the man who knows the fixed and given relation between pitches that make the gamut of *svaras* forming the *svara-maṇḍala*. To give his very words: *dhvaniviśeṣānyaḥ sarvān ṣaḍjādisaṁjñitān / vyavasthitāntarān vetti sa vetti svaramaṇḍalam. (Dattilam, 15)*. But this is not enough to be a *svara-yoga-vit*, 'a man who knows the *use* of *svaras*' — 'and the ways of combining them', one might add, since the word *yoga* here can suggest both *pra-yoga* as well as *saṁ-yoga* — knowing the *svara*-positions in the *svara-maṇḍala* alone will not make one a musician. Or, in other words, the *svara-maṇḍala* and its 'given' relations are not *enough* for music. There is another set of relations, equally foundational, which allows us to make music, providing, as it does, space for the *use* of *svaras*. The man who knows the *use* of *svaras*, says Dattila, should know that there is a certain relation of dependence between *svaras*, which serves as

the ground for their *usage*.² Although *this* relation presupposes the 'given' *svara-maṇḍala* relations, yet it is independent of them, and is imparted by *us* upon the natural foundation, in order to create the possibility of *making* music. This is why Dattila distinguishes this created relation of *dependence* as concerning the *usage* of *svara* — *svara-yoga* — and speaks of it *after* he speaks of the *svara-maṇḍala*. The usage that Dattila had in mind was the singing and playing of *jātis*, the *gāndharva svara*-forms, progenitors, as we have noted, of our *rāga*, and was continued in the *rāgas*.

The *svara* used most profusely (in a *jāti*), Dattila says, is its *vādi*. The *vādi*, we should add here, was also the tonic, the *aṁśa*, which was roughly, though not exactly, equivalent to what we today call the *sā* in Hindustani music, or the *ādihāra-śruti* in Karnatak. However, it was *not*, unlike present practice, the foundational pitch, the basis on which all other *svaras* stand and acquire their individual place and character. Yet, like our own *vādi*, it was the *svara* to be most profusely used in order to establish the characteristic form of a *jāti*. *Svaras* related to the *vādi*, through a certain given *śruti*-distance in the *svara-maṇḍala*, were known as *saṁvādis*. *Samvādis* were *svaras* related through the 'given' harmonious relation of the fourth and the fifth. (Our own practice, one might notice here, no longer quite insists on the *saṁvādi* being in *saṁvāda* or harmonic relation to the *vādi*, even in those *rāgas*, such as *Mārvā*, where the *vādi-saṁvādi* relation can still be said to be a ruling factor in forming a *rāga*). Other *svaras* of the *svara-maṇḍala* were *anuvādis*, *svaras* that could be used without conflict with the *vādi* and *saṁvādi*. *Svaras*, which created a conflict, a dissonance, were *vivādis*, which, in *gāndharva*, were marked by a given pitch-relation with the *chosen vādi* (Dattilam, 18-19). The *vivādi* in *gāndharva* was a *svara* believed capable of 'destroying' a *jāti*. Yet the *svara* was not altogether avoided, and was used, though sparingly and only in the passing, in order to create a much

² *ibid.* verse, 19.

needed sense of tension in a melody, which can pall if it is too smooth. Later, in *jāti*-born *rāgas*, the use of *vivādi* became more profuse; what was earlier understood as destroying a structure, became the source of a great dynamic tension and a pleasingly oblique charm.³

It can be argued that the *vādi-saṁvādi-anuvādi-vivādi* set of relations, contrary to our contention, can be understood as purely analytical categories which may be used for understanding *any*

³ There is more discussion on this later in the essay. In a sense, the whole development of later music, the *rāga*-music, can be said to be a loosening or slackening of the concept of *vivādi*. In *gāndharva*, *vivādi* is defined in terms of a fixed *svara-maṇḍala*: certain *svaras* of a given *śruti*-measure are *vivādi* in nature. In *rāga*-music, and as we also understand the notion today, a *vivādi* is defined not in terms of a *svara-maṇḍala*, with a given scheme of *svaras*, but in terms of *rāgas*: a *svara*, which is *not* considered or stipulated as part of the structure of a *rāga* is a *vivādi* for that *rāga*. Unlike the ancient system, *svaras* are not *vivādis* in themselves. A *vivādi* is a *svara* belonging to *another* *rāga*. But like the ancient *vivādi*, it has its use. Śārṅgadeva, writing in the 13th century, uses the notion of *kāku*, which, in the context, may be translated as 'oblique charm', in speaking of the phenomenon we have in mind, though he does not use the word '*vivādi*' to describe it. In describing possible *parts* of a *rāga*, *rāga-avayavas* or, what he also calls *sthāyas*, he speaks of the use of *svara-kāku* and *anya-rāga-kāku*. A *svara-kāku* consisted of the scintillating use of a *śruti* from an alien *svara*, and *anya-rāga-kāku* consisted of the use of the semblance of an alien *rāga* in rendering the *rāga* one had chosen. *Anyarāga-kāku*, it is true, need not imply the use of an alien *svara*, but only the *semblance* of an alien *movement* with the same *svaras*, as the commentator, Kallinātha, does understand this notion, but the notion does not *forbid* alien *svaras*. There is, however, another concept in Śārṅgadeva, similar to that of *anya-rāga-kāku*, which seems to make a more clear space for the use of alien *svaras*: this the notion of '*rāgāntarasyāvayavo rāge'ṁśah*', or 'incorporating a *part* of an alien *rāga* in the *rāga* being rendered'. This could be done in various ways, most of these consisting in the use of more or less similar *rāgas*; but the more daring could also use the path which consisted in the use of a *part* of a *rāga* which was totally dissimilar (*atyantaṁ visadrśa*) to the *rāga* being rendered. Certainly, this would imply the use of an alien *svara*. The notion of *svara-kāku*, as we have seen above, even more clearly implies the use of an alien *svara*. To quote Śārṅgadeva:

śrutinyūnādhikatvena yā svarāntarasamśrayā // svarāntarasya rāge syāt svarakākurasau matā / ...sā tvanyarāgakākuryā rāge rāgāntarāśrayā / ... rāgāntarasyāvayavo rāge'ṁśah sa saptadhā / ... sādṛśyastūryayorāṁśo'tyantam visadrśamśakah / Saṅgitaranākara, 3, 121-138.

musical structure, whether *rāga*-like or not, and hence improvisation-oriented or not. But in the Indian tradition, it was made the basis of creating a structure through improvisation. We can see this in the manner in which the *vādī-saṁvādī-anuvādī-vivādī* principle was elaborated: it was made the basis of rules for the building of *jātis*.

Interestingly, these *rules* are called *lakṣaṇas*, that is, 'descriptions' or 'defining characteristics' of the *jātis*, and are termed '*jāti-lakṣaṇas*'. But they are 'descriptions' of the *procedure* with which *svaras* ought to be related to each other in order to build the patterns that form a *jāti*. Or, in other words, they are rules. The *sāstras*, such as that of Dattila, formally list ten *jāti-lakṣaṇas*, but a few others are informally spoken of and assumed.⁴

The *lakṣaṇas* are simple enough. The first pair is, clearly, the most crucial: these are the *lakṣaṇas* or rules of *alpatva* and *bahutva*. *Bahutva*, was the rule of 'profusion', to be applied, expectedly enough, to the *svara* taken as the *vādī*. *Svalpatva* was the opposite; it was the rule of 'enfeebling' a *svara* or *svaras*. It applied to *svaras* that were to be made especially weak. There were, besides these quite general rules, others designed to articulate a structure in more specific details. One such was the *lakṣaṇa* laying down initial *svaras*: these consisted of the *svara* with which the structure as a whole was to be begun and other *svaras* placed at the beginning of parts, greater or smaller, within the structure (the *svaras* were known as, *graha*, *nyāsa*, and *apanyāsa*). There was also the rule of dropping *svaras*, and forming scales of five or six *svaras* (*auḍava*, *śūḍava*). Another rule was a rule of 'limitation': it prescribed the range in the lower and higher octave within which a structure was to be confined, (it was known as the rule of *mandra* and *tāra*). There were other, more special, rules of 'associations' (*saṅgati*) between specific *svaras*, and of distinct movements (*sañcāra*, *antaramārga*), characterising individual *jātis*. And, in addition,

⁴ Dattilam, verses 55-56.

there were certain general constraints, applying to *jātis* as a whole which limited the possibilities opened up by the *lakṣaṇas*. These were *niṣedhas*, in contrast to the *lakṣaṇas* which can be called *vidhis*, or rules that create the basis of generating structures.⁵ (The reader might also like to see, in this context, the essay entitled, 'Taṇḍu, the first theoretician of dance', included in this collection, where a similar, or even a more open *vidhi* for the generation of the pure dance-form, *tāṇḍava*, is discussed.)

In later music, the *jāti-lakṣaṇas* became *rāga-lakṣaṇas*. The earliest writer on *rāga*, Matāṅga, engaged in defining *rāga* rather than *jāti*, in fact, equates the two. The *rāga-lakṣaṇas*, he says, are the same as the *jāti-lakṣaṇas*.⁶ The principle of improvisation which the *jātis* initiated was carried over into *rāga*.

These *jāti* and *rāga lakṣaṇas*, one can see, are qualitative in principle and are not capable of being measured and quantified. We cannot say that in order to apply *bahutva* to a *svara*; or to apply the rule of *alpatva*, or any of the other rules mentioned above, a *svara* must be made to occur so many times and for such durations. The relations obtained through the *lakṣaṇas* are not only basically qualitative, they also have plural possibilities of realisation. *Jātis*, and *jāti*-born forms, the *rāgas*, which are described through these relations, cannot, therefore, be notated, in principle. Notations can only serve a subsidiary purpose to describe parts of a *rāga*, or indicate possibilities of movement in it. Even if one were to, conceivably, notate a *jāti* or a *rāga*, and achieve a 'complete' rendering of it, it would remain only one

⁵ Dattilam, verses 55 to 61. For details and an exposition of the text, see *A study of Dattilam*, pages 268 to 278.

⁶ See the *Bṛhaddeśi* of Matāṅga, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, Trivandrum, 1928, *vṛtti* following verse 363, p. 103. What is it, Matāṅga (or the author of the *vṛtti*, if the two are different, which appears likely) asks, that distinguishes a song in general from a *rāga*. The reply is that when a song is characterised by the ten *lakṣaṇas*, it is called a *rāga*: *nanu gītārāga (yoh ko) bhedaḥ. ucyate. daśalakṣaṇalakṣitaṁ gītaṁ rāgaśabdābhidheyam*. The ten *lakṣaṇas* are given by Matāṅga earlier in his work in describing the *jātis*, delineated as a prelude to the *rāgas*, which are Matāṅga's express occupation. In describing the *rāga* forms, he thus assumes the ten *lakṣaṇas* as known.

possible rendering, and would not exhaust the *rāga* itself. And in a deeper sense the form thus achieved through notation, would no longer be a *jāti* or a *rāga* at all, but only a shadow of it, like film-songs composed in a *rāga* or like *rāga*-based Tagore songs, for example. These are, indeed, forms that can be reduced to a notation. But singing or playing a *jāti* or *rāga* on the basis of a notated score would not give us a *jāti* or a *rāga*, since this would not *create* the relations between *svaras* that make the form, but would assume them as given in an already created structure. This is not the idea behind the *lakṣaṇas*. The qualitative relations between *svaras* that make a *jāti* or a *rāga* are to be *imparted* in actual living *usage*, that is, performance. This makes the *jāti*, and its progeny, the *rāga*, also very different from the *sāma* which could be and was notated.⁷ The musician in rendering a *jāti* or a *rāga* is not just a transmitter, to use Confucius's telling term. His function is not the re-rendering of something already created, and, hence, 'given'. Involved here is the principle of improvisation which unlike transmission, has a natural tendency towards invention, to use another Confucian term.

Later theorists, also gave a political metaphor for the *vādi-saṁvādi* relation of dependence between *svaras*. The metaphor is similar to the one given by Confucius, where he speaks of the musically correct hierarchy between the five 'given' *svaras* of his tradition, identifying the 'king'-*svara*, the 'minister'-*svara*, the 'people'-*svara*, the 'affairs'-*svara* and the *svara* representing 'things'. In India, this metaphor has a somewhat different form,

⁷ We have given an illustration of how this is generally done in the *Saṁhitā* editions available today in an earlier footnote in the previous section of this essay; see fn. no. 37. The earliest system of notating *sāma* was a non-written method using the pores of the fingers as marking different *svaras*. Later, as we still find in the written *Sāma Saṁhitā*, more than one method for *writing* the *svaras* along with the text was used. For a description, see, introduction to *Kaushaṁśākhāyāḥ Ūhagānam, Ūhyagānam*, edited by Pandit A.M. Ramnath Dikshit, Varanasi, 1967, pp. 27 to 36. As far as I know, no one has really tried to investigate the history of the written *sāma* notation, and unearth the earliest examples. Intriguingly, the *sāma* system of writing *svaras* is very different from that of the musicological texts devoted to *jāti* or *rāga*.

and it seems to have readily caught on; it became very popular in the musicology devoted to describing *rāga*, because of its aptness and also, it would seem, its picturesqueness. The first musicological work in which the metaphor appears is the *Bṛhaddeśi* of Maṭaṅga, which is also, as we said, the first work devoted to describing *rāga*. It is usually dated to the eighth century, though it may be earlier. The metaphor itself might be older than Maṭaṅga, but after Maṭaṅga it became a commonplace in musicological literature. The *vādi*, in the metaphor, was compared to the king, the *saṁvādi* to his minister, the *anuvādi* to his retinue of followers, and the *vivādi* to his enemy.⁸ The presence of the 'enemy' as an integral part of the picture is interesting both musically and politically. Musically, the *vivādi*, as we have pointed out, creates a much-needed tension. Politically, the picture made sense because according to Indian political thought, a state is only one among a plurality of states which are, in various degrees, potential enemies, but which can be turned into temporary friends. The notion of a *vivādi*, as pictured in this metaphor, is therefore a relative one, the *vivādi* of one *rāga* can be the *anuvādi* or even the *vādi* of another, as we still find in our musical practice. The idea of the *vivādi*, we notice, is missing in Confucius, who seemed to have cared for pure and absolute harmony with no discordant note. Also, the intent of the metaphor for Confucius and for *rāga*-theorists was radically different. For *rāga*-theorists, it was a metaphor for open pluralism. But Confucius' transcendental vision had hardly any room for real pluralism. His vision, though seeming to picture a *rāga*-like structure, as we had remarked earlier, pictures the *rāga* as one and unique.

⁸ See *vṛtti* on verse, 63a : *idanimavasaraṅprāptam caturvidhyam svarāṅam darśayāmi. tadyathā — vadanād vādi svāmivat. saṁvadanāt saṁvādi amātyavat. anuvadanādanuvādi parijanavat. vivadanād vivādi śatruvat —* 'Having come to the subject of the four kinds of *svaras*, I shall show them. The *vādi* is like the king, for it commands. The *saṁvādi* is like the minister, for it is in accord [with the *vādi*]. The *anuvādi* is like a follower, for it echoes [the *vādi* and the *saṁvādi*]. The *vivādi* is like an enemy, for it is in discord [with the *vādi*, *saṁvādi* and *anuvādi*].

The reason for the difference between the ways in which the *rāga*-theorists and Confucius took the metaphor, seems to lie in the fact that the musicology of the *rāga*, which originated the metaphor in India, thought of music as pleasure and not as the means for attaining absolute harmony in life. Indeed, a major characteristic by which *rāga* as a form is defined and distinguished by Maṭaṅga in his *Bṛhaddeśi*, is its pleasure-giving quality, '*rañjanājjāyate rāgaḥ — rāga is born of pleasure*', another notion which became standard fare for subsequent musicology in India, and is still found meaningful.

For Maṭaṅga, this pleasure motive or principle, as we have called it, not only defines *rāga*, but also distinguishes *rāga* from the earlier *jāti*, its parent.⁹ The *jāti*, though structurally conceived on the same lines as *rāga*, was not for pleasure; it was, like *sāma*, a sacred, revealed form.

We should remark here that Maṭaṅga, evidently, intended his Confucius-like political metaphor for both *jāti* and *rāga*. For him, the metaphor articulated a structural principle they both shared; the difference being one of degree, despite the distinct

⁹ *Bṛhaddeśi*, verses 278-284. Maṭaṅga, having finished his exposition of the *jātis*, moves to distinguish the *rāgas* from them. He makes an imaginary interrogator ask the question: *kimucyate rāgaśabdena kim vā rāgasya lakṣaṇam / vyutpatīlakṣaṇam tasya yathāvadavaktumarhasi* (verse, 278) — 'What is it that is said through the word '*rāga*', and how is *rāga* to be characterised? Please expound the right manner in which the word should be etymologically understood [in this context]'. Maṭaṅga, in reply promises to speak of the *rāga*-form, giving details which are not to be found in ancient writers such as Bharata (or Dattila, for that matter, whom he, however, does not actually name in this context): '*rāgamārgasya yadrūpaṃ yannoktaṃ bharatādibhiḥ / nirūpyate tadasmābhiḥ lakṣyalakṣaṇasamīyutam*.' His intention also was to distinguish the *rāga* from the music which Bharata does describe in detail, namely the *jāti*, and of which he, too, had been speaking hitherto. The basic distinguishing mark that he speaks of in the *rāga* is its quality to please. He says: 'The wise call that *svara*-form a '*rāga*' which pleases everyone' — *svaravarṇaviśeṣeṇa dhvanibhedena vā punaḥ / rajyate yena yaḥ kaścīt sa rāgaḥ sammataḥ satām //* (verse, 280). Then he reiterates almost verbally the same statement in the next verse, stating that *rāga* pleases people: *rañjako janacittānām*. Then, just a little later, he puts forth the same matter in terms of etymology: *rañjanājjāyate rāgo vyutpatīrsamudāhṛtā* (verse, 283).

motivations of the two forms, rather than one of kind. The metaphor, however, could not have been applied to *sāma*, from which they both thus differed in kind. Rendering *sāma* was an act of transmission, not innovation, to use Confucius' words again. To help the process of correct transmission, *sāma* was preserved through a system of indicating *svaras* on the fingers — known as the *hasta-viṇā* — and later through written symbols, indicating notes.

The pleasure motive also implied a great difference between the approach to structure in *jāti* and *rāga*. The *rāga* was much more open and freer with the rules, even ignoring, flaunting and changing them in its development. The difference between the two thus lay not so much in the approach to *vidhi* as to *niśedha*. The strictures and limitations which, in the *jāti*, restricted free play of possibilities created by the *lakṣaṇas*, were loosened in the *rāga* as a form, by the impulse to pleasure; creating more space for movement, and inspiring the creation of ever new *rāgas*. Thus the word '*ātāpa*', used for the first time by Maṭaṅga, becomes another 'defining' character of *rāgas*, and *rāgas* began to increase in number, and are in later texts described as, 'innumerable'. This great increase in space for innovation was possible because of a radical change in telos.

This new telos was to make even more radical changes as the tradition of the *rāga* evolved. The ancient *jātis* had a fixed set of *svaras*, 'given' in the *svara-maṇḍala*. One could not *create* *svaras*, but only *relate* them with a set of *lakṣaṇas* or rules in mind. This, to give a more familiar analogy, was like being given a harmonium or a multi-stringed instrument such as the pre-tuned *svara-maṇḍala* (the instrument, not the concept)¹⁰ on which a number of *svaras* have been fixed once and for all. These are ready-made entities we cannot change; though we can put them to our own use, combining them into various forms.

¹⁰ Though the two are clearly related, and the *svara-maṇḍala* as an instrument is similar to the ancient Indian harp-like *viṇā*, which, in fact, played an important role in theorising about *svaras* and in giving rise to the concept of the *svara-maṇḍala*.

There is much in ancient Indian musicology that reinforces this picture of a set of unalterable, 'given', *svaras*. The ancient *viṇā* was similar to the modern *svara-maṇḍala*, on which the *svaras* were fixed. Interestingly, however, the *svaras* were 'given' not only on the *viṇā* — where they could be altered, at least in principle, — they were also thought of as 'given' within us, within our body: the human frame was believed to contain a *viṇā* similar to the instrument that was played, and on which the *svaras* were fixed. The *svaras* thus had a set of predetermined *svara-sthānas* within us, arranged at proper *śruti*-distances. (The article, 'The Body As An Instrument', in this collection, reflects on this notion, giving more details.)

The distance between *svaras*, as we have noted, was measured through *śruti*. A *śruti*, let us remember, could be heard, but it could not be musically used. Only certain *śruti*-groupings were 'given' as *svaras*. Others were not permitted, since they were not *svaras*. All this was to undergo a revolution in later thinking. Later musicians, in exploring the realm of pleasure, or *rañjana*, through the *rāgas*, seeking aesthetic innovation, seem to have quickly realised the musical potential of the 'unuseable' *śrutis*. In *rāga*-music, any *śruti* could be used provided one could create a desired aesthetic effect. Abhinavagupta, the famous Kashmīrī philosopher and musicologist, writing in the period spanning the end of the 10th century and the beginning of the 11th, speaks of the effect created by musicians through the use of *śruti-vaicitrya*: the free and brilliant use of *śrutis* which were denied to the *jāti*.

The ancient *svara-maṇḍala*, as we remarked earlier, did allow two augmented *svaras* besides the regular seven. These extra *svaras* lay between two regular *svaras*, and were, hence called, *antara* (in-between) *svaras*. They were also called *sādhāraṇa*, that is 'common' *svaras*, because they occupied a space that separated two *svaras* and was thus 'common' to them. But if the 'common' space between two *svaras* could have positions that were themselves 'svaras', however 'irregular' they may be, in the sacred *jāti* form, the idea could certainly be

extended to common spaces between other *svaras*, too. And this was done in the more free-flowing *rāga* music; there was no sacred rule of limitation to stop it, and one could be guided by the impulse to pleasure. Indeed, the idea of 'common', in-between *svaras* was extended even further, and taken to what could be called its logical extreme. All the *śrutis*, which were earlier denied *svara*-hood, were now seen as *sādhāraṇa*, since they all did, in fact, lie in the spaces between *svaras*. And hence they were allowed *svara*-hood. Abhinavagupta has outlined the above extension of the notion of *sādhāraṇa*; and after having done so, he observes: "the displacement of a *svara* from its primary position, and its thus acquiring a distinctiveness (*viśeṣo vailakṣyaṇyātmā*) is what obtains when a *svara* becomes *sādhāraṇa* in musical usage. This implies that all [otherwise accepted as fixed] *svaras* can shift to positions above or below [their fixed places] when a pleasing diversity is sought in musical expressions. The rule limiting a *svara* to a single *śruti*-position — on which it is permanently fixed — obtains only in *gāndharva* (that is, the *jāti*-system); in *rāgas* and *bhāṣās* (which were also *rāga*-like forms, described as 'born of the *rāgas*'), it can be seen that musical usage permits a diversity [of *sādhāraṇa* positions]."¹¹

This 'diversity', which was, in effect, introduced in the *svara-maṇḍala* itself, transforming it, and allowing any in-between *śruti* to function as a *svara*, had occurred much earlier than Abhinava, who himself quotes an earlier authoritative text, in this context, to support — and justify — his own observation.

¹¹ Hardly any passage from the *Abhinava Bhārati*, Abhinava's commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, is entirely free of textual problems, the readings being often corrupt. The passage translated above also has words and expressions which are not entirely clear. Yet the meaning, I think, is unmistakable. Here is original from the G.O.S. edition of the text: *svarasvayaḥ (svarasya yaḥ) prāktanarūpādvīṣeṣo vailakṣyaṇyātmā sa eva svarasādhāraṇatāyām prayogaḥ. anena caitatsūcayati sarveṣāṃ svarāṇāmuccanīcatvavaicitryoktivyīṣeṣāt kevalam gāndharve niyamam(mā)adr̥ṣtasiddhyai ekaśrutitvam svarāṇāṃ darśitam, vaicitryāntaram tu rāgabhaṣāḍau lakṣye dr̥ṣyata eva. Ahinava Bhārati on Nāṭyaśāstra 28, 35.*

The text he quotes, is attributed by him to a musicologist named Vṛddhakaśyapa whose writings are not otherwise available, and whose date is difficult to determine. A reasonable conjecture, I would think, might place him roughly in the same period as Mataṅga, or perhaps a little after. The Vṛddhakaśyapa passage, which Abhinava quotes, is, I must confess, not entirely clear to me, but its general intention, for our purpose, can be readily sensed. The first part of the passage, with which we are concerned here, is, fortunately, clear enough. Vṛddhakaśyapa says:

“In *rāgas* and *bhāṣas*, all *svara*-distances, whether comprising of one, two, three or four *śrutis*, can be taken as *kākali* (another name for *sādhāraṇa*) or as *antara* (still another name for the *sādhāraṇa*), and should be freely (*sarvathā*) used”.¹²

¹² The Vṛddhakaśyapa passage comes immediately after the lines from the *Abhinava Bhārati* quoted in the footnote above. The lines which I have translated read :

*kākalyantarayogena catustridvyekataḥ śrutīm /
svarānsarvānprayujīta rāgabhāṣāsu sarvathā //*

This is followed by two more *ślokas* where Vṛddhakaśyapa seems to be saying that in the *jāti* there are fifteen distinct *svara*-positions. This is so obviously against the position of the *gāndharva śāstras*, that I do not quite know what to make of it :

*svarāḥ ṣaḍjādayaḥ sapta tathā cotkṛṣṭapañcamah /
atha dhaivatataścānyāḥ kākalyantarasañjñakau //
ṣaḍjamadhyamaḡāndhārāścātvarāḥ iti sarvathā /
jātiṣvete prayoktavyāḥ svarāḥ pañcadaśaiva tu //*

Vṛddhakaśyapa quite unambiguously appears to speak of fifteen *svaras* in the *jātis* (*jāṇīṣu*). There can be no mistake about this if the reading is correct, and there seems nothing wrong with it. With what grounds, or with what purport in mind he says so is another matter, which is to me a puzzle. Another puzzle, though not such a perplexing one, is the identification of the fifteen *śrutis* he recounts as *svaras* here. I have been able to identify only the following : the seven regular *svaras*, *ṣaḍja* etc., the two augmented *svaras* (*antara ga* and *kākali ni*), and the two ‘displaced’ *pa* and *dha* of the *madhyama-grāma* as relative to the *ṣaḍja-grāma*. This makes eleven *svaras*, and this seems quite in order within the *jāti* system, except for the curious fact that the distinct *pa* and *dha* of the two *grāmas* have been ‘counted’ as *independent svaras*. This in *gāndharva* was never done, because the *svaras* of one *grāma* could not be confused with those of the other. In counting them as *svaras*, Vṛddhakaśyapa seems to be discounting the ancient, quite categorical, *grāma* division, and taking the two *sthānas* as though they were given as *svaras* within a single

We find that the pleasure-oriented aesthetic of the *rāga* has opened the door for *śrutis* and their possible groupings into tones, which were earlier left out of the system as non-*svaras*. The *rāga*, consequently, had room in its music for all the *śrutis*. Vṛddhakaśyapa speaks of *every* single *śruti*, and every possible grouping of two three or four *śrutis* as *svaras*. In effect, now, since single *śrutis* were permitted as musically usable, any ‘audible’, pitch-distinction was a possible *svara*. This was unthinkable in the earlier *jāti* music. Indeed, the very notion of *śruti* seems redundant in the new *rāga svara-maṇḍala*, if one were to still use the ancient term. The only condition for a *śruti* to function as *svara* was that it should produce a desirable, expressive effect as part of a *rāga*.

Expectedly, however, though the new music declared all *śrutis* as *svaras* in practice, yet the *theoretical* position still sanctioned only seven positions as *svaras*, the other *śruti*-positions lying between them were understood to be *sādhāraṇa svaras*: Vṛddhakaśyapa compares them to the earlier *antara* and *kākali svaras*, and, evidently, like these traditional ‘semi-*svaras*’, they were still *thought* to be somehow subsidiary or displaced in status.

It is clear, though, that the change in the notion of *svara*

scale. Perhaps this is symptomatic of the loosening of the strict *grāma* division during Vṛddhakaśyapa’s days, but it cannot be a reckoning that fits the *jāti*-system. Then, there is a phrase which identifies more *svaras*: ‘*ṣaḍjamadhyamaḡāndhārāścātvarāḥ*’. This I have not been able to understand. According to Vṛddhakaśyapa’s count, we already have eleven *svaras* and need four more. And these are what the phrase, one would think, intends to give us. But, what are they? They are, presumably, four extra places which the three regular *svaras*, *sa*, *ga* and *ma*, occupying ‘displaced’ *sthānas* on *śrutis* that lie between them and the preceding or following *svara*. But which *śrutis* can these be? There are no such ‘displaced’ *svara*-positions in the *jāti svara-maṇḍala*. And which of the three *svaras* is to have two positions, and where? What, moreover, about the other *svaras*, *ri*, *pa*, *dha*, *ni*, are they not to have more positions, and why not? These and other questions are bound to bother one in trying to get at what might have been meant. An answer can, perhaps, only be found if we could discover more of Vṛddhakaśyapa’s work, which, at present, seems a remote possibility.

However, The first *śloka*, which is about *rāgas* and *bhāṣas*, and not about *jātis*, presents no such difficulties.

hinges on the new music of the *rāga*, its new orientation, new demands, and its openness towards new possibilities of tonal expression. A radical transformation in the logos of music seems to have happened, even though not so radically articulated: the *rāga* has become the key for discriminating between the *svara* and the non-*svara*. Instead of *svaras* being the basic 'given', and then being taken as the building blocks for making music, we now have the situation where the *rāgas*, which are not given but humanly created, *pauruṣeya* things, become themselves the creators of *svaras*: a *svara* is a tone which a *rāga* uses to make itself.

The musical situation clearly called for a new theoretical vision, or revision, which, as we shall see, was developed in the 16th century, becoming sharper and more radically self-articulate in the 17th. We find a new understanding of *svara* taking a meaningful shape in a remarkable 16th century musicologist, Puṇḍarīka Viṭṭhala. He has written a number of tracts on the *rāga*, the most ambitious being the *Sadrāgacandrodaya*. But he also has other works devoted to the *rāga*, which were written later and are comparatively smaller in size; one of these is the *Rāgamālā*, a work especially interesting for our purpose. Unlike Vṛddhakaśyapa, Puṇḍarīka, in his *Rāgamālā*, identifies only eighteen *śruti*-positions as possible *svara*-positions. The fifth, the sixth, the eighteenth and the nineteenth *śrutis*, he says, right in the beginning of the *Rāgamālā*, are never *svaras*; the others can all be: *śeṣā aṣṭādaśaiva syuḥ śrutayah svarabodhakāḥ* (*Rāgamālā*, 16). Those *śrutis* which can be cognised as *svaras* (*svarabodhakāḥ*), are still cognised in terms of the conventional seven *svaras*, but with the radical difference that each of the seven *svaras*, except *sa* and *pa*, have no longer a single fixed position: they have two more possible positions on neighbouring *śrutis*, occupying the 'non-*svara*' space between *svaras*; *ga* having three such positions.

Puṇḍarīka is aware that he is talking of a *svara-maṇḍala* quite different from that of traditional musicology, and he remarks that 'Bharata and other [ancient authorities] have spoken of only a single *śruti*-position for a *svara* which [in my scheme]

is its first or initial position: *ṣaḍjādinām sthitiḥ proktāḥ prathamāḥ bharaṭādibhiḥ*.' This may also be translated as: 'This, (that is the sequence of *svara*-positions conforming to the ancient mapping and described by Puṇḍarīka just before the present passage), is the position initially enunciated (*prathamā sthitiḥ*) by Bharata and others.'¹³ But whichever of these two

¹³ *dvāviṃśatiḥ śrutisthānaṃ sopānākāravat kramāt //*
vāyupūraṇatastāstu tāvatyuitarottaram /
prabhavantyuccoccatarāḥ śrutayah śravayamātrataḥ //
rāgādivyavahārāya tāsu sapta svarāḥ sthitiḥ /
ṣaḍjaśca ṛṣabhaścaiva gāndhāro madhyamastathā //
pañcamo dhaivataścātha niṣādaścetyanukramāt /
teṣāṃ sanjñā sarigamapadhanityaparā matā //
vedācalāṅkaśrutiṣu trayodaśyām śrutau tataḥ /
saptadaśyām ca viṃśyām ca dvāviṃśyām ca śrutau kramāt //
ṣaḍjādinām sthitiḥ proktā prathamā bharaṭādibhiḥ /
Rāgamālā, 8-13

I quote in detail; also because the only reliable critical edition of the texts of Puṇḍarīka Viṭṭhala is available in a collected edition printed in Kannada letters with a Kannada translation, comments and annotation. The author of this laudable work of scholarship is Dr. R. Satyanarayana. The work is published as *Puṇḍarīkamālā*, pub. by the Government Of Karnataka, (Karnataka Sangeetha Nritya Academy and Directorate of Kannada And Culture), Bangalore, 1986. The Sanskrit text of the *Rāgamālā* covers pages 170 to 202 of this work. The quoted passage is on p. 172. Not knowing Kannada, but only its script, I have, unfortunately, not been able to see Dr. Satyanarayana's translation. I offer my own: 'There are twenty-two *śrutis* (each on a separate string-like artery within the human frame) arranged in a ladder-like sequence. When the air (which arises from the base of the spinal column) strikes them, they produce, in a gradually rising sequence, the gamut of *śrutis*, each of which has a pitch higher than the preceding [*śruti*], [the pitch-difference consisting of the] smallest distinction that is audible. For [rendering] the [musical] forms like *rāgas*, there are seven *svaras* which are stationed on them. These are, in their sequence, named, *ṣaḍja*, *ṛṣabha*, *gāndhāra*, *madhyama*, *pañcama*, *dhaivata* and *niṣāda*, an alternative set of terms for them being, *sa*, *ri*, *ga*, *ma*, *pa*, *dha* and *ni*. The seven *svaras*, *ṣaḍja* and the others, are, in sequence, stationed on the [following] *śrutis*: the fourth (which is the place of *ṣaḍja*), the seventh, the ninth, the thirteenth, the seventeenth, the twentieth, and the twenty-second. Such is the original position initially [mapped] for them by Bharata and other [ancient theorists].'

One might notice that the positioning of the various *svaras*, on the fourth *śruti* and so on, is not how the ancients proceed, but the resulting *svara-maṇḍala*, remains essentially the ancient one.

ways in which we may choose to translate Puṇḍarīka, it is unmistakably implicit in his statement that he felt a conspicuous gap between the ancient system and his own.

What is even more revolutionary in his musicological thought, is his statement that the basis on which a *śruti*-position becomes a *svara* is not a given *antarāla* or distance from another *śruti*-position, but the *rāga* being rendered: In a remarkable passage he says:

'A (*svara*) shifts its position, depending on the demand of the *rāga* being rendered: *yadyadrāgopayogaḥ syād tattadicchā-gatirbhavet.*' (*Rāgamālā*, 14)¹⁴

In his earlier work, the *Sadrāgacandrodaya*, Puṇḍarīka had recognised only fourteen and not eighteen *śruti*-positions as possible *svara-sthānas*,¹⁵ but he added an interesting, though short and not fully developed, argument in order to justify his radical departure from traditional musicology regarding the relation between *śruti* and *svara*. He, obviously, thought that he was making a fundamental break from an almost self-evident orthodoxy, and this needed justification. The defence he gives, leads to a basic reflection on the very nature of *svara*.

Musicological thought in India has conceived *svara* on two distinct bases, which, supposedly, should lead to an identical cognition, but which can be seen to have parted ways with the dominance of the *rāga*. The distinction, which we have earlier described in terms of *svara* as given and *svara* as felt, becomes, in the hands of Puṇḍarīka, an opposition. This opposition can be significantly understood in the light of two *svara-lakṣaṇas*, or 'definitions' of what constitutes the *svara*-hood of a *svara*, which have been articulated in musicological thinking. It is also, one might notice, a fundamental opposition concerning

¹⁴ *op. cit.*, p. 172.

¹⁵ I assume it to be earlier, for the reason of its greater conservativeness, and also because Dr. Satyanarayana gives it before the *Rāgamālā*. Unable to understand Kannada, I have not been able to follow his discussion concerning the dates of Puṇḍarīka's works. However, for my purpose, their relative dating is only of passing importance.

cognition, and is to be found not only in the logos of music, but in a sense in logos itself.

The first, and as it appears, the more ancient, of the two *svara-lakṣaṇas* can be expressed as, '*antarāla niyamo svarah* — *svara* is an [unbending] *rule* which fixes distance [between pitches]'; this, as we have seen, was enunciated many centuries ago by Dattila in describing the *svara-maṇḍala* of the ancient *jātis*. Pythagoras' vision, more mathematically oriented, follows the same path. The attempt is to cognise and 'measure' something in itself, as it were, without reference to the cogniser.

The second *lakṣaṇa*, places the cogniser, or consciousness at the centre: '*svato rañjayata iti svarah* — it is that [distinct pitch-position] which pleases in itself'. It is, in other words, *svara* as it is evident to our awareness when we make music and seek an aesthetic pleasure, or in other words a musical meaningfulness. This *lakṣaṇa*, relies on the etymology of the name, '*svara*' itself, and was believed by later musicologists to be inherent in the very concept of '*svara*', if it was to be the basis of music and not just an object out there in nature. There is also, not surprisingly, a definite connection between this music-oriented *lakṣaṇa* of *svara* and the *lakṣaṇa* of *rāga* itself. Like '*svara*', '*rāga*' is defined by later musicologists as 'that which pleases — *rañjayata iti rāgaḥ*'. In the ancient system, which also had the second *lakṣaṇa* in mind, though not so explicitly, there was no quarrel between the two *lakṣaṇas*. Indeed, as for Pythagoras, they were believed to coincide. The *lakṣaṇa* of *svara* as *svayambhū*, 'self-born', is old and may be construed to represent this accord between the inner and outer, *svara* as given in nature and *svara* as felt, since '*svayambhū*' does not incline towards either senses, and can embrace both. For Pythagoras, the fact that the 'felt', 'perceived' *svara* coincided with a 'rational', mathematical equation was a profound discovery, the discovery of a '*pramāṇa*' a 'measurable criterion' through which consciousness could not only be aware of things, but 'know' them as they were in themselves, and not merely as they appeared. This was the seed that has found its fruit in the modern

scientist's assertion that mathematics is the language of nature herself. But music is not a 'natural' object, though it uses what is given in nature. In fact, even the *svara* as given in nature, has obviously to be 'felt' as integral to music in order to be part of musical usage: hence the difference in what is 'given' as *svara* in different musical cultures. The history of the *rāga* significantly and articulately reveals that *svara* as a felt entity can also find those sounds meaningful which are 'discordant' with those 'given' in nature. The world of music, like all human, *pauruṣeya* worlds created in culture, is the product of a tension between the given in nature and the creative human consciousness with *puruṣārthas* of its own, one of the *puruṣārthas* being the exploration of aesthetic possibilities. The opposition or discord between *svara* as given in nature, and as given in our musical creativity, is *not*, as one might be tempted to conclude, between a 'real' and an 'apparent' or merely imaginary entity. The *antarāla*, or tonal distance, which was *rejected* earlier because it was thought to be self-evidently given as a *non-svara*, and also *felt* to be so — on the ground of being *not svayambhū* — is now, in exploring the possibilities of the *rāga*-form through the pathways of improvisation, and of seeking new pleasures, discovered to be a *svara*. The deeper tension here is between the changing 'given' in the world of music and what is believed to be the really and uniquely given, either as essence or law in Nature, or the Transcendent.

In Puṇḍarīka's musicology of the *rāga*, we can find an interesting reflection on the opposition between the two ways of conceiving *svara*, and a defence of the second of the two *lakṣaṇas*. His definition of *svara* unmistakably leans towards the second *lakṣaṇa*:

"That which is produced immediately after a *śruti*, and is smooth, and gives rise to a [sympathetic] after-sound, and is [also] self-resplendent, [such a sound] is termed by the knowledgeable, a *svara*, because it pleases the mind of a listener by itself."

This definition is to be found in the *Sadrāgacandrodaya*.¹⁶ Puṇḍarīka begins the work with a description of *svara* which assumes the ancient *svara-maṇḍala* and the fixed position of the seven *svaras* at specific *śruti* — positions.¹⁷ But in this he was merely paying lip-service to the tradition of the *śāstra* and its conventions. For, he quickly changes his stance, and controverts the old *svara-maṇḍala*, and states that *śrutis* can also be *svaras*, implying that *any śruti* can be a *svara*. He also realises the evident contradiction in his statements, and poses it as a *pūrvapakṣa*: 'You have', he says, voicing the *pūrvapakṣa*, '[earlier] made a distinction between *śruti* and *svara*, but that distinction contradicts what you are saying now [in equating the two] — *nanu svarasya śrutitah prthaktvaṁ tvayā yaduktam na tathā'tra yuktaṁ* (*Sadrāgacandrodaya*, 1, 31).

In reply, he gives a short statement, trying to make short work of the above charge. He says: '*śruti* is [that sound] which is heard before [a pitch-position] is actually struck; *svara* is the after-sound that it produces. [This should suffice as an answer to the objection] which is, indeed, trifling.' This statement is not entirely clear to me: what does he mean by a sound heard before it is struck? It obviously assumes a discussion which was part of the thinking current in the new musicological milieu in which Puṇḍarīka was writing. However, the thrust of Puṇḍarīka's counter-argument is not difficult to guess. It banks upon the distinction between *āhata* and *anāhata* sound, and takes an *anāhata* — unstruck — sound to be the potentiality of a sound and not an actual sound; this potentiality he calls *śruti*. An *āhata* sound is the realisation of that potentiality, and is distinguished as *svara*. Resultingly, no pitch-position that can be sounded and heard is, in this view, a *non-svara*.

Puṇḍarīka then gives another argument in his support. This argument assumes a latter-day understanding of *śrutis* in terms

¹⁶ *śruteśca nairantarabhāviko yaḥ snigdho'nuśabdātmaka ojasātmā / śroturmanorajjanakāratvātsvatastu tajjñairuditah svarō'sau// Sadrāgacandrodaya*, 1, 24. *op.cit.*, p. 79.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1, 22-23.

of *śruti-jātis*, a concept, which appears only in medieval texts, in a period when *rāga*-music had become the generally accepted form of what music should be. It is not to be found in ancient *jāti*-oriented musicology. The concept of *śruti-jātis* classifies all the *śrutis* into five kinds, on the basis mainly of their *expressive* quality, and not their position in the *svara-maṇḍala*. These five kind of *śrutis* are named: *diptā* ('bright', 'shining'), *āyaytā* ('expansive'), *karuṇā* ('having pathos'), *mṛdu* ('soft') and *madhyā* ('middling', 'neutral').¹⁸ All except one, the *madhyā*, indicate an aesthetic function. Elaborating his short argument, discussed above, in favour of considering any *śruti* a *svara*, Puṇḍarīka now refers us to the authority (*pramāṇa*) of those who speak of the five *śruti-jātis*.¹⁹ What this *pramāṇa* is, Puṇḍarīka does not tell us, and I have not been able to discover it elsewhere. But one can guess its purport: If all *śrutis* have an *expressive* quality of some kind; they are, clearly, all of them, possible *svaras*, whatever their comparative pitch-position in a *svara-maṇḍala*, since being expressive is a basic characteristic of being a *svara*. This view, obviously, makes the cogniser's sense of music the '*pramāṇa*', the criterion, for *svara*-hood.

In Ahobala, a more adventurous thinker, who wrote his *Saṅgīta-pārijāta*, a century after Puṇḍarīka (in 1665), the radical ideas found in Puṇḍarīka achieve their logical culmination, and also a much greater sense of self-assurance. They are no longer a matter of doubt and questioning, but are taken as a new 'given',

¹⁸ A relatively old text where the idea occurs is the *Bharata Bhāṣya* of Nānyadeva, written perhaps between 1097 and 1133 A.D., the period of Nānyadeva's rule over Mithila. This line of thinking about *śrutis* had indeed named all 22 *śrutis* on expressive lines. Nānyadeva, in his chapter on *śruti*, after expounding and discussing the ancient views on the subject, where he speaks of the twenty-two *śrutis*, says: 'there are in [all] the *grāmas*, only five *śrutis* to be always found, *diptā*, *āyatā*, *karuṇā*, *mṛdu*, and *madhyā*' — *dīptā'yatā ca karuṇā mṛdu madhyeti nāmataḥ / pañcaiva śrutayah proktā jñeyā grāmeṣu nityaśah //* See *Bharata Bhāṣya*, edited with notes by Chaitanya Pundarika Desai, pub. Indira Kalā Saṅgīta Viśvavidyālaya, Khairagadh, 1961, vol.1, *śrutyādhyāya*, verse 83, p.94.

¹⁹ *yairjātayah pañca matā śrutiṅām te tu pramāṇaḥ pravādanti tatra. Sadrāgacandrodaya, op. cit., 1, 33.*

which can be meaningfully described as a cultural, 'given': Ahobala's *pramāṇa* are musicians and the knowers of music.

There is a tendency, with the great cultural prestige of 'science' ruling our minds, to decry such a 'given' as merely 'subjective' as opposed to the 'measured' and the 'given in nature' as being truly 'objective'. But all cultural things are founded on the tension between the 'measured' and the 'perceived'. Their 'objectivity' is never free of the 'subject; it lies in inter-subjectivity. What Ahobala does is to articulate the inter-subjectivity of music, in other words, its culture-dependence.

He unreservedly states:

'*Śrutis* are not different from *svaras*, because [like *svaras*], they [too] are audible. Their difference, according to the *śāstras*, is similar to that between a snake [in its usual straight, oblong form] and its [special] coiled state. All *śrutis* can acquire the state of *svara*-hood, in different *rāgas*. Because they are bases of *rāgas*, therefore are they rightly called *śrutis*. *Śrutis* are many, separated from each other by the breadth of a hair; this can be perceived on the *viṇā* as well as the voice: such is the view of those who know music.'²⁰

The confidence we notice here, that what Ahobala has to say is truly based on the *śāstras*, is remarkable, even if not correct, if the reference *saṅgīta-śāstra*. The *śāstra*, referred to cannot be any prestigious work of the *saṅgīta-śāstra*, as one might be likely to presuppose. The *śāstra* Ahobala has in mind seems to be the *darśana-śāstra*, and his metaphor for equating *śruti* and

²⁰ *śrutayah syuḥ svarābhinnāḥ śravaṇatvena hetunā / ahikūṇḍalavattatra bhedoktiḥ śāstrasammatā // sarvāśca śrutayastattad rāgeṣu svaratām gatāḥ / rāgahetutva etāsām śrutisamjñaiḥ sammatā // keśāgravyavadhānena bahvyo'pi śrutayah śritāḥ / viṇāyām ca tathā gātre saṅgītajñānīnām mate //*

Saṅgītapārijāta, 38-40 (as quoted in the notes on *Bharata Bhāṣya* by Chaitanya P. Desai, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 102. See also *Saṅgītapārijāta* with a translation into Hindi by Kalind, pub. Saṅgīta Kāryālay, Hathras, 1971 verses 38 to 41, pp. 18-19).

svara appears to be taken from a work of a *bhakti* school of philosophy, arguing against *advaita* and its *māyāvāda*. But, as he himself later adds, his confidence is really based on the belief that his views accord with those who really know music. Relying on the perception of musicians and music-knowers, he breaks away not only from the *antarāla niyama* of the ancients, but even from the ancient and strangely continuing myth that there are only twenty-two audible tonal *antarālas* in an octave. Intriguingly, Ahobala also argued, in the lines which follow the above passage, that the twenty-two *śruti svara-maṇḍala*, which he finds inadequate was constructed by the process of *ṣaḍja-pañcama-bhāva*: arriving at pitch positions through the harmonics of the fifth (making *pa* the *sā* gives *re*; with *re as sā* we have *dha* and so on).²¹ So, in effect, Ahobala seems to reject the harmonic principle itself on which the 'natural' givenness and mathematical measurability of *svara* is based. This is a revolutionary move, indeed.

What I have said above regarding the dynamic, evolving and integrally inter-connected, relation of *svara* and *rāga* is, in fact, true, I believe, of the relation between *svara* and the music of any rich and enterprising musical culture. The example of the *rāga* is, surely, only an instance of a more universal cultural phenomenon. The specific ways in which the relation between *svara* and music develops, will certainly differ with the individual history of a culture, yet one would think that tensions similar to the one outlined above would be common. What I have done is to describe the phenomenon as I see it in the history of Indian music. This will, I hope, also serve a cautionary purpose, and dispel the myth that Indian music or its musicology is basically ahistorical.

Paradoxically, the *saṅgīta-śāstra*, in more recent times, has tried to get back to the assurance of the *svara-sthānas* as somehow 'given' even as it has become more historically

²¹ *madhye pūrvottarabaddhaviṇāyān gātra eva ca /*
ṣaḍjapañcamabhāvena śrutirdvāvimśatirjaguḥ ||
ibid, verse, 41.

oriented. But the essence of the idea that Ahobala so daringly propounds, continues among the *sampradāyas* of music, both musicians and *gunijans* — the 'knowers of music'. Indeed the idea, I think, can be carried still forward. In all musical thinking the belief — or rather the rooted *samskāra* — that *svara* is a *position*, has continued, and is still with us. It is there even in Ahobala. But if we go by what we actually do in practice, as Ahobala bravely does, the idea cannot but be challenged. If *rāgas* decide *svaras*, as has been believed for a few centuries now, then a *svara* need not be a static *position*, that is, a *sthāna*. We also have *āndolita svaras* in many *rāgas*, such as the *Miyān ki Malhār* and *Darbāri*, where a *svara* to be a *svara in the rāga* has to be a swing, a particular movement over *sthānas*, which is what an *āndolana* is, and not a static *position*.

Many of the larger visions and reflections of the great musicological thinkers discussed above are denied today in musicology or even in what we know in our own culture as *saṅgīta-śāstra*. The discipline is understood as a descriptive science, or a *lakṣaṇa śāstra*, with prescriptive undertones — or overtones — that such a 'human' science or *śāstra* is bound to have, but the spaces of thought beyond this, leading out of music or deeper within it, are considered out of bounds. It is forbidden to take 'speculative' leaps of the kind that ancient thinkers like Pythagoras, Confucius or the singers of *sāma* like Yājñavalkya — to mention only one of them—took. These, it is believed, were thinkers who had not yet been able to shake off their non-scientific, mythological and mystical moorings. One might wonder if the visions of Pythagoras, Confucius and Yājñavalkya can be dismissed as merely 'mystical' and 'mythological', even though one might agree with the thrust of thought which distinguishes between myths and mystical statements and those produced by what is called the cognitive enterprise. The musicological enterprise, as we have tried to look at it above, has clear roots in 'reason' or a 'rational logos' in the larger sense of the term. What it tries to do is to explore the manifestation of 'cognition' or 'knowledge' in music itself. It is thus truly a

'science' or the 'logos' of music. What we find, I think, are visions which life and thought can feed on creatively.

I say this also as a kind of self-justification for my own venture into fields outside the '*lakṣmaṇa-rekhā*' of what can be called 'traditional' musicology, using the term 'tradition' in its sense as 'the accepted convention' regarding the domain of the discipline. But a reader might ironically note, however, that the present collection of essays does not really fall outside the field of convention. This is true. If, as I would fondly like to believe, I have really done any substantial stepping-out, it is more in a long Hindi essay, a venturesome project, entitled, *Saṅgit Evam Cintan*,* published separately as an independent work, and not collected here. This Hindi essay seeks to understand thought itself, its nature and creativity as a human, cultural enterprise, through the eyes of music, especially the *rāga*. The present essay too, has acquired an analogous, if not an identical, thrust.

But something more can be said here concerning the notion of stepping-out, which, I believe is relevant to those who do musicology in India. I would like to point out that musicology as *saṅgīta-śāstra* is an old and hoary discipline in India. The *śāstra* had its own traditions and its traditional boundaries, its *maryādā*, which was not quite fixed, as it never is in any long tradition of thought on a subject — and as I hope the survey above also reveals — yet it did move within discernibly marked limits. A remarkable stepping out of *saṅgīta-śāstra* took place in the 19th century with our encounter with of west. Musicology in the west has interests quite different from traditional *saṅgīta-śāstra*, and though it too is a *lakṣaṇa-śāstra* of its kind, its notion of *lakṣaṇa* in the context of music is quite different from ours. It has, for one, a pointedly 'contextual' orientation and gives much more value to the history of music and the circumstances under which music is created than our *saṅgīta-śāstra* does — or, for that matter, any of the other Indian *śāstras* connected with the arts,

* Delivered as a series of lectures under the auspices of the Hiranand Shastri Vyākhyānmālā, organised by Vatsal Nidhi and published by Prabhat Prakashan, New Delhi, 1994.

including the richest of them, namely, *alaṅkāra-śāstra*, do. A contextual, historical approach is, in the west, considered not something contingent, but a central part of the *lakṣaṇa* of these arts. We have also learnt to follow the west in this regard, and, consequently, all our *śāstras* regarding the arts, including *saṅgīta-śāstra*, have stepped out, so to say, from their earlier confines. Indeed we can no longer even think of these *śāstras* in purely traditional Indian terms, so much has the western śāstric tradition taken hold of us. But, looking at the *pauruṣeya* logos of the *rāga* and its essentially *historical* spirit, the addition of history to our *saṅgīta-śāstra*, need not be considered an entirely alien implant.

The case of modern *saṅgīta-śāstra* is, in an important sense, different from other *śāstras*, say *alaṅkāra-śāstra* or *vāstu-śāstra*. In these *śāstras*, unlike *saṅgīta-śāstra*, we have not added something new to an already rich tradition, but, literally, stepped-out of the Indian tradition and its own *maryādā* into a new tradition, the western, and its different confines. This has been a kind of total stepping-out almost similar to what happens with people at the end of a civilisation, to which they had been long heir. *Saṅgīta* as well as *saṅgīta-śāstra* have been an exception. Stepping-out here has been more of a reaching out, a broadening of frontiers. We have come to acquire a 'contextual' interest without losing our moorings in the earlier approach and the central concepts of what constitutes *lakṣaṇa* in music.

Appendix I

Some time back Professor Bansidhar Bhatt of Munster, Germany, was kind enough to send me a paper he had written, entitled, 'Study of the word, *nikṣepa* and other derivatives in the Śvetāmbara Jain Canon' (published in *Akten des Melzer — Symposiums 1991*, ed. Walter Slaje and Christian Zinko, Leykam, pp. 15-53). Prof. Bhatt has serious and radical objections to my understanding of *ruiya-joniyam* (*rudīta-yoni*) as meaning that the source of song is lament, or the sentiment of *karuṇa* in man. This, he says, is a merely a 'poetic' statement and can hardly be expected of a work devoted to the 'scientific' discipline of musicology which seeks 'universal theories' (p. 47).

No one, I should think, would really deny that the statement in question, as I have understood it, does, in fact, make a 'universal' or general claim; it can also be certainly called a 'theory' concerning what makes man sing. Lament, the theory claims, is the cause of song. There is, of course, no attempt in our text to adduce arguments in favour of the 'theory', nor should this be expected from the kind of text that we have, which deals only sketchily with its subject. As to being 'scientific', what one may ask, is wanting here? The theory is certainly 'scientific' in being 'causal'; it speaks of a causal relation between lament and song. But what is lacking, perhaps, is that such a theory, even though apparently causal, cannot really be a matter of factual, experimental examination; and so it is unscientific. One might even add that the very enquiry, as to the basis of song in human nature is unscientific in principle since it cannot lead to any proper empirical examination. But then would it be proper to be only 'scientific' in an enquiry concerning music? Are suggestive and intuitive statements to be totally avoided, even if they add to the wealth and depth of our

understanding? Should one not be speculative in understanding music, since music, it can be meaningfully said (to make another 'theoretical' point, so to say) is itself born of the speculative spirit. Music is also an aesthetic activity, and statements concerning aesthetics, though obviously central to musicology, cannot be termed 'scientific' in the sense of being purely descriptive. Take the statements we have in our text regarding *guṇas* and *doṣas*. Their intention is obviously prescriptive and not descriptive as demanded by a 'science' of the kind which Prof. Bhatt appears to have in mind. But the question really is, should such a demand be made a prescriptive, or imperative, demand for the science or the knowledge, the *vidya*, *sāstra* or *veda*, of music?

Prof. Bhatt's own understanding of '*ruiya jonyam*' is interesting. '*Ruiya*', he has tried to show, is really a misreading for '*ruinda*', a word which stands for '*rovindaka*', a *gītaka* sung in *gāndharva*, a distinct form of ancient music; and '*yoni*', means 'a basic stanza'. Thus the phrase, '*giyam ruiya-joniyam*', should actually be read as, '*giyam ruinda-joniyam*', and it means, 'the *rovindaka* is a basic stanza (a form) of *gīta*'. This, I think, is not only extremely far-fetched, but seems to make no sense. I have not been able to understand the phrase, 'a basic stanza (a form) of *gīta*'. In what sense is a stanza intended as a *form* of *gīta*? A stanza, one would think, is a *part* of a *gīta*, which is usually a larger unit. Indeed, the *rovindaka*, as the reader can see from the *Dattilam* and the *Nātyasāstra* (or from my exposition of *rovindaka* in a *A Study Of Dattilam*, especially pp. 406-410) was a large and complex form containing many stanzas, and can hardly be equated with a stanza, even 'a *basic stanza*', however the term 'basic' might be understood here.

The notable thing in Prof. Bhatt's article, in the context of our Jain text, is that he shows us through references that *rovindaka* was known to ancient Jain circles, thus adding meaningfully to our knowledge concerning ancient, and what might be termed, 'non-*saṅgītaśāstric*' references to the *gāndharva* and its forms.

Appendix II

Thāṇamga Text on Music

(Major variant readings are given from the Aṇuḡgaddāra text published in a critical edition by Sri Mahavira Jain Vidyalaya, Bombay).

सत्त सरा पण्णत्ता, तं जहा—

सज्जे रिसहे गंधारे मज्झिमे पंचमे सरे।
धेवए चेव निस्साए सरा सत्त वियाहिया ॥ 1 ॥

एएसिं णं सत्तण्हं सराणं सत्त सरट्ठाणा पण्णत्ता, तं जहा—

सज्जं च अग्गजीहाए उरेण रिसएं सरं।
कंटुग्गएण गंधारं मज्झिजीहाए मज्झिमं ॥ 2 ॥
नासाए पंचमं बूया दंतोद्वेण य धेवयं।
मुद्धाणेणं य णेसायं सरट्ठाणा वियाहिया ॥ 3 ॥

सत्तसरा जीवणिस्सिया पण्णत्ता, तं जहा—

सज्जं रवइ मऊरो कुक्कुडो रिसएं सरं।
हंसो णदइ² गंधारं मज्झिमं च गवेलगा ॥ 4 ॥
अह कुसुमसंभवे काले कोइला पंचमं सरं।
छहं च सरसा कोंचा नेसायं सत्तमं गया ॥ 5 ॥

सत्तसरा अजीवणिस्सिया पण्णत्ता, तं जहा—

सज्जं रवइ मुयंगो गोमुही रिसहं सरं।
संखो णदइ³ गंधारं मज्झिमं पुण झल्लरी ॥ 6 ॥
चउचलण पइट्ठुणा गाहिया पंचमं सरं।
आडम्बरो धेवइयं महाभेरी य सत्तमं ॥ 7 ॥

1. भमुहवक्खेवेण।
2. रवइ।
3. रवइ।

एएसिं ण सत्तण्हं सराणं सत्त सरलक्खणा पण्णत्ता, तं जहा—

सज्जेण लहई वित्ति कयं च न विणस्सइ।
गावो पुत्ता य मित्ता य नारीणं होइ वल्लहो ॥ 8 ॥

रिसहेण य एसज्जं सेणावच्चं धणाणि य।
वत्थ गंधमलंकारं इत्थिओ सयणाणि य ॥ 9 ॥

गंधारे गीयजुत्तिण्णा वज्जवित्ती कलाहिया।
हवंति कइणो पण्णा जे अण्णे सत्थपारगा ॥ 10 ॥

मज्झिमस्सरसंपन्ना भवंति⁴ सुहजीविणो।
खायई पियई देई मज्झिमस्सरसस्सिओ ॥ 11 ॥

पंचमस्सरसंपन्ना हवंति पुढवीवई।
सूरा संगहकत्तारो अणेगगणनायगा⁵ ॥ 12 ॥

धेवयस्सरसंपन्ना⁶ हवंति कलहप्पिया।
साउणिया वग्गुरिया सोयरिया मच्छवंधा य ॥ 13 ॥

चंडाला मुट्टिया सेया⁷ जे अण्णो पावकम्मिणो।
गोघातगा य जे चोरा णिसायं सरमस्सिया ॥ 14 ॥

एएसिं णं सत्तण्हं तओ गामा पण्णत्ता, तं जहा—सज्जगामे मज्झिमगामे
गंधारगामे। सज्जगामस्स णं सत्त मुच्छणाओ पण्णत्ताओ, तं जहा—

मंगी कोरवीया हरी य रयणी सारकंता य।
छट्टी य सारसी नाम सुद्धसज्जा य सत्तमा ॥ 15 ॥

मज्झिमगामस्स णं सत्त मुच्छणाओ पण्णत्ताओ तं जहा—

उत्तरमंदा रयणी उत्तरा उत्तरासमा⁸।
समोकंता य सौवीरा अवभीरु⁹ हवइ सत्तमा ॥ 16 ॥

4. हवंति।
5. अणेगणरणायगा।
6. धेवयसरमंता।
7. मेता।
8. उत्तरायता।
9. अभीरू।

गंधारगामस्स णं सत्त मुच्छणाओ पण्णत्ताओ, तं जहा—
 नंदी य खुड्डिया पूरिमा च चउत्थी च सुद्धगंधारा।
 उत्तरगंधारा वि य पंचमिया हवइ मुच्छा उ ॥ 17 ॥
 सुद्धुत्तरमायामा सा छट्ठी नियमसो उणायव्वा।
 अह उत्तरायया कोडिमा य सा सत्तमी मुच्छा ॥ 18 ॥
 सत्तसरा कओ संभवति गीयस्स का हवंति जोणी।
 कइ समयया उस्सासा कइ वा गीयस्स आगारा ॥ 19 ॥
 सत्तसरा नाभिओ हवंति, गीयं च रुइयजोणियं¹⁰।
 पायसमा ऊसासा, तिण्णि य गीयस्स आगारा ॥ 20 ॥
 आइमिड आरभंता समुव्वहंता या मज्झगारंमि।
 अवसाणे तज्जवितो¹¹ तिन्नि य गीयस्स आगारा ॥ 21 ॥
 छट्ठोसे अट्टगुणे तिण्णि य वित्ताइं दो य भणिईओ।
 जाणाहिइ से गाहिइ सुसिक्खिओ रंगमज्झम्मि ॥ 22 ॥
 भीयं दुयं रहस्सं¹² गायंतो माय गाहि उत्तालं¹³।
 काकस्सरं अणुणासं च होति गीयस्स छट्ठोसा¹⁴ ॥ 23 ॥
 पुण्णं रत्तं च अलंकियं च वत्तं तहा अविघुट्टं।
 महुरं समं सुललियं अट्टगुणा होति गेयस्स ॥ 24 ॥
 सरकंठसिरपसत्थं¹⁵ गिज्जइ मउरिभियपदबद्धं।
 समतालपडुक्खेवं सत्तस्सरसीभरं गीयं ॥ 25 ॥
 निहोसं सारमंतं च हेउजुत्तमलेकियं।
 उवणीयं सोवयारं य मियं महुरमेव यं ॥ 26 ॥
 समं अद्धसमं चेव सवत्थं विसमं च जं।
 तिण्णि वित्तप्पयाराइं चउत्थ नोवलब्भइ ॥ 27 ॥

10. रुन्नजोणीयं।
11. अवसाणे य झवेता।
12. दुयमुप्पिच्छं।
13. उत्तालं च कमसौ मुणयव्वं।
14. छट्ठोसा होति गीयस्स।
15. विसुद्धं।

सक्कया पायया चैव दुहा भणिईओ आहिया।
 सरमंडलम्मि गिज्जंते पसत्था इसिभासिया ॥ 28 ॥
 केसि गायइ महुरं केसि गायइ खरं च रुक्खं च।
 केसि गायइ चउरं केसी य विलवियं दुतं केसी ॥ 29 ॥

विस्सरं पुण केरिसी ॥

सामा गायइ महुरं काली गायइ खरं च रुक्खं च।
 गोरी गायइ चउरं काणा विलंबं दुतं च अंधा ॥ 30 ॥

विस्सरं पुण पिंगला।

तंतिसमं¹⁶ तालसमं पायसमं लयसमं गहसमं च।
 नीससिऊससियसमं संचारसमं सरा सत्त¹⁷ ॥ 31 ॥
 सत्तसरा तओ गामा मुच्छणा एकवीसई।
 ताणा एगुणपण्णासं सम्मतं सरमंडलं ॥ 32 ॥
 इह सरमंडलं समत्तं¹⁸।

16. अक्खरसमं।

17. In *Anuḍḍāra* this verse comes after verse 25 above.

18. *Anuḍḍāra* ends with से ते सत्तनामे।

Index

- A Historical Study of Indian Music* 199
- A History of Indian Literature* (see also, 'Winternitz, Maurice') 218fn, 223fn
- A Study of Dattilam* ii, 49fn, 63, 110fn, 305fn, 309fn, 315fn, 337
- Abdul Karim Khan 55, 59, (same as, 'Abdul Karim')
- Abhijñāna Śākuntalam* (see, 'Śākuntalam')
- Abhinava (see also, 'Abhinava Gupta' and 'Abhinavagupta') 242fn, 245; and composite arts 95ff; and dance 75ff; on dramatic speech 99fn; on music in theatre 128fn, 135ff; on *nāṭya* 95ff, 133ff; on *viṇā* 201
- Abhinava Bhārati* (see also, 'Abhinava Gupta') — 69ff, 85fn, 128fn, 169fn, 321fn
- Abhinava Gupta (see also, 'Abhinava', 'Abhinavagupta', 'Abhinava Bhārati') 8, 18, 20, 37ff, 38fn, 69ff, 93fn, 95ff, 115, 168-169, 176fn
- Abhinavagupta 127, 131fn
- abhinaya* (mime, acting) 70, 72-73, 81ff, 106ff; and *bhāva* 118
- absolute; in music 267-306
- actor 28, 100, 126
- Adāraṅg 59
- Adhyātmaviveka* (of 'Śarṅgadeva') 249
- affinity; between realms 120ff, 163ff
- Agni: The Vedic Ritual of The Fire Altar* 301fn
- āhata* 263, 329; *nāda* 289ff, 311
- Ahobala 330ff
- Ajanta 24, 57
- Akten Des Melzer* 336
- alanikāra-śāstra* 17-18, 118fn, 247, 335
- alanikāra* 103, 117; in music 103, 228fn
- ālankārikas* 19, (see also, 'critics; literary')
- ālāpa* 51, 88ff, 221, 319
- ālāta-cakra* 97, 135
- ālekhyavat* (also, '*tulya*', '*prakhya*', '*kalpa*'; a painting-like resemblance or *sainvāda*); concept of and musical style 36; a kind of *sainvāda* (see also, '*sainvāda*') 24ff; subspecies of 27ff
- Allaudin Khan 12
- Altekar, A.S. 159, 191, 192fn, 199, 202
- Amara 201
- Amarakośa* 70fn, 201
- Amaru* 21
- Ames, Roy (see, 'Roy Ames')
- Amir Khan 36, 53, 59
- Amitabh Bacchan (an actor) 157-158
- Amolak Chandra Surpuria 223fn
- Amṛtamanthana* 105
- anāhata* 263, 329; *nāda* 293
- Ananadavardhana 93; his concept of literary creativity 16ff; his concept of meaning 19-20; on *pratibhā* 20ff
- Aṅga* (a branch of Jain literature) 223, 232
- aṅga* (style) 38
- aṅgahāra* (a dance-whole) 73ff, 83, 115

- aṅgavidyā* 243
Aṅgavijā 243-244
anirukta; *sāma* 301fn
anṛca; *sāma* 46ff, 286ff
antarmārga 35; of a *rāga* 32
anukarāṇa (mimesis) 95, 101, 105ff, 114, 118-119, 128fn
Aṅuḡgaddāra 223-224
anuvādi 312ff
Aparājītapṛcchā 180
Āpastamba Grhya Sūtra 195fn
apauruṣeya; music 267-306
Āraṇyaka; texts 44, 305
 architect 17,
 architecture (see also, '*vāstu-sāstra*')
 4, 5, 40-41, 334; vis-à-vis music
 14, 58,
 Aristotle iii, 271fn; and Bharata 94-
 95, 111
 Arjuna; as a musician 186
 art; forms, composite 52, 93-122 (see
 also, 'arts the association of');
 history of 15, 58
 arteries; and the production of speech
 and *svara* 255ff
 artists 7, 15, 56; their activity of
 transformation 17
 arts; affinity of 120; formal 16, 122,
 (see also, 'form; non-representa-
 tive'); non-representational 101,
 118-119; performing 58, 99; the
 association of 52, (see also, 'art-
 forms, composite') traditional
 and modern 4ff
aśarira (see also, '*sāma*'); *sāma*;
 46ff, 287ff
 Ashok Kumar (an actor) 158
āśraya (base); of music 288ff
 auditorium 139 (see also, '*nāṭya-grha*')
Āyāra (Āyārāṅga) 223fn
āyurveda 263; aś revelation 256ff;
 birth of the body in 248ff.
- Bach 59
- Bade Ghulam Ali 91
Bahār (a *rāga*) 89, 91, 169
 Baiju Bāvarā (see also, 'Nāyaka
 Baiju') 214
 Bāna 187, 198
bandish 90 (see also, '*chiz*' and
 '*krī*'); its replication 32
bāni (see also 'style') 62
 Basant (a *rāga*; see also, '*Vasant*')
 167
 Beethoven 184
 Begum Akhtar 53, 104, 105
Bhāgavata; painting 184
 Bhagīratha Prasāda Śāstrī 291fn
Bhairava (a *rāga*); painting of 185
Bhairavi (a *rāga*) 33; and *rāga*-time
 association 167
Bhaktamāla 214
bhakti 49fn, 306
bhāṇas; music in 197ff
 Bharata (see also, '*Nāṭyaśāstra*') 19,
 21, 51, 53, 168, 199, 239fn,
 318fn, 324-325; and Confucius
 273, 289; and Hindi films 123-
 162; and his *Nāṭyaśāstra* 19,
 130ff; and his theatre 92-122,
 130ff; and Tanḡu 69ff; his
 concept of *vṛtti* 111ff; his
saṅgraha 98, 99 110; on dance
 37, 69ff; on *pada* 293-294
Bharata Bhāṣya (see also, 'Nānya
 Bhūpāla) 65, 169, 231, 236fn,
 330fn, 331fn
Bharata Nāṭyam 109, 112, 113
Bharatakośa 175-176fn
Bhāratīya Calacitra Kā Itihās 126fn
Bhāratīya Saṅgita Kā Itihās (of
 Thakur Jaidev Singh) 70
 Bhāsa 189
 Bhatkhande; and musical institutions
 14; on *rāga* and time 12, 164ff
Bhātkaṅḡe Smṛti Grantha 168fn,
 172fn
 Bhatt, Bansidhara 336-337

- Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa 141
 Bhaṭṭa Śobhākara 235fn
bhāva (in *nāṭya*); and *abhinaya* 118;
 and *rasa* 118, 273ff
bhāva (in *āyurveda*) 250ff
 Bhavabhūti 242
 Bhīmacārya Jhalkīkar 291fn
 Bhimsen Joshi 59
Bihāg (a *rāga*) 36
 Billikoth Ramachandra Sharma
 288fn, 302fn
biruda (a limb of '*prabandha*') 216
Biwi O Biwi (a Hindi film) 155-156,
 158
Bobby (a Hindi film) 142, 143
 body; as an instrument 247-263; as
 embodied self 249ff; the birth of
 248ff
bol (in percussion playing) 116-117
Book of Songs (Chinese) 268ff
Boy Friend (a Hindi film) 157, 158
Brāhmaṇa; texts 42ff, 225fn, 271,
 285ff, 302fn
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 306
Bṛhaddeśi (see also, 'Matanga') 62,
 65, 168, 207, 215, 238fn, 315fn,
 317, 318-319
Bṛhadharma Purāṇa 177ff
Bṛhatkathakośa 198fn
Bṛhatkathamāñjarī 195fn
 Buddha 48, 196, 197
buddhi; and the body 251ff; and the
 process of speech-production
 255, 260-261
 Buddhist; ethos and music 49;
 literature, music in 187, 196-
 197 (see also, '*Jātakas*')
 Caitanya 179
cakras (connected with the
kuṇḡalīni) 259
 Candragupta II 198; as a musician
 190-191; as a playwright 191
 Caraka 256
cāri (movement in dance) 76, 86
Caturbhāṇi 198fn
Caurapañcāśikā; paintings 185
 Chaitanya P. Desai 170fn, 330fn
chālikya-gāndharva 186
Chāndogya Upaniṣad 285
 Chari, V.K. 114fn
 China; music in, 267ff, 307ff
chiz (composition) 61
 civilization; traditional 3
 classical (see also, '*śāstriya*' and
 '*prabandha*'); forms 32, 55-56,
 59, 87ff, 143; musicians 51
 (also, 'musicians'); singing 51-
 53, 222
 coinage; Gupta, *viṇā* in 186-204
 composers (see also, '*vāggeyakāras*')
 30, 59-60, 144, 206fn
 composite; 94ff art and the concept
 of *uparāñjana* 94ff
 Confucius 289, 307, 310, 316-319,
 333; as a musicologist 267ff;
 defines man through music iii,
 273
 content; vis-à-vis form 16, 31, 72-73
 correspondences; cosmic 44-45
 creation; as transformation 16-38
 creative; transformation and style
 32ff
 creativity (see also, 'creation,'
 '*pratibhā*'); and plagiarism 24ff;
 and similarities 23ff; and the
 concept of *dhvani* 20-21; and
 the concept of *yonī* 25; and the
 structure of a poem 29; denial
 of 23; literary 16ff
 critic(s) (see also, '*saḡṛdaya*') 280; Con-
 fucius as 280ff; literary; 17ff
 criticism (see also, '*saḡṛdaya*'); in
 music, 1, 10ff, 218; in newspa-
 pers 14-15; in poetry 56; oral
 10, 14
dādrā 90

- Dāmodara Gupta (see also, 'Kuttanimatam') 145ff
- dance 6, 16, 37, 52, 119; and Hindi films 123ff, 144ff, 154ff; and *nāṭya* (theatre) 72-73, 99, 105ff, 153; ceremonial 272; theory of, and Taṇḍu (see, 'Taṇḍu'); unit of 37-38, 71ff, 114ff (see also, 'ṛtta; mātrkā'); *yojanā* in 74fn, 84ff
- Darbāri* (a *rāga*) 333
- Dasaveyāliya* 223fn
- Dattila (see also, 'Dattilam') iii, 174fn, 237fn, 311ff, 318fn, 327
- Dattilam* (see also, 'Dattila') ii-iii, 65, 66, 176fn, 194fn, 224, 233fn, 237fn, 311fn, 337
- Daya Krishna 286ff
- deśi* 86, 119, 217-218, 258
- Deśi Toḍi* (a *rāga*) 91
- Devanand (an actor) 141, 149
- Devardhigaṇi 224fn
- devices; theatric 129, 132ff, 150ff
- Dhaky, M.A. 180fn
- dhamani* (see, 'artery')
- dhamār* 89
- dharma* 271, 279
- Dharmendra (an actor) 149
- dhātu* 220
- Dholā-Mārū*; paintings 184
- dhrupad* 34-35, 38, 88ff, 102, 207; analogous to *gāndharva* 102; as a style of rendering *rāgas* 32ff, 88ff; its history 61-62, 215fn
- dhruvā* (theatrical songs; see also, 'gāna', 'theatrical') 128fn, 242; and *gāndharva* 102ff, 115, 121, 144; *ātma-saṁstha* and *para-saṁstha* 142-143; types of and their uses 135ff, 156ff
- dhvani*; and the concept of *kāku* 100; theory of, and creativity 20-21
- Dhvanyāloka* (see also, 'Ānandavardhana') 8fn, 18ff, 23fn.
- Dhvanyālokalocana* (see also, 'Abhinavagupta') 18
- Die Musikinstrumente Indiens Und Indonesiens* 192fn
- Dighanikāya* 196
- Dikshit, Ramanatha A.M. 302fn, 316fn
- Dilip Padgaonkar; and songs in Hindi films 127-128
- Dipak(a)* (a *rāga*) 232; occult effect of 12
- director; of films 126, 137-138
- doṣa* 10, 218, 227, 240ff, 337
- drama (see also, 'theatre') 52, 128fn
- dramaturgy (see also, 'nāṭya') 130
- drśya-kāvya* (see also, 'theatre') 19
- Druhiṇa 93fn
- Dvijarāja Bhaṭṭa 302fn
- Ebeling, Klaus 174ff, 183-184
- education (see also 'music'); in music and improvisation 31, 60
- emotions; harmonised through music 270; in Hindi films 137ff, 153ff, 160
- Epigraphica Indica* 187fn
- ethnomusicologist i
- Europe (see, 'European')
- European; music 39ff
- experience; universals of 23
- Faiyaz Khan 59
- Falke, D.G. 126
- feeling (see, 'emotion')
- film 52; and the *nāṭya* of Bharata 94-95, 102; documentary 129; Hindi, and dance 123ff; Hindi, and music 102, 105, 123ff; Hindi, history of 125ff
- Film And Reality* 125fn
- film-songs; tradition of 123ff
- Fleet, J.F. 186fn

- folk; music 215, 217-218
- form; archetypal 87; classical 30-31 (see also, 'classical'); generation of 71ff; musical (see also, 'music') 39, 63, 65, 66-67, 88ff, 104, 143, 215ff, 229; non-representative 71-73, 105ff, 114; of a *rāga* 87-91; vis-à-vis content 16, 31, 71
- formal; arts 16, 101; influences on Hindi films 125ff
- formalistic 18
- formula 88, 124
- Fox-Strangways, A.H. 166, 177fn
- Gadyacintāmaṇi* 198-199fn
- gamak* 38, 221
- gāna* (see also, 'dhruvā', 'theatrical'); vis-à-vis *gāndharva* 102, 294
- gāndharva* 49-50, 53, 70-71, 101ff, 121, 144, 193-194fn, 294, 305, 308ff, 321, 337; and *rāgas* 70; improvisation in 66-67; *śāla* 104; vis-à-vis *gāna* 102, 294
- gāndharva-śāstra* 70, 322fn
- geya-vikāras* (see also, 'vikāra') 298fn
- gharānā* 32, 56, 61, 62, 88
- Ghasilal, Muni 224fn, 225fn, 227fn, 228fn
- ghazal* 30, 31, 53, 104, 105
- Gitagovinda* 63; and the tradition of music 205-222; paintings 184; vis-à-vis *Mānasollāsa* 207ff
- gitaka* (see also, 'gāndharva') 105, 106, 337
- giti* (see also 'style'); and *rāga*-time association 169-170
- Gotama (a *sāma* singer) 297
- grāma* 226, 229; number of 230-231, 238
- grāma-rāgas* 103-104, 168
- Greek 2, 57, 60, 268, 269fn; music 39; musicology 267
- guṇa* 10, 218, 227, 240ff, 337; Sāṅkhyān 252
- Gupta; kings and music 186ff, 200ff
- Gupta Inscriptions* 186fn
- Gurjari* (a *rāga*) 222; legends about 12-13
- Guru-Granth* 269
- Hara Prasada Sastri 207
- haraṇa* (see also, 'plagiarism') 25
- Haricandra 188
- Harīṣeṇa 188, 198-199fn
- harmonics 332
- Harṣa 188
- hasta-viṇā* 319
- Hazra, R.C. 179
- Hema Malini (an actress) 141
- Hindi (see also, 'film'); films and dance 123ff; films and music 102, 105, 123ff; films, history of 125ff; plays 125ff
- Hindustani; music (see also, 'music, Hindustani'); 14, 16, 32ff, 59-60, 65, 117, 206fn, 236, 312; music and the category of *pratibimba-kalpa* 30; styles 32ff; vis-à-vis Karnatic 163ff
- Hiraṇya Śrauta Sūtra* 195fn
- history (see also, 'music'); and music 39ff, 54ff, 163-173 (see also, 'music, history of'); and the concepts of *vṛtti* and *rasa* 119ff; axial break in 2; milieu and style 34-35; of Hindustani music 16
- History of Dharmasāstra* 187fn
- Howard, Wayne 301fn
- Hussain, M.F.; and *rāga*-painting 185
- ideas; and music 39ff
- identity; cultural 6; of a musical piece 31

- imagination (see also, 'pratibhā') :
creative 16-38
- Imān Dharam (a Hindi film) 158
- imitation; and theatre 95, 128fn, 151
(see also, 'anukaraṇa')
- improvisation; and music education
31, 61; and *sāstriya* (classical)
music 31, 62, 89-91; and style
32ff; in *gāndharva jātis* (see
also, 'gāndharva', 'jāti') 67
- India's Intellectual Traditions 107fn
- Indian (see also, 'music'); music,
drone in 40-41
- Indian Philosophy: A Counter-
Perspective 286ff
- indriyas (sense-organs); spiritual or
physical 252, 254
- innovation (see also, 'creativity') 8,
319
- instrument; body as 247-263 (see
also, 'vinā')
- international; and the 'modern' in art
2-3, 5
- interpretation; in music 30, 59; vis-à-
vis transformation 30
- Isibhāsiyāim (see, 'Rṣibhāsiya')
- itivṛtta (dramatic plot) 112ff, 160ff
(see also 'plot')
- Jagadekamalla 170, 176fn
- Jaimīniya Brāhmaṇa 285
- Jaimīniya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa 42ff,
285ff
- Jaimīniya-sākhā 42
- Jain; ethos and music 49; literature
and music 188ff, 198, 201, 210-
211, 223-246, 336-337
- Jain, Panna Lal 198-199fn
- Jātakas (see also, 'Buddhist';
literature'); and music 187fn,
194fn, 196-197, 199
- jāti (a *gāndharva* form; see also,
'gāndharva') 63, 103, 230fn;
and *rāga* (see also, 'rāga') 66-
67; *dhyāna* 176fn; improvisation
in 67
- jāvali 294
- Jayadeva (see also, 'Gitagovinda')
63, 112, 113, 179, 205-222
- Jayadeva Singh (Thakur) 70fn
- Jijñāsā: A Journal of the History of
Ideas And Culture 150fn
- Jineśvara Sūri 210
- Jivandhara Campū 199fn
- Johny Merā Nam (a Hindi film) 141,
149
- Journal of The Asiatic Society 191fn
- Kādambari 188, 198
- kaiṣiki (a *vṛtti*; see also 'vṛtti') 144ff
- kāku (intonation); in dramatic speech
99ff, 102, 110, 289fn
- Kalānidhi (see also, 'Kallipātha')
86fn
- Kālidāsa 29, 139, 147, 187, 191,
212, 229fn, 238
- Kalind 331fn
- Kallinātha 86, 206fn, 213-214,
215fn, 216fn, 237fn, 258, 313fn
- Kalpasūtra; miniatures 174, 183
- Kāmasūtra 191
- kambala-gāna (a *gāndharva* form)
63
- Kāmod (a *raga*) 91
- Kane, P.V. 187fn
- Kanhupāda 207
- Kapadia, H.R. 228fn
- karana (a unit in dance) 37ff, 73ff,
115ff, 119
- Karnatic(ak); music 14, 60-61, 65,
164ff, 312
- Kashmir (see also, 'Kashmiri') 142
- Kashmiri 17, 142, 320; theorists 18
- Kaśyapa; 138 on music in theatre
108
- Kaśyapa (a singer of *sāma*) 297
- Kathākosaprakaraṇa; music in 210-
211
- Kathāsaritsāgara; vinā-playing in
195fn
- Kaumudi (commentary on the
Dhvanīyālokalocana) 8-9fn
- Kauthumaśakhāyāh Ūhagānam
Ūhyagānam 302fn, 316fn
- kavi (see also, 'poet') 8-9, 20, 117
- kavi-karma (activity of the poet) 7
- kāvya (see also, 'poetry') 17, 18, 29,
201; and *nāṭya* 117, 118; and
rasa 19; *drśya* (theatre; see also,
'theatre') 19
- Kāvya-mīmāṃsā (see also
'Rājaśekhara') 24fn; and
plagiarism 24ff
- Khamāj (a *rāga*) 33
- Khāravela (see also, 'kings') 187,
188
- khyāl 30, 31, 38, 52, 59, 60, 61; 88,
91, 103, 104, 207, 215fn,
analogous to *gāndharva* 298;
102; as a style of rendering
rāgas 32ff
- kings; as musicians 186ff, 276, 278,
282
- kīrtan 53, 104
- Kīrtidhara 86
- Kohala 86, 238
- Kṛṣṇa; as a composer 186
- kṛti (see also, 'chiz', 'bandish') 60,
61
- Kṣemendra 195fn
- Kumar Gandharva 36, 59
- Kumārāgupta I 198; and music
186ff, 190, 202
- Kumbha (see, 'Rānā Kumbha')
- kuṇḍalini; and *svara*-production
258ff
- Kuntaka 9, 27
- Kuṭṭanimatam (see also, 'Dāmodara
Gupta'); on theatre 133fn, 145ff
- Lakṣmaṇasena 214, 219
- lakṣaṇa; of *jātis* and *rāgas* 314ff: of
svara 326ff; vis-à-vis *lakṣya*
258
- lakṣya; vis-à-vis *lakṣaṇa* 258
- Lalitavistara 187fn
- Lallan Piyā (a composer of *thumris*)
33
- Lallan Piyā ki Thumriyān 33fn
- Lankāvatara Sūtra 197
- Laura-Candā; painting 185
- Laxman Pai; and *rāga*-painting 185
- Legge, James 2714ff
- Li Ki 270ff
- Lin Yutang 268, 271ff
- linguistics (see also, 'Śikṣā') 57, 100
- literary (see also, 'literature');
creativity, concept of 16ff
- literature 31, 57; Buddhist, music in
187 (see also, 'Buddhist');
critical awareness in 16ff; Urdu-
Persian 21; vis-à-vis music 15,
63-64
- Loafer (a Hindi film) 149
- Locana; on *Dhvanīyāloka* 8-9fn
- Iogos iii-iv; of music 267-335
- lokadharmi 82, 110, 130ff
- lokasvabhāva 91, 95, 106, 112, 113,
114, 116
- lyrics 51
- Madan, J.F. 126
- Madhubala (an actress) 156
- Mahābhārata 124, 186, 187
- Mahāvagga 187fn, 196
- Mahāvīra 48, 231, 232
- Mahimabhāṭa 9
- Mālakosha (a *raga*) 90
- Mālavikāgnimitram (see also,
'Kālidāsa'); and Hindi film 147-
148
- Malhār (a *rāga*) 167, 236; occult
effect of 12
- man; 39ff concept of and music 31ff
- Mānārika (a commentator on
Gitagovinda) 211fn, 219fn

- manas* (mind) 259-260; and the body 251ff
- Mānasollāsa* (see also, 'Someśvara') 65, 170, 206fn, 218fn; *prabandha* in 207ff, 215fn
- mantra*; pronunciation of 100; Vedic and *sāma* (see also, 'Vedic'; '*sāma*') 42, 64
- mārga* (see also '*mārgi*') 217-218
- mārgi* (see also, '*mārga*') 258
- Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* 223
- Mārvā* (a *rāga*) 312
- Masterpieces of Jain Kalpasūtra*
- Painting* 174
- Mataṅga* (see also, '*Bṛhaddesi*') 168, 169, 207, 215, 217, 235, 238, 315, 317, 318-319, 322
- māyikā* (see also, '*nṛta*'); approach to structures 115ff, 122; concept of, and *sthāya* 36ff; vis-à-vis *vr̥tti* 115ff
- mātu* 220
- mazmūn* (poetic theme) 21
- meaning; theories of 19-20
- Meghadūta* (see also, '*Kālidāsa*') 229fn; music in 197
- Mīmāṃsā* (see also, '*Mīmāṃsaka*') 251
- Mīmāṃsaka* 251, 286
- mind (see, '*manas*')
- Misra, G.S.P. 142fn
- Miṭhūn Chakravarti (an actor) 155
- modern (see also, 'modernity'); as international 2-3, 6; as opposed to traditional 1ff; music in Confucian thought 278ff
- modernity (see also, 'modern'); and tradition 1ff; its absence in music and dance 4-5
- mokṣa* 48
- Motichandra 198, 243fn
- Mṛcchakatikam* (see also, '*Śūdraka*') 10-11, 197
- mudrā* (in dance) 119
- Muhammad Shah 35
- Mukherjee, Bratindranath 191fn
- Mumtaz (an actress) 149
- Muni Ghasilal (see, 'Ghasilal, Muni')
- Muni Nathmal (see 'Nathmal, Muni')
- music (see also, 'musical', '*saṅgita*'); absolute or *apauruṣeya* 267-306; *ādhyātmika* 284ff; aesthetic thought concerning 10ff, 227ff, 240ff, 270ff and ceremony 277; and cosmic correspondences 42ff; and dramatic speech (see also, '*pāthya*') 99ff; and film 123-162; and human harmony 270ff; and ideas 39ff; and polity 273; and style 32ff; and the analytical categories of poetry 31; and the category of *pratibimbakalpa* 31; and the concept of man 39ff; and the *kuṇḍalini* 258; and the other arts 7ff, 52-53, 99ff; and the pleasure principle 318ff; and the *sanyasic* ethos 48; and theatre (see also, 'theatre', '*nāṭya*') 101ff, 118-119, 127ff, 152-153; and words 51-53, 101ff, 286ff; as *upāsana* (see also, '*sāma*') 48; Chinese 267ff, 307-308; conceptual framework concerning 66ff; criticism in 1, 10ff, 14ff, 240ff; drone in 40-41; education 66, 87-88, 187-188, 268ff, 281; European (see also, 'west') 31-32, 59, 62; Greek (see also, 'Greek') 39, Hindustani (see also, 'Hindustani') 12, 16, 30, 32, 59-60, 117; history 15, 39ff, 45, 54ff, 120, 163ff, 307ff; ideal 268ff; lighter forms of 53; logos of 267-335; meaningless

- syllables in (see also, 'syllables, nonsense') 46ff, 51, 216, 221, 290ff; miraculous effects of 12-13; monodic 40, 45; northern Indian (see also, 'Hindustani') 88; notation in (see also, 'notation') 61; real or true 277ff; recordings of 15, 55, 62; replication of (see also, 'transmission') 32; texts (see also, '*saṅgita-sāstra*') 54-68, 168ff; vis-à-vis society 34-35.
- musical (see also, 'music'); culture 54, 57, 66; education 31; lore 245; notation (see also, 'notation') 15, 54; texts (see also, '*saṅgita-sāstra*') 54-68, 168ff
- musician(s) (see also '*vāggeyakāra*') 17, 49fn, 66, 87-88, 90, 91, 110fn, 316, 331ff; and the *kuṇḍalini* 259; classical 51, 166-167, 172, 193, 202fn; kings as 186ff; 276, 278, 282; occult power of 47
- musicologist (see also, 'musicology') 67
- musicology (see also, '*saṅgita-sāstra*') iii, 296; as logos of music 267-335; history of 67, 308ff; practice of 67-68.
- Nabhādāsa 214
- nāda* (see, '*āhata, nāda*')
- nāḍi* (artery) 254; and *svaroṭpatti* 255ff, 259ff
- nādotpatti* (the birth of *nāda* – sound – in the body) 247ff
- Naiyāyika 151
- Nalanda 141
- Namaka Halāl* (a Hindi film) 154, 157-158
- Nandi* 223fn
- Nānya (see, 'Nānyabhūpāla')
- Nānyabhūpāla 169ff, 176fn, 217, 231, 235fn, 330fn
- Nānyadeva (see 'Nānyabhūpāla')
- Nārada 174ff, 186, 230fn
- Nāradi (Nāradiyā, Nāradiyā) Śikṣā* 88; notation in (see also, 'notation') 61; real or true 277ff; recordings of 15, 55, 62; replication of (see also, 'transmission') 32; texts (see also, '*saṅgita-sāstra*') 54-68, 168ff; vis-à-vis society 34-35.
- narratives; in Hindi films 123ff, 153ff; the grammar of 150ff
- Naṭasūtra* 70
- Nathmal, Muni (same as 'Muni Nathmal') 223fn
- naturalism (see also, 'realism') 124ff
- nāṭya* (see also, 'theatre', '*Nāṭyaśāstra*'); and music (see also, 'music') 101ff; and stage-space 98-99; as a composite art (see also 'art') 92fn, 136fn; plot in 112-113; the *sāstra* of 92-122; vis-à-vis dance 72-73, 80ff
- nāṭyadharmi* 82, 130ff; as a transformed world 107ff, 118-119, 151ff, 159ff; *itivyṛta* as (see also '*itivyṛta*') 112-113
- nāṭya-grha* (see also, 'theatre-hall') 98-99
- Nāṭyaśāstra* (see also, 'Bharata') 38fn, 65, 66, 69, 72, 73fn, 74fn, 75fn, 76fn, 77fn, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83fn, 84fn, 85fn, 130fn, 161fn, 176fn, 194fn, 200fn, 201, 224, 228fn, 230, 231, 234fn, 289fn, 293fn, 321fn, 337; forms of theatre in 131fn; its authorship 92; its system and structure 92-122; music criticism in 241; *rasa* in (see also '*rasa*') 18-19, 93; theatric devices in (see also 'theatric, devices') 129, 150ff
- nāṭyāyita* 148ff
- Nawab, Sarabhai (see, 'Sarabhai Nawab')
- Nawab, Vidya Sarabhai (see, 'Vidya Sarabhai Nawab')

Nāyaka Baijū (see also, 'Baiju Bavra') 90
 Nāyaka Gopāla; Kallinātha refers to 215fn
nāyikā-bheda; painting 184
New Catalogus Catalogorum 249fn
 newspapers; musical criticism in 14-15
Nirukta 64
nirvāna 48
 notation (see also, 'music') 15, 54, 59, 61, 65-66, 284fn, 301, 315ff
nr̥tta (see also, 'dance', 'Tandu') 82, 105ff, 147fn; *hastas* 82-83; *karaṇa* (see also, 'karaṇa') 73ff; *mātrkā* (see also, 'mātrkā') 37ff, 73ff, 114ff; vis-à-vis *nr̥tta* 37
nr̥tya (see also, 'dance', 'nr̥tta'); vis-à-vis *nr̥tta* 37
 Nyāya 251
Nyāyakośa 292fn

Od̥disi 109, 112, 113
On The Art Poetry (see also, 'Poetics', Aristotle') 94fn
 oral; criticism (see, 'criticism; oral')

pada (see 'words')
Pādātādītakam 198, 199
 Padgaonkar, Dilip (see 'Dilip Padgaonkar')
 Padma Khanna (an actress) 149
Padmaprābhṛtaka 197
 Padmāvatī; and Jayadeva 211, 212, 214, 169
 painter 16
 painting 4, 5-6, 39, 40, 41, 193; and *saṁvāda* (see also, 'saṁvāda') 24; of *rāgas* 12-13, 174-185; vis-à-vis music 13, 58, 63-64
 Pande, G.C. 212fn
 Pāṇini 71-72; and theoretical activity in India 69ff
Pāṇiniya Śikṣā 260ff

Paraj (a *rāga*) 91
paramārtha; and *vyavahāra* 272-273fn; as essential meaning (see also, 'mazmān') 25
paramparā (see also, 'tradition'); as understood in the 'tradition' 7ff; and *rūḍhi* 7; and convention 7; criticism in 7ff; three elements of 7; and 'tradition' 7
parapurapraveśa-tulya (also, 'var'; transformation through change of context) 26ff; sub-species of 27-28
 Pārśvadeva (see also, 'Saṅgita-samaya-sāra') 171, 176fn, 215fn, 217
 Parveen Babi (an actress) 154-155
pāta (a limb of *prabandha*) 216, 222
 Patañjali 257fn
pāthya (speech); and *kāku* 99ff; in *nāṭya* 99ff, 102
pauruṣeya: logos and music 307-335
 Padmini Kolhapure (an actress) 155
 percussion-playing; in Bharata 116-117
 person (see, 'body; as embodied self')
 phonetics (see also 'Śikṣā') 100
piṇḍotpatti (birth of the human body) 248ff
 plagiarism; creative and imitative 24ff
 Plato 278; on music 270
 playwright 7, 107
 pleasure; the principle of, and *rāga*-music 318ff
 plot (in a play; see also, 'it̥v̥rtta') 117
 poem: its structure and creativity 29
 poetic (see also, 'poetry'); tradition 56
 poetics; Indian (see also, 'alāṅkāra-śāstra') 18, 56
Poetics (see also, 'On The Art

Poetry, 'Aristotle') 95
 poetry 41; analytical categories of, and music 31, 35; and music 51ff, 104-105, 205ff, 220ff; and theatre 99, 117, 133-134, 152; creativity in 23ff; criticism in 56-57; practice of 23ff; Sanskrit 30; transmission of 29
 poets 51; practice of 23ff
 polity; and music 274ff
 polyphony 40; and Vedic music 43-45
 post-modernism 1
prabandha (a form of music) 170, 206fn, 207fn
Pracīna Bhārata meṅ Saṅgita 197fn
 Pradyota (king of Avantī) 187, 188
prajñā; musical (see 'logos')
 Prajñānānanda, Swami 179, 192fn, 199
 Prakrit 218, 228
 Pran (an actor) 158
prāna (vital breath); and the production of speech and *svara* 253ff
Prāśastapāda 291fn
Prāśastapāda Bhāṣya 291fn
pratibhā (the creative impulse) 8-9, 213
 Anandavardhana on 20ff; and imagination 8; transcendental 279ff; two kinds of 8-9, 14
pratibimbakalpa (also, 'tulya' and 'var'; mirror-image-like transformation) 24, 25ff and Hindustani music 30-31; and *saṁvāda* (see also, 'saṁvāda') 23ff; sub-species of 28-29
 Pratr̥da Bhalla (a *sāma*-singer) 47
pravṛtti (a concept in Bharata); and *vṛtti* 111fn
prayoga ii-iii, 94, 311; and *nāṭya* 94, 111, 113, 117fn; vis-à-vis *śāstra* (see also, 'śāstra') ii-iii
prayokṛ (the director of a play) 111fn, 114

Premnath (an actor) 149
Puṇḍalika (a Hindi film) 126
 Puṇḍarīka Viṭṭhala 324ff
Puṇḍarikamālā 325fn
Purāna 49fn, 65, 124, 175, 177ff, 223, 229, 231fn, 232, 245, 246
Pūriyā (a *rāga*); *tappā* in 34
puruṣārtha ii, iii, 328
pūrvaraṅga 98, 105, 115
Pyāri Behnā (a Hindi film) 155
 Pythagoras iii, 267, 291, 307, 309, 310, 311, 327-328, 333

qawwālī 30

rāga 62, 104, 206, 207, 219, 230fn, 232, 258; and association with time 11-12, 44-45, 163-173, 236, 240; and *jātis* (see also, 'jātī') 66-67, 305, 307; and seasonal affinities 44, 166-167; and style 33ff, 61; and words 51ff; as deity 13, 181ff; auspicious quality of 169ff; compositions in (see also 'bandish', 'chiz') 60-61; description of 32, 87-88; *dhyāna* 12-13, 174ff, 236fn; 87ff form of 164ff; formulas in 88; hierarchy of *svaras* in 283-284; improvisation in (see also, 'improvisation') 87-91; its logos 307-305; *lakṣaṇa* 314ff; miraculous effects of 12-13; paintings 12, 174ff, 236-237; purity of 55-56, 59-60, 67-68; reproduction of 32; theorising about 70
rāga-dhyāna; and *rāga-mālā* painting (see also 'rāga-mālā') 174ff
rāga-mālā; and *nāyikā-bheda* 184; paintings 174-185, 237; texts 13, 174ff
Rāgamālā (of Puṇḍarīka Viṭṭhala) 324ff

- Rāgamālā Painting* 174ff, 183
Rāgasāgara 174ff
 Raghavan, V. 189fn
Raghuvaṁśa (see also, 'Kālidāsa') 187
Rājā Hariścandra (a Hindi film) 126
Rājaprasnīyam 201
 Rajasekhara 27, 28, 29; his concept of creativity in poetry 16, 24ff; his transformational categories and music 31ff; on plagiarism 24ff
 Ramakrishna Kavi 77, 175-176fn
 Rāmāmāya 167
Rāmāyaṇa (of Vālmīki) 23, 124, 187, 196
 Rāṇā Kumbha 176, 205fn, 219ff
 Randhir Kapoor (an actor) 156, 158
 Ranjit (an actor) 149
rasa 22, 45, 57, 104, 111, 113, 114, 139, 150, 155, 162, 273 274, 278; and *bhāva* 118; and history 119ff; and theatre 21ff, 95ff; and *vṛtti* 113ff as a *bhāva* in *āyurveda* 250-251; extended beyond theatre 18ff, 93; how aroused in *kāvya* 20ff; theory of, and music 13-14, 89
Rasikapriyā (see also, 'Rāṇā Kumbha') 63, 219ff
Ratnāvali; an ancient performance of 133fn, 145ff, 148
Ravindra Saṅgita (see also, 'Tagore; songs'); transmission of 29
rcas (see also, 'rk') 46
 realism; and Hindi films 125ff, 150ff, 159ff
 realms; affinity between (see also 'affinity') 119ff
 reciprocal; functioning, concept of 42ff
 replication (see also, 'reproduction'); and transformation 30ff; in music 30, 31, 32
 reproduction (see also, 'replication') 30fn
Republic (see also, 'Plato') 270
Rgveda (see also, 'rk') 43
rk 43, 286ff, 295fn; vis-à-vis *sāma* 286ff
 Roman 2, 60
Roopa-Lekha 192fn
 Roy, Ames 125fn
ṛṣi(s) 279ff
Ṛṣibhāṣita 228
ṛta 43ff, 279
 Rudradāman; as a musician 187

Śabdaratna 292fn
 Sachs, Curt 192fn
Sacred Books of The East 270fn, 271ff
 Sadāraṅg 59, 215fn
Sadrāgacandhodaya 324ff
sahṛdaya (see also, 'critic', 'criticism') 7, 8, 14, 20, 23, 56, 72, 281
 Saira Bano (an actress) 149
 Śaivism 49, 70
Śakuntalam (see also, 'Kālidāsa') 113
sāma (see also, 'music, Vedic') 42, 43, 49, 101, 308; and mystic attainment 45ff, 285ff and the *kuṇḍalini* 259; and the syllable 'Om' 45; *anirukta* 301-302fn; *anṛca* 45ff, 286ff; as revealed music 46, 285ff; as *upāsana* 46ff, 286ff; *aśarira* 46ff, 286ff; attitude to, Vedic 45ff, 64, 67, 285ff; independence of 286; its parts and cosmic identities 44-45; literature concerning 285ff; meaningless syllables in (see also, '*aśarira*', '*anṛca*', '*anirukta*') 46-47; notation in (see also, 'notation') 284fn; *vikāras* 52, 295ff; vis-à-vis *rk* 286ff

- Sāmaveda* (see also, 'sāma') 42, 295ff; notation in 316; singers of iii, 286ff
Saṁhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa 302fn
sampradāya iv, 66, 182
 Samudragupta; as a musician 186ff, 190, 193, 199, 202, 204
saṁvāda (harmony between *svaras*) 291, 332
saṁvāda (resemblance between poems) 23; kinds of 23ff
saṁvādi 311ff
saṅgat 110fn
saṅgita (see also, 'music'): ii-iii, 67ff, 247ff, 261, 272, 283-284, 291fn, 307ff 332ff, 337; texts (see also, 'music, texts') 174ff, 212-213, 217, 218, 223ff; the defence of 49fn
Saṅgita Cintāmaṇi 65
Saṅgita Cūdāmaṇi 170, 176fn
Saṅgita Darpaṇa 172
Saṅgita Evaṁ Cintan 66fn, 72fn, 87fn
saṅgitaka 52
Saṅgita-makaranda 180
Saṅgitapārijāta (see also, 'Ahobala') 330fn
Saṅgitarāja (see also, 'Rāṇā Kumbha') 63, 176; and the *Gitagovinda* 220ff
Saṅgita-ratnākara (see also, 'Śārṅgadeva') 62-63, 65, 86, 119, 171ff, 175-176, 193fn, 206fn, 207, 237fn, 238fn
Saṅgita-ratnākara of Śārṅgadeva, Text And English Translation 248fn
Saṅgita-samaya-sāra (see also 'Pārśvadeva') 65, 171, 175, 176fn
Saṅgitopaniṣad (see also, 'Sudhākalaśa') 175
Saṅgitopaniṣadsāroddhāra (see also, 'Sudhākalaśa') 174ff, 236fn; and the *Thāṇaṅga Sūtra* 239fn
saṅgraha (see 'Bharata')
 Sanjiv Kumar (an actor) 155-156
saṅkalpa; and the body 252ff
 Śankara Mīśra 219fn
 Sāṅkhyan; *gunas* 252
 Sanskrit 218, 228, 286; poetic tradition 16ff, 31, 205ff; poetry, anthologies of 10; Vedic, and *svara* 292
 Sarabhai Nawab 174
 Sarahapāda 207
sargam (see also, '*svara*, as a limb of *prabandha*'); singing of 216, 222
śarira-viṇā (see also, 'viṇā') 261-262
 Sarma, K.V. 189fn
 Śārṅgadeva (see also, '*Saṅgita-ratnākara*') 175-176, 193fn, 206fn, 207, 217, 235, 238, 313fn and *rāga*-time association 171ff; and the concept of *sthāya* 36ff; on body as an instrument 247-263; on composers (*vāggeyakāras*) 28fn; on the process of sound production 247ff
śāstra (see also, '*śāstric*') ii-iii, 69ff, 119-120, 217, 247ff, 307ff, 332ff; and structure in relation to the *Nāṭyaśāstra* 92-122; as revelation 256ff; its relation to *prayoga* ii-iii, 69ff, 114, 256ff, 262-263; of speech 99ff
śāstrakāra 73, 80
śāstric 217; activity 69ff, 74; impulse; iii
śāstriya (see also, 'classical'); as a transformational form of music 31
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 225fn
Satyānarayana, R. 325fn
 Satyavrata Sāmaśramī Bhaṭṭācārya 296ff

Sāyana 233, 302fn
 scale (see also, 'thā', 'svara-
 maṇḍala') 32
 Schroeder 215
 sculptor(s) 4, 16
 Sekasubhodaya 214
 self; body as 249ff
 Shammi Kapoor (an actor) 156-157,
 158
 Sharābi (a Hindi film) 158
 Sharma, Prem Lata 34fn, 248, 260fn
 Shashi Kapoor (an actor) 154-155,
 158
 Shelley 242
 Shiki 268fn
 Shorī Miyān (a composer) 35
 Shringy, R.K. 248
 Śikṣā 64; as *sāstra* of speech
 (phonetics) 99ff, 245-246, 260ff
 Śilalin 70
 śilpa 98
 Sīmhābhūpāla 215fn, 216
 singer(s) (see also, 'musicians');
 classical 51ff; women as; 228-
 229, 244-245
 sīrā (see, 'artery')
 Skandagupta 191
 Slaje, Walter 336
 Smita Patil (an actress) 158
 Smṛti(s) 49; Yājñavalkya 49fn
 society; and music 34-35
 Somadeva 195fn
 Someśvara (see also, 'Mānasollāsa')
 170-171, 208ff, 217
 song (see also, 'music'); and Hindi
 films 123ff, 150ff; and speech
 101; in *Thānaṅga Sūtra* 226ff;
viṇā accompaniment to 193ff;
 virtuous, in Confucius (see also,
 'Confucius') 279ff
 soul; as embodied 247ff
 speech (see also, 'pāṭhya'); and
 music 101; in theatre 99ff, 133,
 289; vis-à-vis *svara* 289ff

Śrī (a *rāga*); 12 occult effect of 10
śruti 263; *jāti* 329ff; vis-à-vis *svara*
 320ff
 Staal Frits 301-302fn
sthāna ('position' in dance) 68, 76,
 79-80, 83-84, 86
sthāna (position of *svara*) 100-101,
 200fn, 224, 228, 230, 232ff,
 261-262, 320ff, 333
sthānaka (see, 'sthāna' in dance)
sthāya; and *karāṇa* (see also,
 'karāṇa') 37-38; as a unit of
 musical style 36ff; concept of,
 and *mātrkā* (see also, 'mātrkā')
 37-38
stobha 298ff; *sāma* (see also 'sāma')
 299ff
stobhākṣaras (see also, 'stobha') 51
 story (see, 'narrative')
 structure; of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* 92-122
Studies In The Upapurāṇas 179
 style 11, 117; as transformation 32ff,
 88ff; cultural 75; in music 11,
 32ff, 59, 88ff; structural basis of
 (see also, 'sthāya') 32ff, 35ff
 Sudhākalaśa (see also,
 'Saṅgītopaniṣadsāroddhāra')
 174ff, 236fn, 239fn
 Śūdraka; as a *sahṛdaya* of music 10-
 11, 197-198
Sujātā (a Hindi film) 143
 Surpuria, Amolak Chandra 223fn
śuskākṣara (see also, 'nonsense') 51
 Suśruta 256
sūt 38
svara 177ff, 272, 301, 303; and
 speech 99ff, 289ff and *śruti*
 320ff; as a limb of *prabandha*
 216, 222; *āśraya* of 288ff; in
 Confucius 283-284; its correla-
 tion with colour etc. 234ff;
lakṣaṇa 244, 326ff; *maṇḍala*
 229, 308ff, 320, 327, 329, 330;
 production, physiology of

233-234, 247ff; *sādhāraṇa*
 320ff; the logos of 270ff; vis-à-
 vis *pada* (words) and *tāla* (see
 also, 'music' and words') 102ff
Svaramela-kalānidhi 167
svaroṭpatti (the process of *svara*-
 production) 247ff
svayambhū; *svara* as 327
svikarāṇa (creative assimilation) 25
Swami Prajñānānda (see,
 'Prajñānānda, Swami')
Śyāma-kalyāṇa (a *rāga*); representa-
 tion of 183
Śyāmilaka 198, 199
 syllables (see also, 'music, meaning-
 less syllables in') 290ff; as
āśraya of music 288ff; nonsense
 (see also, 'nonsense') 51ff, 102;
 of Sanskrit speech 233-234,
 257fn
 system; combining multiple struc-
 tures 96, 92-122
 Sze-hsia (Hentse) 271; on music
 278ff
 Szema Chi'en 268fn
 Tagore; songs (see also, 'Ravindra
 saṅgīta') 316
Tāṇḍava 69ff, 106
 Taṇḍu 106, 315; and his theory of
 dance 69-86
tānpūrā 40, 193, 203
 Tānsen 47, 62, 214
 Tāntrism; and *rāga-dhyāna*s 181ff
tappā 88, 217fn; as a style of
 rendering *ragas* 32ff
tarāṇā 51
tena (see 'tenaka')
tenaka (a limb of *prabandha*) 216,
 220, 222
Tere Mere Sapne (a Hindi film) 142,
Texts des Purāṇa sur la Théorie
Musicale 231fn
Thānaṅga Sūtra 65; music in

223-246, 336-338
thā (see also, 'scale') 32; *melakartā*
 system 40-41
The Canonical Literature of The
Jains 228fn
The Coinage of The Gupta Empire
 191fn, 192fn
The Gupta Gold Coins In The
Bayana Hoard 192fn, 202
The Hindi Padāvali of Nāmadeva
 298fn
The Music of Hindustan 166-167,
 177
The Wisdom of Confucious (see also,
 'Lin Yutang') 268fn, 269fn
 theatre (see also, 'nāṭya'); and dance
 72-73, 80ff, 105ff; and music
 101ff, 191; and *rasa* 18;
 conventions in 130ff, 151ff;
 indigenous, and Hindi film
 125ff; Pārsī 129; popular 126,
 129-130; traditional 129-130,
 151
 theatric; devices 130ff, 151ff
 theatrical; songs (see also, 'dhruvā',
 'gāna') 53
 theme 87
thumri 31, 31, 38, 88, 207, 217fn; as
 a style of rendering *rāgas* 33ff;
 its decline 34; words in 53, 294
Thumri Saṅgraha 33fn
Times Of India, The 127
 tradition 17; as modernity under-
 stands it 1-7; of film-making
 125ff; as it understands itself
 7-8
 traditional; and the modern 1ff;
 theatre 129ff, 151ff
 transformation; and replication 30,
 58ff; and *sāstrīya* music 31ff; as
 innovation 8; creative, and style
 32ff, 59; creative, and the
 concept of *yoni* 25; its role in
 creativity 16-38; kinds of, in

- poetry 20ff
transmission; of music 279ff, 319; of poetry vis-à-vis music 29
Tripura-dāha 72, 105
tulyadehitula (also 'vat'; see also, 'samvāda'); and style 35-36; as a kind of *samvāda* (resemblance) 23-24, 26 sub-species of 29
Tumburu 186
Tyāgarāj 60

Ubhayābhisārikā 198
Udāta-rāghava; music in 140
Udayana; as a musician 186-187, 188-189, 194-195
Upaniṣad(s) 305-306
Upapurāna; *Bṛhadharma* 177ff
uparañjaka 102, 104, 110, 135-136
uparañjana 135-136; concept of, and composite arts (see also, 'arts') 95ff
uparañjantiya 135-136
upāsana; *sāma* as (see also, 'sāma') 46ff, 284ff
Urdu; plays 126
ustād 59
Uttuṅodaya (a Kerala critic) 8

Vācaspati Miśra 257
vādi (svara) 310ff
Vādibha Simha Sūri 188, 198-199fn
vādyā 110
vāggeyakāra(s) (see also, 'composers') 28fn, 213-214, 218, 248
Vaiśeṣika Sūtra 291fn
Vaiṣṇavism 49, 177ff, 205
vāk-kāraṇas 116-117
Vālmiki 23, 196, 242-243
Vararuci 198
vara (syllables in speech; see also, 'syllables') 100; *mātrkā* 116; *prakarṣa* 116; 103
vartanā (in dance) 84ff

Vasanta (a *rāga*; see also, 'Basant') 91
Vasanta Vilāsa 185
Vasiṣṭha Caikitāneya; a *sāma* singer 46
vāstu-sāstra (see also, 'architecture') 335
Vasudeva Hīṇḍi 188, 198
Vātsyāyana 191
vāyu (wind); and the production of speech and *svara* 253-254, 260
Vāyu Purāna 231fn
Vedāṅga 64
Vedic 196; attitude to *sāma* 42ff, 66-67, 285ff; literature (see also, 'sāma') 64-65, 195; *mantras*, relation to *sāma* 285ff; music (see also, 'sāma') 41ff; 48-49, 64-65, 66fn, 67, 195, 285ff
Veṅṣaṁhāra; music in 141
Victoria No. 203 (a Hindi film) 149, 158-159
Vidya Sarabhai Nawab 183fn
vikāras (distortion of words); in *sāma* (see also, 'sāma; vikāras') 52
Vikramorvaṣyam (see also, 'Kālidasa') 133fn, 147fn
Vimānavatthu 199
viṇā; as accompaniment to song 186-204; *hasta* 319; in the human frame 261ff; *sapatatantri* 199ff; *svara-maṇḍala* as 319-320; *svayamvara*, the motif of 188, 198
Viṇā-vāsavadattam 153-154, 189, 194-195
Viṣṇudharmottara Purāna 223
vivādi (svara) 310ff
Vohra, M.P. 180fn
vrātya(s) 45
Vṛddhakaśyapa 322ff
vṛtti; and history 119ff; concept of, in Bharata 111ff, 144ff,

- 159-160; vis-à-vis *mātrkā* 116; vis-à-vis *pravṛtti* 111fn
Vyākaraṇa 64
Vyāsa Bhāṣya (on the *Yogasūtras*) 257fn
vyavahāra; and *paramārtha* in music 272-273fn
vyutpatti (grasp of tradition) 8

Waley, Arthur 269fn
Walt Disney 184
weltanschauung 48
west 30, 100, 124; and Indian critical thinking 18; criticism in the 9; its cinema and Hindi films 124ff; its peculiar relation to modernity 2ff; the theatre of 152-153
western 15, 87, 94, 128, 152

westernisation (see also, 'west') and modernity 1ff
Winternitz, Maurice 218fn
words; and music 50-53, 102ff, 220, 286ff
writer 13, 126

yajña 43, 44, 48, 67, 284
Yājñavalkya 333
Yājñavalkya Śikṣā 236
Yājñavalkya Smṛti 49fn
Yāska 64, 69
yoga 258-259, 262 music as 282
Yogasūtra 257fn
Yoki 270ff
yoni (see also, 'transformation'); of *sāma* 296ff

Zinko, Christian 336