TWO MEN AND MUSIC

Nationalism

in the

Making of an Indian

Classical Tradition

Janaki Bakhle

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2005

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press, Inc., publishes works that further
Oxford University's objective of excellence
in research, scholarship, and education.

Oxford New York
Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in
Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.
198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

www.oup.com

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Bakhle, Janaki.
Two men and music : nationalism in the making of an Indian classical tradition / Janaki Bakhle.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN-13 978-0-19-516610-1; 978-0-19-516611-8 (pbk.)
ISBN 0-19-516610-8; 0-19-516611-6 (pbk.)
1. Music—Social aspects—India. 2. Bhatkhande, Vishnu Narayan, 1860-1936. 3. Paluskar,
Vishnu Degamber, 1872–1931. I. Title.
ML338 .B23 2005
780′.954—dc22 2004020776

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

THREE

THE CONTRADICTIONS OF MUSIC'S MODERNITY

Vishnu Narayan Bhatkhande

The year was 1922. Music had been in the public eye for close to two decades. Princely states were still providing the major source of both employment and economic stability for musicians, but independent schools for teaching music had been founded in cities in all three presidencies. In Bombay Presidency, music appreciation societies in Pune, Bombay, Satara, Sangli, and elsewhere had begun conducting classes for select groups of young men and, occasionally, women, and the process by which musical education for a middle-class public would become systematic seemed under way. It was a time that an interested contemporaneous observer might have described as one of progress. And yet, no less a figure than Pandit Vishnu Narayan Bhatkhande, a renowned musicologist and scholar, wrote in a letter to a friend that he felt as if he were witnessing the impending demise of music.

The recipient of Bhatkhande's letter in 1922 was his close friend and colleague Rai Umanath Bali, a *taluqdar* from Daryabad, close to Lucknow. Rai Umanath would have read this lament: "Poor music. I really do not know what sins music has commit[t]ed. No protector comes forward to champion its cause. Nobody appreciates its great utility. People will certainly have to repent one day. The next decade will kill most of the leading artists and scholars

and by the time the people wake up there will be only fifth class musicians left to please them."[1] This premonition of loss seems extraordinary, voiced as it was by Bhatkhande, already well known by then as a protector and champion of Hindustani music.

When Bhatkhande spoke and wrote, he did so mainly about North Indian vocal music, and within that subfield of Indian music, his accomplishments were many and wide-ranging. By the second decade of the twentieth century, he had excavated and made public a large number of old manuscripts. He had collected and notated thousands of musical compositions that he had subsequently compiled in many pedagogical volumes. He was a prolific writer of historical and musicological treatises on music in Sanskrit and Marathi (his native language) and an influential theorist and historian. A few years after writing the letter to Rai Umanath Bali, the two of them collaborated with another wealthy *zamindar*, Nawab Ali, to found a college of music. Toward the end of his life, he was sought after by rulers of princely states to explain the intricacies of music, by leaders of the nationalist movement to establish departments of music in newly founded universities, and by high-ranking officials in the provincial governments to proctor examinations and evaluate teaching methods and curricula in new schools of music.

Bhatkhande's accomplishments had all been in the service of music.[2] He had spent the first two decades of the twentieth century actively involved in bringing music to the forefront of public consciousness, advocating the need to make music easily available in terms of access to both musical performances and musical learning. And yet, in 1922, his lament sounded heartfelt. Had something changed between when he began his career in music in the early years of the twentieth century and a mere two decades later? Had something gone wrong? There was a clear sense of an impending failure, alluded to in his letter, and indeed, as we shall see, his own failures were quite real. In the literature about him, biographical and historical, these failures have all but disappeared. Because of his successes Bhatkhande is considered an icon not just in the modern Indian state of Maharashtra, but also in the larger world of Hindustani music in India.

In this chapter, the focus is both on Bhatkhande's accomplishments and on what is left out of the extant literature: his disappointments, failures, and flaws. He is presented as a flawed secularist, as a failed modernist, and as an arrogant nationalist. This may seem an odd way to proceed, but a close look at his failures enables one to disentangle his tripartite understanding of music—

modern, scholastic, and secular—otherwise occluded by hagiography and dismissal. At a time when music and faith were being successfully soldered together by musicians like Pandit Paluskar, Bhatkhande insisted that music and religion be kept apart. When South Indian music was carving out for itself a unique place in Indian history in which its origins were being posited as untouched by and unlinked to North India, Bhatkhande advocated the integration of North and South Indian music. Without it, he believed, a new nation would sing not in a unified chorus but in differentiated cacophonies. In the course of his travels, he met a number of eminent musicians and scholars who spoke of Indian music's undoubted antiquity. He responded to these charlatans, as he perceived them, with disdain. For him, late-nineteenth-century music had a young, two-hundred-year genealogy, which meant that India's music, as he saw it, was fundamentally modern, not ancient, but its youth did not detract from its status as national classical music. Put another way, even though he argued that a nation, any nation, needed a system of classical music, his argument did not assume the necessity of an ancient pedigree.

Nationalism in and of itself was not Bhatkhande's sole focus, and national politics, whether Gandhi's noncooperation movement or Ambedkar's and Periyar's anti-Brahmin causes, were not his concern. His letter to Rai Umanath Bali made no mention of the noncooperation movement, Chauri-Chaura, or Gandhi's arrest in March 1922, something that had happened a few months before he penned the letter. There was no such evasion when it came to music's national future as Bhatkhande envisioned it. Music, in order to be nationalized, had to be institutionalized, centralized, and standardized. It had to be put into a national academy to which everyone could have access. But before that could happen, it needed a demonstrable and linked history, one with a text or a few key texts that explained foundational rules, theories, and performance practices. This history also required a historical point of origin, but unlike his contemporaries, Bhatkhande had no particular investment in putative ancient Vedic origins. Music's history could do as well with a foundational text from the sixteenth or seventeenth century.

This vision of a modern yet Indian music nationalized and instituted in a recognized academy never acquired quite the successful punch Bhatkhande hoped it might in independent India. Indeed, the music college that he founded began to founder almost as soon as it began. These failures are juxtaposed against the overwhelming success of his contemporary, Pandit Paluskar, about whom we shall read in the next chapter. And it is this vision that seems

particularly relevant today, when the institutionalization of national classical music, North or South Indian, appears inextricable from all that Bhatkhande questioned, such as the mutually exclusive trajectories of North and South Indian music; the uncritical worship of one's teacher, who was assumed to be a spiritual guide; the imputation of spirituality to the performance of music; and the maintenance of secrecy and suspicion, in particular, around questions related to easy access to primary sources, documents, letters, and the like.

For all that Bhatkhande maintained a radical perspective on music for his time, he is also one of Indian music's most contentious, arrogant, polemical, contradictory, troubled, and troubling characters. It may be better to view him not as a charlatan or a savior, but as a tragic figure, one who was his own worst enemy. All through his writings, there is ample evidence of elitism, prejudice, and borderline misogyny. In the pages to follow, a few of the most egregious examples of his contempt, his anti-Muslim prejudice, his Brahminic elitism, and his privileging of theory over practice as it relates to music are offered without camouflage or disavowal. Yet nothing Bhatkhande wrote or said was uncomplicated, and he constantly qualified his most troubling assertions. As a result, there is simply no way to box his life and its trajectory into simple categories or directions. Every anti-Muslim utterance, every elitist claim, and every arrogant dismissal was qualified by what remained a constant throughout his life—an obsession with textual authority. What motivated him was a modern and modernist pursuit: the search for proof, demonstrability, documentation, history, and order. His classicism was modern, his prejudices were not restricted to any one group, his elitism was qualified by a powerful desire for egalitarianism, and the austerity he demanded of musicians was amply lived by him as example.

Bhatkhande made three compelling and radical claims. First, respectfully but firmly, he rejected the authority of the Vedas. Second, he was unfailingly skeptical not just about the *Natyashastra* but also about most texts from the ancient period, settling instead on a seventeenth-century South Indian text as the only one that had any real bearing on contemporary music. Third, he believed in the concept of secular music, meaning that the performance and pedagogy of music should be rejuvenated in the modern period, untouched by a discourse of religion or spirituality. Not one of these ideas has taken hold in the world of performing arts, whether in performance or pedagogy. Sixty-odd years after Bhatkhande's death, much of classical music is suffused with sacrality, held up by the notion of the ancient *guru-shishya parampara*. The

Vedas and the *Natyashastra* are routinely assumed to hold the secrets of Indian music's performative origins. This state of affairs bears little resemblance to Bhatkhande's actual work and writings.

As befits a tragic figure, the unwitting saboteurs of Bhatkhande's dreams, desires, and vision have not been his competitors or even their students. For a man who spent his life making music visible, scholastic, and secular, the most ironic of his failures is a posthumous one, effected by his own devotees and students, who have done exactly the opposite of what he advocated. People who were acquainted with him or his students police the documents that would allow a critical history of his life to be written. Scholars are greeted with skepticism, even suspicion. The archive is closed to the public, and many students, men and women, begin their lessons by prostrating themselves at their teacher's feet and do not question why this should be so.

At the turn of the millennium, there was a music gathering in Bombay dedicated to Bhatkhande. One of the leading musicians in the city, a student of one of Bhatkhande's students, presided over the occasion. At the base of Bhatkhande's portrait, adorned by a marigold garland, stood a silver incense stand. The proceedings began with a speech about his greatness. There was deep respect for his memory at the gathering, and the atmosphere was reverential. No one made a mention of his radical claims or his prejudices, and while there were occasional questions, vigorous or polemical debate was out of the question. A leading historian and scholar of music, Ashok Ranade, spoke of a future of music in which students would be obligated to question their teachers, a future in which music teachers might perhaps learn from their students. But even he spoke of this future as something still to happen. "Yenaar aahe vel," he said in Marathi, "the time is approaching." Close to seventy years after Bhatkhande's death, it has not yet arrived. How did it happen that a vision that began with scholastics, debate, and secularism culminated in garlands and incense? To some extent, Bhatkhande has to be held accountable; in order to do that fairly, we need to begin with Bhatkhande's life, where he was born, his early years, and his education, then move with him through his musical tours, writings, institutional success, and, finally, his last days.

Vishnu Narayan Bhatkhande was born on August 10, 1860, into a Brahmin family in Bombay. His father worked for a wealthy businessman. Neither of his parents was a professional musician, yet he and his siblings were taught music; this was not unusual in a family of his class background. At the age of fifteen, he began receiving instruction in sitar and shortly thereafter began

studying Sanskrit texts on music theory, a field of inquiry that would remain with him as an obsession all through his life.[3] In 1884, he joined the Gayan Uttejak Mandali, the music appreciation society whose history was detailed in chapter 2. The Mandali exposed Bhatkhande to a rapidly expanding world of music performance and pedagogy, and for the next six years, he studied with musicians such as Shri Raojibua Belbagkar and Ustad Ali Husain, learning a huge number of compositions, both *khayal* and *dhrupad*.[4] However, music was still a sideline for him. He received his BA from Elphinstone College, Bombay in 1885. In 1887, he received his LLB from Bombay University and embarked on a brief career in criminal law. He abandoned it to turn his full attention to music after the death of his wife in 1900 and his daughter in 1903.[5]

The first thing Bhatkhande did was to embark on a series of musical research tours, the first of which was conducted in 1896 (when his wife was still alive). During this tour he traveled to the provinces of Gujarat and Kutch. In 1904 (the year after his daughter's death) Bhatkhande traveled extensively in South India. He resumed his touring in 1907 with visits to Nagpur, Hyderabad, Vijayanagar, and Calcutta, and concluded in 1908 with a tour of Allahabad, Benares, Lucknow, Agra, and Mathura.[6]

He traveled with a series of questions—one hundred of them. His major project was to search out and then write a "connected history" of music, and it began with these tours, which he believed would give him some clues to help recover some missing links. In the course of his travels, he got some clues, and had to abandon others. How he coped—ideologically, affectively, and intellectually—with what he found is a large part of this story. The ostensible reason for the tours was to visit religious sites and see the country, but Bhatkhande was less interested in those objectives than in meeting music scholars. A single-mindedness of purpose dictated his approach in each city. He refused offers of introduction to professional lawyers and businessmen, claiming that he had no desire to trade superficial comments on the weather but wanted to get on with the business of meeting scholars of music and musicians.[7] Aside from an occasional compliment to some monument, his diaries are devoted solely to his musical pursuits.

In his reliance on random interlocutors, there was an ethnographic quality to Bhatkhande's approach to his research. Mornings in new cities always began the same way. After waking up, he set out in search of scholars and patrons of music. He found them by asking people on the streets if they knew

the names of famous people who had an extensive knowledge of music. In this question alone, one can locate the success of music's move into the cultural sphere. A layperson on the street could now be approached to provide information about music and musicians. With this information, acquired at random, Bhatkhande set out to locate the residences of the people whose names he had found. Once he arrived, he used his letters of reference and introduction, bluntly stated his purpose, and set up appointments to meet and talk. If he happened to attend a music performance he considered it a serendipitous event, but his primary interest was to meet other scholars of music, not spend all his time listening to music. A curious way to write about music, one might think. But Bhatkhande was interested less in the actual performances of music than in the theory that underpinned the education of the musician.

Bhatkhande kept several diaries of his tours. The status and location of the originals is unknown. The person entrusted with them, a self-styled student of Bhatkhande's by the name of Prabhakar Chinchore, reportedly found them squirreled away in an old library, following which he kept them secret for years. Here and there the odd musician or the occasional critic was allowed a sneak peek at parts of this "authentic archive," but in general, and far more than the archive of his rival, Paluskar, Bhatkhande's materials have been kept away from the public. Prabhakar Chinchore had contracted Alzheimer's disease by the time the research for this book was conducted, so at this point, the origins of the diaries are unknown. Three of the four diaries had been copied in handwritten cursive Marathi. They could certainly have been doctored, but given the paradoxical reverence with which Bhatkhande's students treat his memory, it is likely that the master's words were simply copied word for word, a document of greatness for distribution among the believers. At any rate, they are considered authoritative, and that is itself significant even if experts agree that the copies in circulation are not in Bhatkhande's handwriting. Since these texts are considered authoritative by the cognoscenti, they have a special place in the archive of music.

In one of these diaries, Bhatkhande referred to his potential readers (*vachak*),[8] suggesting that even in a format as seemingly private as a diary, he was writing for a future audience, not just noting down personal memories for family members alone. The diaries were not merely accounts of his travels, but also the blueprints for his future writings. Along with recollections of the day, he worked out both musicological minutiae and the narratological style

he would adopt in his more formal texts—in particular, in the five-volume *Hindustani Sangeet Padhati*. People he talked to in his travels reappear as figures in his formal texts. He kept notes for himself and wrote parenthetical comments that draw the reader into a private exchange regarding his interlocutors.

Bhatkhande did not interview the people he met so much as he interrogated them, seeking out what he judged to be their ignorance. He always began with deference and compliments and then moved on to gentle questioning, which became increasingly aggressive. The interview culminated with him having maneuvered his interviewee into a situation where the only possible response to a technical question was to confess ignorance. In all these encounters, Bhatkhande met only men. He had little regard for women musicians and did not believe he could learn anything from them. This was not because they were women but because, given the condition of music at the time, women were less likely than men to have access to the kind of information he believed would set music free.

Bhatkhande used this barrage of questions even with well-known authors of texts on music. While the diaries provide evidence of an extraordinary intellect focused on a singular project, they also point to Bhatkhande's high opinion of his own scholarship. Somewhere in the middle of an interview with a music scholar, he would ask, "Do you read Sanskrit?" Shortly thereafter, the questions would take on a patronizing tone: "Are you sure you understand Sanskrit?" He would ask it again. "Are you sure you have understood what you've read? Because I don't think you have." Invariably, his interviewee, a musician, would confess ignorance of Sanskrit. Confession, however, was not enough. Bhatkhande would often confirm his diagnosis. "So, you don't understand Sanskrit, cannot sing any of the ragas in the *grantha*s you claim to have read, and have not understood the *grantha*s themselves?"[9] Bhatkhande then corrected his interviewee, set his knowledge of Sanskrit straight, and even offered to sing parts of music that were written about in the *Sangit Ratnakara*,[10] the text about which he had just received the confession of ignorance from his browbeaten subject.[11]

In this attempt to expose the lack of textual and theoretical understanding of music, he questioned not only scholars and patrons, but musicians as well. He asked them the same questions over and again. "On what authoritative text or source (*adhaar*) do you rely for your musical knowledge and performance? Which books have you read in music? Which texts were you told about

by your teacher? Have you ever seen those texts? Can you show them to me?" Their response was usually that they had not read anything, had never seen these texts, and had received instruction without asking their teachers all the questions Bhatkhande believed were vital to their education. A tradition (*parampara*) was in place, and they had abided by it. He reported such encounters with no apparent awareness that his techniques might not have been greeted with warmth. Instead, Bhatkhande wrote that his efforts to reeducate people had met with great appreciation![12] On occasion, he apologized for his forthrightness but qualified this with the suggestion that since both he and his interlocutor were engaged in the same noble pursuit—the search for the foundations of music—he hoped no offense would be taken. From the hostility he generated, it is clear that offense was taken and offered in equal measure. Bhatkhande was not popular among musicians or among other scholars, who found him arrogant and aggressive.[13]

In the course of the musical tours described in his diaries, Bhatkhande met many people—scholars, musicians, and others. This chapter will deal with three exemplary conversations: with Sri Subbarama Dikshitar, a well-known authority on South Indian (Carnatic) music in Etaiyapuram in Tinnevelly District; with Raja Sourendro Mohun Tagore, a well-known authority on North Indian (Hindustani) classical music in Calcutta; and with Karamatullah Khan, a sarod player in Allahabad. These conversations reveal a bit about Bhatkhande's personality, opinions, aspirations, and desires. They also point to a sense of disquietude, an ambivalence that would not go away.

On December 17, 1904, in Etaiyapuram, Bhatkhande met Sri Subbarama Dikshitar (1839–1906).[14] Dikshitar was the author of *Sangeeta Sampradaya Pradarshini* (one of the first notated compilations of Carnatic music compositions, published in 1904) and, at the time, one of the most celebrated of Carnatic music scholars. Initially Dikshitar was reported by Bhatkhande as akin to an "ancient sage whose face shone with wisdom" and whose knowledge of music equaled his own.[15] Bhatkhande's narrative begins with Dikshitar as a humble but learned man who acknowledged at the outset that he was not familiar with Sanskrit per se even though he had a great many couplets (*shloka*s) from the *Sangit Ratnakara* memorized. This is, by itself, a curious comment, since the Dikshitar family was well known for its proficiency in Sanskrit. So what Bhatkhande presented as honesty on Dikshitar's part could well have been simple modesty. Dikshitar answered, if not always to Bhatkhande's satisfaction, his questions about the use of the chromatic scale

in Carnatic music, the use of only twelve microtones (*shruti*s) as opposed to the twenty-two in the original text, and the genesis of the seventy-two *melakarta*s. He also agreed to procure for Bhatkhande what would have been for him a priceless gift, a copy of a seventeenth-century text, Venkatamakhi's *Chaturdandi Prakashika* (c. 1660). Dikshitar claimed that it was a more recent and authoritative source for Carnatic music's orderliness than the *Sangit Ratnakara* and offered to explain it to Bhatkhande.

By the end of the conversation, Bhatkhande remained unimpressed by the singers of Carnatic music, but awed by its impeccable system. Here one can get a preliminary glimpse into his agenda: he had begun formulating what would become his own system of Hindustani music.[16] But systematizing music was a far easier task than finding a "connected *itihaas* (history)." This kept eluding him. Instead of connections, he got fragments and inconclusive answers. He wanted material links between texts and current musical practices, but few existed. He maintained the hope that someone (else) would investigate the links between the fixed scale in Vedic chants and current music, yet it was not an interesting intellectual quest for him or the sole focus of his search. Had he been so invested, he might have prejudged the music differently and moved on. Instead, he heaped scorn on most assertions that contemporary music could be traced back in a straight line to the Vedas. He returned to his search many times and asserted that music was an ever-changing art. And in one of his most radical assertions, Bhatkhande stated that music as it was then performed had a history going back only two hundred years, not two thousand. Therefore, and because it changed constantly, music had to be viewed as a modern form. This assertion won him no friends among his music contemporaries, many of whom were equally concerned with emphasizing that music was, by definition, timeless and eternal, yet derivative of the Vedas. What Bhatkhande was searching for was textual authority, one or two Sanskrit texts that could serve as benchmarks for contemporary musical performances. For him, these texts would enable the writing of a history of change, not a history of stasis or of civilizational continuity. But even with Sanskrit texts, in particular the one he was most taken with, Sharangdeva's *Sangit Ratnakara*, he could not in the end make them fit the bill as the urtext; neither could any other scholar.

These were not his only problems. He wanted to establish a link between the *Sangit Ratnakara* and Carnatic music so that he could use it to bridge the gap between the *Sangit Ratnakara* and North Indian music. He had hoped

that "with the help of this music I can identify where the missing links are between an earlier music and contemporary music."[17] He believed that the *Sangit Ratnakara* was the closest textual source for North Indian music performances, but if now, as Dikshitar had told him, the *Chaturdandi Prakashika* was more relevant than the *Sangit Ratnakara*, the historical time frame he was working with was closing, approaching the seventeenth century as a starting point rather than the thirteenth. This should have made his historical project easier, and his conversation with Dikshitar may have been the reason he would assert in his writings that contemporary "classical" music had a two-hundred- rather than a two-thousand-year history. While he acknowledged that the sources exercised a "veto power" over his desire for a connected history, he never fully let go of this ideal.

But if texts were disappointing, Bhatkhande also had no real aesthetic appreciation for Carnatic music:

> In the South, the emphasis on tala [meter] has diminished the wonder of melody . . . all singing here is bound to each beat of the tala. There is a jerk per *maatra* [beat] and this "yaiyy yaiyy" style of singing—if they sing like this then I will in all honesty rate their style quite low. If you calculate the number of beats between two *aavartan*s [cyles] and if you emphasize through jerks each beat while waiting for the next one and then pounce on it like a hungry cat, I am afraid I cannot find such music appealing. . . . This is my prejudiced opinion, and singers here will not be happy with it nor do I expect them to be. . . . They will say their music is popular, but popular music is not necessarily good music.[18]

He turned to Carnatic music mainly for its formulas and order.[19] His desire to establish a Sanskritic base for Carnatic music was propelled by an instrumental purpose. If such a base could be established that met with his scholastic approval, he intended to use it to systematize North Indian music. His criticism of Carnatic music was balanced by his dislike for the arbitrariness and lack of order in North Indian music, where tradition and performance dictated the rules of music rather than the other way around. His desire to know the intricacies of Carnatic music was governed by a drive to affix a system of similar rules (*niyam*) that would be understood by all practitioners, students, and connoisseurs of North Indian music.

The most important result of his conversation and meeting with Sub-

barama Dikshitar was the idea that Venkatmakhi's *Chaturdandi Prakashika* might be useful in restoring order to the current disordered state in Hindustani music. Here one also sees his desire to have "throughout the country one style of music." Some years later, in 1916, at the first All-India Music Conference held in Baroda, he would voice a hope that if both systems of music could be integrated, the nation would sing in one voice. The imperative was a unifying one, and he saw his task as fraught but necessary. "My efforts will initially meet with great disapproval, but after an age the road I have chosen will appeal to succeeding generations, in particular an educated society, this is my hope . . . God has chosen to relieve me of my householder responsibilities, perhaps in one sense this is the reward for that pain."[20] However, before such nationwide systematization could happen, one major hurdle needed to be overcome: "First the rules of ragas have to be fixed once and for all just as they are here."[21]

Following his southern tour, Bhatkhande went to Calcutta in November 1907. If Etaiyapuram had cost him one link but given him another, Calcutta, by way of his conversations with its residents, gave him confirmation of his credentials. For many years, Bhatkhande had admired Raja S. M. Tagore (1840–1914). Tagore was not only a wealthy *zamindar* but also a notable authority on Hindustani music. He had authored, edited, and published several books on the subject.[22] Trained in music at an early age, he received instruction from famous musicians such as Kshetra Mohan Goswami and Sajjad Hussain. Bhatkhande was eager to meet Tagore and narrated his meeting with warmth, directing his readers to Tagore's generosity, dignity, and knowledge. He noted how quickly he had established a sympathetic friendship, finding in Tagore's views on music and history confirmation of many of his own. It was, as one reads from his other narrated conversations, the only worthwhile meeting for him in Calcutta. Tagore even arranged for Bhatkhande to receive copies of several old treatises on music.

Most of his other conversations in Calcutta had been frustrating mainly because he reported that people he met asserted far too easily and without proof that all Indian music was divine since it hailed from the Sama Veda or the Atharva Veda (1000–800 B.C.). They also invariably claimed knowledge not just of Sanskrit but also of Western classical music. Bhatkhande narrated these declamatory conversations with barely concealed exasperation. The figure of the pedantic pandit was one he would use in his writings as a key symbol of what he called *nirupyogi panditya.* And it was in Calcutta that he would

come to the sense that it was vitally important to keep music separate from both religion and politics, the latter understood as high-level governmental negotiation and conflict. Perhaps this is why, despite the nationalist tumult around him, his diaries bear no mention of Gandhi, Nehru, Jinnah, or Ambedkar, and it is only in the occasional personal letter that he lets slip a comment that reveals any knowledge of or interest in the political happenings of the time. His sense of the need for an unsacralized music can be seen from his account of a conversation with Raja S. M. Tagore's brother, Gaurihar Tagore, in which Bhatkhande had responded to a question with this answer: "Yes (I am), indeed a Brahmin," and "it is not that I don't have faith in God," but "I consider faith and music to be separate subjects. I believe that in the twentieth century they should stay separate. If that is not done, it will amount to a disrespect for music."[23]

Bhatkhande shows here his acute sense of history. It is "in this century" that music needs to be kept away from faith. By itself, the demand does not seem unusual, except when compared to the wishes of his contemporary, Pandit Paluskar, for whom the crisis of contemporary music was resolved by fusing faith and religiosity with the performance and pedagogy of music in the belief that this fusion was the essential element that set Indian music apart from the West. By contrast, Bhatkhande's critique of music seems distanced from any deep engagement with the nature or capabilities of Western music. Bhatkhande had no interest in showing that Indian music and musicians could do all their Western counterparts were capable of, such as assembling bands and orchestras. Indeed, he not only had no knowledge of Western classical music, he had very little interest in it, and as a model for Indian music, the only aspect of it that was relevant was the bar system, which he used to notate meter. But even there, the only accomplishment of that borrowing was to divide tala into compartments. As such, we get no sense from his work that he was in competition with the West, and his sense of urgency was propelled by a local and located unease about the current practices of musicians, which, in turn, lent heft to his belief that without his intervention, the future of music would falter. When he looked for models either to oppose or mimic, he looked to North and South Indian music. His sense of order came from South Indian music and his sense of aesthetics from North Indian music. Indian music, by definition, could be systematic, old without being ancient, and unlinked to faith without sacrificing its native quality.

Although Bhatkandhe's conversation with Gaurihar Tagore was useful as a

way of expressing his secularism, it was not as directed as his dialogue with S. M. Tagore. There he brought up the question of his elusive connected history. From the beginning of the conversation, the question of an adequate history plagued him. "Is it even going to be possible to write a history of our music?" he asked him. "If it is possible, how should it be written? Where does one start? Where and how can one establish a reliable chronology? In Akbar's time, Tansen was famous, but he has left behind no written record."[24] Even if history does not march forward in a straight line, where music was concerned, it had taken too many undocumented detours. Tagore was the only figure in Bhatkhande's diaries who escaped being damned by faint praise or caustic criticism, because Bhatkhande was able to have a scholarly conversation with him about textual sources. Even though Bhatkhande would go on to write that Tagore's written works were themselves scholastically weak, he recollected his meeting and conversations with him with unqualified pleasure, gratitude, and regard.

In Allahabad, on the last leg of his tour, Karamatullah Khan, a sarod player from Allahabad, presented Bhatkhande with one alternative to his imagined connected history. Bhatkhande was unreceptive. He had a deep-seated suspicion of musicians as a group, but he had also reasoned that a textual foundation was essential to the writing of his history. He could not accept that musicians were the living archive of music's theoretical history, even if they were his resource for its performative history. Karamatullah Khan had come to meet Bhatkhande, having heard about him as the great intellectual of musical history. He had written his own small work on music and wished to talk to Bhatkhande because he admired him. In the course of the conversation, he raised the possibility of a different way to understand music's past and Bhatkhande bridled in response. Bhatkhande already believed that musicians would resist his attempts to order Hindustani music, and the reason for that would emerge as a refrain in subsequent works, namely, that "this work is very difficult and because our music is in Muslim hands it has become even more difficult. Those people are for the most part ignorant and obstinate and will not like new rules imposed on them, this is my experience."[25] It is not clear whether he meant musicians as a group or Muslim musicians in particular, but at any rate, he was skeptical even before the conversation commenced.

By way of introduction to this conversation, Bhatkhande wrote, "By and large, I don't like discussing music with professional musicians. They know

little but like to fight a lot. They spend a little time with us, learn just a little from us, and then say they have known this all along. They claim our knowledge is only bookish, not useful for skillful practitioners. I suppose one should just accept that they are the ones who are virtuous, skilled, can play instruments and sing, and so we should just acknowledge what they say as the truth." Not an auspicious beginning, it would be fair to say. But perhaps what was emerging was also a process of demystification, a sense that one could treat a practitioner as someone with whom a reasoned conversation about music was at least conceivable. The comment also addressed the divide between a history and theory of music, on the one hand, and its practice, on the other. This divide was one that Bhatkhande wanted not to maintain but to bridge. The conversation proceeded:

Karamatullah Khan: What have you decided about Teevra, Atiteevra, and Atikomal Swaras?

Bhatkhande: Khan Saheb, you must have addressed all of this in the book you wrote.

K: Yes, I have.

B: Which text did you use as authoritative for your work? Or did you write whatever came into your mind?

K: Of course not, how could I have written without textual authority?

B: Tell me the name of one Sanskrit text if you can, please, so that we can then talk about that text.

K: What is the need for a Sanskrit text? Why only Sanskrit? It is not as if there are not many other texts. I have thought carefully about a lot of them before writing my own.

B: Were those texts in Sanskrit or Prakrit?

K: No, what is wrong with reading in Arabic and Persian, there are no lack of texts there. There is one beautiful text after the next on music in these languages. Music as an art was not confined solely to Hindustan. Arabia, Iran, these countries too had music. They too had ragas and raginis, their children and wives, such compositions can be seen for example in "Arabi" raga, I worked through the 52 notes given and came up with our "Bhairavi" or our "maakas" is the same as your Sanskrit "Malkauns." I studied all of this and then wrote my book and I will give you a copy. (He does this immediately.)

B: Khansaheb, are you claiming that your Musalman Pandits translated our Sanskrit texts and then *took* them to their respective countries?

K: No. Not at all. Nothing like it. Music belongs to all countries. I went to the Paris Exhibition and heard music from all over the world. I talked at length to various scholars of music there and then came back and wrote my book.

B: I do not completely follow your meaning, perhaps. Are you possibly claiming that scholars from Arabia and Iran *took* their music from our country's ragas?

K: No, not at all. I am saying those countries had ragas/music right from the beginning. Whether they *took* it from here or Hindus *took* it from there, who is to decide? Perhaps the concept of ragas traveled from there to here. It is possible.

[Bhatkhande noted to himself, "This answer in particular made me a little angry. Ragas from *our* books are turned inside out, twisted around in *their* books, yet we have apparently stolen music from them, this is what this Khansaheb is declaring." (Emphasis mine.)]

B: Khansaheb, which is this book, can you tell me its name and year? Was it *Sarmaay Ashrat*? [sic]

K: No, No. That is not the book I mean, that is a recent book. I am talking about books going back hundreds even thousands of years back, one of which is Tohfat-ul-Hind, a very important work.[26]

Bhatkhande broke off the conversation here, writing: "Forget it. There is no point in arguing with this Khansaheb."[27]

The arrogance is unmistakable in this conversation, as is Bhatkhande's hostility. What we are given in this account is a judgment on a musician followed by a conversation that confirms the indictment. The question of theft is central, going to the heart of Bhatkhande's project: What are the origins of Indian music? The immediate impression this conversation conveys is that of an expansive musician in conversation with an arrogant, prejudiced, and irate pedant. Moreover, it appears that Bhatkhande was simply lapsing into elite Hindu prejudice against "low-class" Muslims and rejecting an alternative history simply because it had been suggested to him by a Muslim musician. We can concede that Bhatkhande's prejudice is buttressed by his arrogance; what we also see in this conversation is his exasperation, once again, with throw-

away historical claims made by musicians. Bhatkhande calls off the conversation when Karamatullah Khan refers to a text dating back thousands of years. He had responded similarly in Calcutta with people who cited the Vedas as references. There is no question that Bhatkhande had in place a conception of "our" music, which is Indian, of Hindu origin, to which Arabic or Persian could have contributed, but for which a Sanskrit text might be decisive. Yet, had he simply prejudged the question of history as either Hindu or Muslim, he would have stopped with this interview and gone no further in his inquiry. And in the course of his years-long inquiry, his exclusion of performers as informants was not carried out exclusively on the ground of caste or religion or gender per se, but as a result of his obsession with scholasticism and the creation of a modernized, national, cultural institution. This does not, needless to say, preclude a hybrid origin for Indian music, so one is left with the question: Why could he not conceive of one?

Karamatullah Khan was in effect stating that it did not matter whether ragas had come from Iran or Arabia to India or the other way around, or what the origins of raga were—music belonged to all countries and people. This was quite a remarkable argument, open-ended and flexible, but it was not precise. Had Bhatkhande accepted it, it would have necessitated closing the inquiry into origins, but much more important, it would have meant that it did not matter whether or not music was, or could be, demonstrably classical. From the vantage point of the late twentieth century, Karamatullah Khan was voicing a prescient and progressive claim against national, ethnic, and religious essentialism when it came to music. But Bhatkhande was looking for a "classical" music that existed in his time, not one that used to exist in ancient times. References to "thousands of years ago" were routinely met with characteristic irritation. The confusion and ignorance of musicians bothered him, because if they were singing a "classical" music, there was no consensus among them about the sign or the proof of the classical. There were no agreed-upon texts or authorities, and every musician was free to cite and interpret the "tradition" exactly as he chose. Moreover, there was no agreement even as to which were the basic or foundational ragas. One of the frequent criticisms leveled at Bhatkhande was that he did not know the basics of ragas—Abdul Karim Khan, for instance, dismissed him as an ignorant pedant, as we shall see in chapter 6. What bothered Bhatkhande was not simply the question of nomenclature, but also the issue of standardization. Having conducted the research, he bridled when a practitioner of the art told

him his history was too limited and exclusionary and usually turned away when told he did not know the basics. This is why even the wonderful fluidity of music's origins as suggested by Karamatullah Khan had to be rejected. The suggestion that it did not matter where ragas came from or whether they were demonstrably Persian or Arabic was not something Bhatkhande could accept, whether it was suggested to him by a Hindu musician or a Muslim one.

Bhatkhande was not unique among late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century nationalists in caring deeply about a classical and pure past. Once the origins of music had been decided by Bhatkhande, its future could be pulled out of the contemporary morass of sectarian divides and familial jealousies. All nations ought to have a system of classical music. He would have accepted that there was a certain measure of give and take between different classical music systems. He would perhaps even have agreed that there was, or ought to be, a Persian classical music. What he could not accept was that the foundation or system of Indian music was uncertain. Bhatkhande had rejected the claims that music could be traced back to the Vedas and that the *Sangit Ratnakara* was authoritative. He had stated that the *Natyashastra* was not useful for the study of raga-based music. Given all this, it would be hasty to conclude that anti-Muslim prejudice alone governed his course of study. Yet, as we have seen, he could not accept that contemporary music had a non-Hindu or non-Sanskrit origin.

While this combination of sentiments locates Bhatkhande squarely as a Hindu nationalist, it does not, by definition, make his vision for music exclusionary. The question of origins related to history, not to contemporary or future practice. While music needed a clear and precise historical trajectory, the future of music was not closed but open, available, and accessible to all. This is precisely where we see a difference between him and other musicians such as Paluskar. Even when he precluded a non-Hindu origin for music, he had no desire to turn contemporary musical performance and pedagogy into something recognizably Hindu. Paluskar assumed that music was Hindu in the past and Hindu in the future. Bhatkhande had no investment in a Hindu music as it was defined for him, whether in Pune, Calcutta, or Tanjore, but was interested in a national music. For all his prejudice, then, his judgment against musicians was not based on religion alone or on the sense that Muslims were foreign to India, but on the grounds of documentation, demonstrability, and a sense of secular nationalism.

I bring Bhatkhande's travels to a close with one last meeting. In 1908, in Mathura, he met a Mr. Ganeshilal Chaube, who raved and ranted at Muslims for their obdurateness, thievery, and ignorance.[28] Bhatkhande suggested to the irate Mr. Chaube that Hindus should share some of the blame for having allowed their music to decline. Chaube is important here neither for his tirades against Muslims, nor for his claim that he learned music directly from the heavens. Bhatkhande describes him as similar to scholars he had met on his southern tour. Chaube and others could "rattle off various Sanskrit quotations out of context to intimidate people but it should not be surmised from this that they actually understood what they were saying."[29] The ability to recite Sanskrit by rote was not scholarship. Chaube, as well as others who made claims on behalf of "music and texts that go back thousands of years," was pilloried in caricature and as the epitome of pedantic and useless knowledge (*nirupyogi panditya*) offered by charlatan pandits.

Bhatkhande's Solution: Texts and a Connected History

By 1909, Bhatkhande had finished his tours and was ready to embark on his own writing projects. By now he was familiar with most of the major Sanskrit texts, such as Bharata's *Natyashastra* (dating from the second century B.C. to the second century A.D.), Sharangdeva's *Sangit Ratnakara* (a thirteenth-century work), through Ahobal's *Sangit Parijat* (seventeenth century). From our location in the twenty-first century, the obsession with Sanskrit texts might appear part of an early, elaborated ideological sympathy for a future *Hindutva.* Yet to see Bhatkhande's focus on Sanskrit texts as part of this ideology might not be giving him enough credit and would certainly mean ignoring a great many of his assertions. For one thing, his scholasticism would have inevitably led him to Sanskrit texts on music theory. It would not be possible to ignore Sanskrit texts even if there could be no straight line from the *Natyashastra* to the present. Crooked as the line might be, there was a corpus of texts on music written in Sanskrit, translated on occasion into Persian, such as Faqirullah's *Rag Darpan*, that could not be ignored if Bhatkhande was serious about writing a complete history. The texts could be deemed irrelevant or inaccurate, as Bhatkhande argued, but to not delve into extant treatises on music that predated those in Persian or Arabic would be unthinkable. What set Bhatkhande apart from his contemporaries in the world of music,

then and now, was a lack of investment in arguing that music's origins could be traced straight back to and through only a Sanskrit text. Nor did he quickly collapse *Sanskrit* with *Hindu* and then *India*. Bhatkhande lived in the period of an emergent nationalism, when all nations search for a hoary past to legitimize themselves, as Benedict Anderson has reminded us.[30] But Bhatkhande's search was not a simple Hindu nationalist search. He consistently emphasized that music as it was currently being played and sung belonged to a different period, one that was constitutively modern and adequately different from previous periods so that any reliance on texts such as the *Dharmashastra*s as a guide for everyday life was seen by him as romantic at best and anachronistic at worst.

Bhatkhande rejected the idea that the claim for an unbroken history of music could be sustained merely by asserting that Hindustani music could reach back into antiquity, to the Sama Veda chants, as the origins of contemporary music (*prachaarit sangit*). He also came to discover that music's relationship to texts more than two hundred years old was difficult, if not impossible, to prove. The 36,000 couplets of the so-called Gandharva Veda, supposedly composed by the god Brahma and assumed to be the first text on the arts in ancient India (the title of Veda suggests that its origins were not human but divine), were not available in transcribed manuscript form, and all knowledge of it was based solely on references to it in other Sanskrit works.[31] While he regretted not having done research on the Sama Veda, chants which were claimed to be the origins of Hindustani music,[32] he also advised his students not to believe that "our" music derived from the Sama Veda unless and until someone demonstrated how it came together with the origins of Gandharva music, as suggested by the *Natyashastra*.[33]

The *Natyashastra* had not shown itself to be of much use or relevance, and Bhatkhande summed up why this was so. "Bharat's *Natyashastra* has been recently published and become famous," he wrote, "and *shruti* [microtone], *grama* [ancient scales], *murchana* [scales sung in rapid ascending and descending order], *jaati* [possible precursor to raga]—on these subjects there is some description but not of our ragas."[34] He had concluded that *shruti*, as described in the *Natyashastra*, was not useful in determining the fixed scale of Hindustani music. He had not found adequate demonstration of the relationship between microtones and pitches in the *Natyashastra*, and in his subsequent writings he expressed sarcasm and contempt for the wasted efforts of writers on the subject.[35] In other words, music's inescapable modernity—and

its unverifiable interreferential historicity—was both apparent and, to some extent, acceptable.

Furthermore, on the subject of music's modernity, Bhatkhande expressed consternation as to why his colleagues avoided recognizing it. "If ancient music is now no longer visible, what is the harm in saying that plainly?" he wrote. "Look at the texts on music in the West, you will find nothing in there that maintains people's confusion and ignorance."[36] The issue was clarity, and there was an abundance of confusion in Sanskrit texts. Bhatkhande had asked scholars during his touring: "Do you think it is possible to revive any of the Sanskrit raga rules? If not, where will be the superiority of a scientific or theoretical musician over an ordinary illiterate, practical singer? Both would be without foundation." Furthermore, "if there is a dispute, what work is to decide? Who is to judge? Will you leave such an important point to the arbitrary tastes of ignorant musicians?"[37] If there was no consensus among musicians themselves about aesthetic standards, what was to be done? The answers he received confirmed for him that the paucity of authentic, original (*mool*) *grantha*s and the irrelevance of available ones to contemporary musical performances had produced a situation where the only possible solution was for someone to produce an authoritative text. Such a text had to be foundational, explaining both the rules and methods of current musical practices. This text could be used as a standard-bearer in the matter of adjudication of quality, as well as in the evaluation of historical change over time. "If music is conceded to be moving constantly, has not the time [arrived] when a new systematic treatise on the current ragas (including Mohammedan additions, of course) is desirable, if not indispensable, for the guidance of the public? In view of the possibility of getting the help of the best musicians, . . . attached to native courts and in view of the facilities. . . . the phonograph, don't you think it practicable? Our ancient Pandits at one time did the same, they made a good collection of ragas. Will not such a step at least arrest future degeneration and mark a stop [make a stamp]?"[38] The solution was simple. Someone needed to collect, annotate, and compile the ragas, and write an authoritative, decisive, historical, and theoretical text. Who better than Bhatkhande himself, given the time and effort he had spent in learning compositions and languages and conducting tours?

Over the course of one year, 1910, Bhatkhande composed hundreds of Sanskrit couplets in which he outlined his theory and history of Hindustani music. He named his text *Shrimallakshyasangeet* (hereafter *SLS*). He also wrote *Abhi-*

nava Raga Manjari and *Abhinava Tala Manjari*, Sanskrit treatises on raga and tala. With the authorship of these three texts, Bhatkhande wrote himself into a long line of music theorists ranging from Sharangdeva to Ahobal. Tradition was now invented with a classical yet modern genealogy. This modern genealogy, in Bhatkhande's view, was what made Indian music classical, because it had a system, a method of adjudication, order, and stability. In other words, the condition for music to be classical was that it was modern. And insofar as Bhatkhande could not simply dismiss Vedic texts or the *Natyashastra*, he did what modern historians do; he accommodated them into his narrative as texts of faded importance but not direct relevance. By doing so, he kept the concept of antiquity vital to a conception of nationalism, but he did this without falling prey to the nationalist seduction of drawing a straight line back between current music and ancient texts. The gap between theory and practice that "illiterate musicians" had fostered now had a bridge, but a self-aware and modern one. By 1928, at the age of sixty-eight, he had written eighteen musicological works—compilations, textbooks, treatises, and booklets. In none of them is there an uncritical celebration of India's ancient wisdom, or of the Vedas as the source of all knowledge for music.

Bhatkhande's Major Works: Sanskrit and Marathi, Hindustani Sangeet Padhati

Bhatkhande wrote initially in Sanskrit, which had prestige but limited accessibility. Given his project, this may seem curious, because his interests were democratic and egalitarian, but it is understandable. A modern national classical music needed a classical language. Furthermore, there was a scholarly precedent for him in Sir William Jones's evaluation of Indo-Persian musicological treatises, many of which were translations of Sanskrit treatises. Even though both Arabic and Persian had been used as spoken and written languages far more recently than Sanskrit, Bhatkhande did not consider them adequate for a history of music.[39] They were translation languages, in his view, not authorial ones. In such an understanding, he followed an established colonial and elite pattern of prognosticating about India's future by asserting the primacy of Sanskrit, and thereby a Brahmin understanding as well, as the only authentic window into India's past without which no competent history of her future was imaginable.[40] Bhatkhande's deference to San-

skrit was not unrelated to the authority conferred on it by European Orientalist scholarship. Many scholars have written on the role of colonialism in rendering Sanskrit and the Vedas integral to an understanding of India as Indian.[41] Yet Bhatkhande's deference to Sanskrit was also tactical, strategic, and slightly cynical. B. R. Deodhar, founder of a school of music in Bombay and student of Bhatkhande's rival, Pandit Paluskar, had asked Bhatkhande about why he'd written in Sanskrit in a conversation with him. His response was candid. "People do not accept anything unless it can be backed by Sanskrit quotations . . . the only way the public can be persuaded . . . is by producing a Sanskrit book which gives the new rules."[42]

However, he also wrote a number of important texts in his mother tongue, Marathi, including four volumes of explicatory texts, which he named *Hindustani Sangeet Padhati* (hereafter *HSP*). They were published between 1910 and 1935. Of all his writings, these volumes offer the clearest glimpse into his politics. The first three were finished quickly, between 1910 and 1914.[43] The fourth volume took much longer, and although he completed it in 1929, it was published only in 1932. The conditions under which he wrote it were not perfect, as he wrote to Rai Umanath Bali, explaining the reason for his long silence: "I was busy finishing the fourth volume of my Hindusthani Sangit Paddhati (the work on the theory of music). Thank God, I have been able to finish it somehow. The noises in the head still continue but I do not worry on that account. I am trying to get accustomed to them and hope to succeed in accomplishing it."[44] The years between the publication of the first three volumes and the last one were busy ones for Bhatkhande. He had organized five music conferences, established in 1918 a school of music in Gwalior, and in 1926 cofounded the Marris College in Lucknow.

In these works, Bhatkhande wrote in colloquial (as opposed to literary) Marathi, in the form of conversations between student(s) and teacher in a music classroom. Each volume was one uninterrupted conversation. This format would have been available to him from a number of sources. His colonial education would have introduced him to Plato's Socratic dialogues. He would have known the Pune Sanskritists, at least by reputation, and might have had on hand the *shastra/prayog* distinction available from contemporary writings on the Upanishads. He would also have had a sense of *shastra* that could be translated as both science and classicism. Lastly, the dialogue format was common as well to Persian and Arabic texts, familiar to many scholars.

The main objective of these volumes was to explicate Bhatkhande's San-

skrit treatise, *Shrimallakshyasangeet* (*SLS*), and *Abhinava Raga Manjari*.[45] But there seems to have been another objective, which was to offer *SLS* as the only text that could satisfy a genuinely scholastic student. When Bhatkhande referred to *SLS* in these four volumes, which he did a great deal, he did so by naming the author as one among the writers of the canon without revealing that he was writing about himself. In other words, if one did not have advance knowledge of the fact that Bhatkhande was the author of *SLS*, one would not know by reading the four volumes of *HSP*. *HSP*, thus, was not only self-explicating but also self-aggrandizing.

The four volumes were intended as pedagogical texts, emphasizing dialogue between teacher and student, but Bhatkhande used the first three to write on a variety of subjects: Indian history and historiography, Sanskrit texts, Muslim musicians, the Vedas and their relationship to music, colonial writers, princely states, Westernization, colonialism, nationalism, the superiority of *dhrupad gayaki* over *khyal gayaki*, and the need for notation. Distrustful of all but a few musicians and skeptically respectful of all texts composed in Sanskrit, he gave full voice to uncommonly strong criticisms of musicians, princely rulers, ignorant audiences, intellectual charlatans, and half-baked ideas. In other words, his criticism cast a wide net, unrestrained by hierarchy, class, caste, or religion. Most of these criticisms were voiced through anecdotal caricatures, so there is no way of knowing if the events and people so unflatteringly described were fictional or corresponded to actual meetings, but the ghosts of Karamatullah Khan (the ignorant musician) and Ganeshilal Chaube (the fake Pandit) hover over many of the narratives.

The main characters in these texts are the teacher and the student. The teacher is cautious, humble, benign, and learned. The student is curious, quick, skeptical, yet respectful. Both characters epitomize the virtues of their respective subject positions. The teacher is patient and slow to anger, even though in all conversations with musicians, he is always at the receiving end of ignorant and arrogant abuse. Insofar as they reveal the author's interiority, these texts, as much as the diaries, can be considered Bhatkhande's autobiographies.

These chronicles criticized the dominant hagiographical tradition. Bhatkhande's method of instruction could be seen as similar to that of the neotraditional exchange between student and teacher (*guru-shishya parampara*), but significant modernizing touches set it apart. In his narrative constructions of a dialogue between the exemplary student and the wise teacher, truth triumphed over ignorance, the first represented by the teacher in

the course of his travels, the second represented by musicians and charlatan scholars.

The narrative advances through questions and clarifications, interspersed throughout with anecdotes and reminiscences. The student expresses ignorance through doubt, denunciations of texts or myths, or demands for additional explanation. The teacher responds by proffering either an anecdote, a brief lecture on history, or a first-person remembrance of an encounter. The narrations are sophisticated versions of Bhatkhande's diary reports of conversations with Karamatullah Khan in Allahabad, Babu Chatterjee in Calcutta, or Ganeshilal Chaube in Mathura. Each anecdote concludes with a moral, such as "beware those who come bearing false knowledge."[46] In other instances, the teacher attends a performance, at the end of which he asks the singer, with strategic humility, the rules and textual foundations of the raga he has just sung. All through these accounts, the teacher/narrator creates with his students a community of cognoscenti allied in a battle against those who would mystify the pursuit of real knowledge.

While *SLS* is the metatext that presides over the volumes, it is revealed as the final authority on music only after a whole range of texts in Sanskrit and English are explained. Bhatkhande believed that students of Hindustani music should master seventeen major texts,[47] in addition to the two foundational texts, *Natyashastra* and *Sangit Ratnakara*. In fact, he wrote of the two authors as one, BharatSharangdeva. Each volume had lists of texts the student was expected to read and memorize, along with the libraries in which they were to be found throughout the country. He did not restrict his teachings to Indian languages, referring to two watershed texts in English, C. R. Day's *The Music and Musical Instruments of Southern India and the Deccan* (1891) and Augustus Willard's *A Treatise on the Music of India*, written originally in 1793 but published as a book only in 1834. Other English writers, from Sir William Jones to Raja S. M. Tagore, were also quoted at length, and the quotations were followed by Bhatkhande's critical opinions.

On Muslims and Colonial Beneficence

If Bhatkhande was an extraordinarily complex visionary in so many areas, he was also a man of prejudice. When writing about the decline of music, he suggested that colonial interest in texts was preferable to "Badshahi" (Mughal rule) benevolence: "Some people assert that the condition of music is such

because our music fell into the hands of Musalman singers."[48] But for Bhatkhande, it was the inattention to order and system that distinguished the Badshahi. "There is nothing novel in the fact that under Musalman rule, Musalman singers were encouraged [that is, patronized] and given importance. But who was going to teach those singers anything about the correct way of singing and about Sanskrit *granthas*?" Added to that, a justifiable pride in religious exclusivity interfered with learning. "Those people were also proud of their religion, and there was no possibility that they would learn from Hindu Sanskrit pandits. To say that that period was not a great one for music would not be unusual." From here, he moved on to the British:

> Muslim rulers were not as interested in our ancient knowledge as our present rulers are. Today it would not be unusual to find many Westerners who have studied our religious texts very well. Those sorts of examples are not frequent in the time of the Badshahi. I know of no Musalman pandit who has written a Sanskrit *grantha*. I don't even know of one who understood a Sanskrit music *grantha*. Musalman singers liked music, they were very creative, one can say this, but they had no interest in learning the ancient texts, this too can be said. Even singers like Tansen left no written texts behind. Even to prove that they understood music *granthas* well would be extremely difficult.

Bhatkhande was willing to concede creativity to "Musalman" singers, but this was all. These singers were ignorant of texts and neglectful of both the order and the historical condition of the musical tradition.

Bhatkhande expressed no view that he did not almost immediately contravene or contradict in subsequent pages. The mode of expression for Bhatkhande was to relay an opinion or judgment and then immediately qualify or retract it. I cite here the most egregious passage about Muslims as one example of many in his four volumes, so as not to evade the depth of his prejudice. The teacher/narrator explains to his students the difference between the four kinds of pitches associated with a raga—*vadi*, *samvadi*, *anuvadi*, and *vivadi*. To do so, he uses the metaphor of a conservative middle-class Hindu household:

> The *vadi swar* is the father, the *samvadi* his first son, who had less status than his father but more than anyone else in the house. The *anuvadi swar*s are the servants, whose sole function is to facilitate the

> work of the father. Finally, the last category, *vivadi*, are not useful. They are *bhandkhor* and *tondaal* [eager to pick a fight, aggressively hostile, and loudmouthed]. There are those who believe that using a *vivadi swar* in very small quantities is sometimes necessary, even desirable; then one can perhaps see how to do this using a different principle or analogy. Sometimes in Hindu households there are Muslim servants, but it is necessary to affix limits on where they may enter and how much freedom they should have. Of course, I am only using this example flippantly, I don't need to say that.[49]

Flippant or otherwise, the sense is clear. Discordant pitches ought best to be discarded, but in a spirit of accommodation, the teacher grants that if they are to be used at all they should be carefully monitored and controlled, much like Muslims in a Hindu household.

When not being prejudiced Bhatkhande was often dismissive, pitying "poor Muslims who were intimidated by 'our' Sanskrit texts and knowledge."[50] He wrote of them as childlike, often using the adjective *bechare*, which could literally mean poor or with bad luck, worthy of pity, beguiled, or unschooled.[51] He ridiculed Muslim singers for their pretensions to *granthi* knowledge[52] and represented them as ever willing to pick a fight, abusive, polemical—similar to the hypothetical servants in his earlier example. Having written of Muslims as aggressive and in need of surveillance and control, he went on to indict Hindus as well, arguing that they should bear a fair share of blame for having let what was rightfully theirs fall into the wrong hands:

> If our current music is not the same as that of the music writers' period, it is no fault of the writers. If *our* educated people did not value music knowledge and knowingly let it pass into the control of the Miansahabs [a term used for Muslims], and in their company *our* music changed, then who should be held accountable for this? Now however much *we* may repent this takeover it is not, in my opinion, going to be very useful. It would not be wrong to state that just as it would not be possible to have Manu's views be dominant in society today, in the same way it would not be possible to use ancient texts on music. It is not my view that Muslim singers have ruined music. Their only fault was that they did not write down all the changes they made to the music. But there may have been many of them who could not read or write.

This is an important passage. Bhatkhande condemns both Hindus and Muslims, but the reasons are not clear. His irritation is directed at musicians, singers, and instrumentalists—not because of their religious affiliation, but because as performers they did not pay adequate attention to posterity nor, for that matter, to the future. In this sense, Bhatkhande's search for origins was not simply nostalgic. Had it been so, he would not have so quickly dismissed the relevance of the *Dharmashastra*s to contemporary life or the Vedas to music. Indeed, his contemporaries like Paluskar embraced a nostalgic and reconstructed ideal of Hindu life in accordance with Manu. Bhatkhande's project, however, accommodated an understanding of historical change. Muslims might be blamed for their illiteracy, but not for their faith.

The passage continues in an ironic tone: "Our love and respect for Muslim singers should be apparent in this, that within our community [*amchyaat*] any Hindu singer however excellently he sings, if there is no Khansaheb [Muslim musician] in his musical tradition, we consider him only a *bhajani haridas* [a singer only of devotional music]!" He admits, in other words, that devotional music is aesthetically inferior to that which is taught and authenticated only by Muslim musicians. Moreover, "Where do we have the right to think less of Muslim singers? We are truly in their debt. If we were to tout the fact that Tansen's guru was Swami Haridas, even so if someone were to ask us which is the text he left behind, what could we say? Even if this is the condition, don't squander your respect for ancient texts. They are not altogether useless. When you read them then you can decide, calmly, what their value is."[53] Having denounced Muslims for being aggressive, ignorant, and illiterate, he does not altogether reverse his opinion but acknowledges that music's aesthetics are indebted to its Muslim history. But is its history not indebted as well? *Thaat* (grouping of ragas) was Hindu, and there were two kinds of performances and ragas, Hindu and Muslim. "We sing *miyan-ki-malhar*, *miyan-ki-sarang*, *miyan-ki-todi*, *husaini todi*, *darbari todi*, *bilaskhani todi*, *jaunpuri*, *sarparda*, *saazgiri*, *shahana*, *yamani*, *navroz*, . . . and if we were to say they are supported by ancient texts, would it do us credit? Some might ask, what if we left aside these Musalman varieties, there are other ragas that are in our *granth*as, are there not? Yes, but who even sings those today?"[54] This is not necessarily a lament but also an observation that the focus on *granth*as misses the point. Contemporary music, however one felt about it in the early twentieth century, was that which was sung by Muslim musicians. He continues, "We break the rules given in the *granth*as and

mimic Musalman singers. In so many cases we do not even acknowledge the *thaat*s that are given in the *grantha*s. Even in the singing of well known ragas like *bhairav*, *bhairavi*, *todi* we follow none of the *granthi* rules, will it not beg the question, then what is our *shastra.*"[55] This is an important question for a nationalist like Bhatkhande. He continues with an imperative: "Understand my point correctly. I have no desire to criticize present day music or musicians. *I will go so far as to say that our Hindustani music is only just being classicized. The texts on music that are being written today are all establishing new rules for music's classicism.*"[56] This statement can be read as Bhatkhande's most emphatic declaration that music needed to be classical in order to be modern. It can also perhaps be read as his injunction to his students to stay away from an uncritical nostalgia for the *grantha*s. Bhatkhande was clearly aware that in order for music to be called classical it needed established rules, but he was also aware of the fact that particular rules were themselves an inextricable part of the modern world in which he was firmly located, without nostalgia.

Classicization, seen in this regard, was instrumental and went hand in hand with nationalization. The *gharana*s could not fit the bill—not because they were Muslim, but because they were disorderly. Moreover, they were not public institutions. Access to them was restricted, there was no public arena of discussion and debate, and instruction was selective. The reason Muslim musicians had to be excluded was not simply because they were Muslim, but because they, like the Kshetra Mohan Goswamis and Ganeshilal Chaubes, did not possess the knowledge to create and sustain a modern academy of classical music. The academy had to be built from scratch, which Bhatkhande recognized in his comment that "Hindustani music is only just being classicized." The *ustad*s and *gharana*s could not serve the academy's needs, nor could the *bhajani haridas* (a veiled reference to Paluskar), because in spite of their creativity, they did not understand what the "classical" was in their music. For Bhatkhande, classicization meant at least two things: system, order, discipline, and theory, on the one hand, and antiquity of national origin, on the other. Of course, these requirements equally define the very character of modern music. The first set of elements he could not find in contemporary practice, and he had toured the country in search of them. He found confusion, not order, and an emphasis on spontaneity rather than disciplined performance. So he set out to impose order on contemporary music. His liberal nationalism allowed him to include "Muslim" ragas, such as *malkauns,*

darbari, and *miyan-ki-malhar*. But they all had to be integrated into a body of rules, constructed according to a national canon of musical theory.

The rules in his writings cautioned his readers against believing that mere voice training (*galyaachi taiyaari*) was all that was needed for good performances, insisting that performers needed to know the rules of music (*sangeetache niyam*) as well.[57] In one of the lengthiest anecdotes of all five volumes, he narrates a detailed story—in the nature of a *panchatantra katha*[58] or an Aesopian fable—of a gifted but undisciplined singer who believes that with a little bit of music education he can join the ranks of famous musicians. The singer starts out with a traditional teacher (*guru*) who demands of him all that Bhatkhande would demand of his students, but tires quickly of such discipline, in which he is required to notate what he learns and focus on perfect pitch (*swar*) and theory (*raga agyan*), rather than vocal acrobatics (*tanabazi*). Unhappy with the rigor of this training, he switches to a musician maestro (an unnamed *Khansaheb*). The contrast between the two is clear. The Muslim *Khansaheb* smokes tobacco (*hookah*), chews betel nut (*paan supari*), disparages him publicly, teaches him very little, and tricks him out of his money.[59] Bhatkhande's disparagement was clear: without true knowledge, which is to say rule-bound, bookish knowledge, students were liable to fall into the hands of ignorant practitioners.

Along with his dismissal of ignorance, Bhatkhande advocated a healthy skepticism concerning pandits and singers who believed that the texts in their possession were written by the gods themselves.[60] He took pains to dispel popular myths about the power of ragas to influence climates and seasons.[61] Society, he noted, was too ignorant and childlike at the time to understand fables as mere fables. One should not try to dispel such ignorance, he cautioned, but pity it instead.[62] This was not real history, and students needed to know that even ancient texts could be challenged.

This was difficult advice. He commented wryly that "it is a great crime (*mahapaap*) in these days to state that writers of ancient *granthas* had made a mistake in their theorizing or that music as it was performed is no longer possible to perform."[63] And indeed, criticism of his works came flying at him from musicians and scholars. The first group believed his writings were simply irrelevant to their performance; the second, in unlikely sympathy with the former, accused him both of trying to reduce music education to mere mechanical understanding and of denying its divine history. Bhatkhande addressed such criticisms directly. "Those writers who have abandoned the

muddle of *murchana* and *grama* and written their texts using contemporary music as their foundation should be admired and applauded,"[64] he wrote. Yet he wrote in Sanskrit because he understood that, otherwise, he would not be recognized as a classical writer.

Sanskrit had more than a merely instrumental function. Throughout the volumes of the *HSP* texts, there is a tension between Bhatkhande's desire to make music modern and accessible and his unshakeable belief, despite his erudition, that Urdu, Persian, and Hindi texts on music were not scholarly enough for the task at hand.[65] Here he shared the sentiments of Sir William Jones, who admired the complexity of Sanskrit for its ability to tackle the first principles of music. Unfortunately, such a classificatory logic had too great a potential to take on a divisive character in its very formulation, given the historical circumstances of the time: Hindu music was made essential, natural, and ancient; Muslim music was thus made lacking in foundation, aberrational, and new.[66] Inasmuch as this may not have been the logic that Bhatkhande was working with, it provided the ballast other lesser scholars could use to put into practice a partitioning of the cultural sphere (and of music) into Hindu and Muslim.

In addition to his other writings, Bhatkhande also compiled 1,800 compositions, collected during his travels from hereditary musicians, in six volumes titled *Kramik Pustak Malika*. These were originally composed in Marathi and later translated into Hindi. This was and remains an extraordinary compilation. On the one hand, it brought together for the first time, in one series of texts, virtually the entire corpus of popularly sung ragas and compositions. This meant that students no longer needed to participate in the elaborate rituals of admission into a guild in order to learn music. The compilation was itself the culmination of a concentrated effort to make famous musical compositions accessible, notated, and easy to learn under the supervision of a reasonably trained musician. It did not, in other words, require a maestro to teach ordinary, everyday people the rudiments of music. Because of Bhatkhande's unceasing efforts, the compilation could be considered part of the national canon of musical compositions—the property and treasure of all. On the other hand, the compilation managed simultaneously to detach the compositions from their Muslim *gharana*s. This meant that the role of the *gharana*s in compositional authorship was erased from the newly created record of music's history in the pursuit of a neutral and nonreligious corpus. What it did, therefore, was to write Muslims out of musical history as

authors. This move did not wipe them out of music's history entirely, but it did not allow their contribution to be considered as authorial or authentically authoritative. And worse still, it paved the way for other, less secular Hindu nationalist musicians and scholars to climb atop Bhatkhande's foundational work and claim that what was primarily sung by Muslims from within a familial tradition now needed to be installed in a primarily Hindu home. This home, now guarded by new notions of Sanskrit knowledge, barred access to "illiterate musicians" who happened mostly to be Muslim.[67]

Last Days

The fourth volume of *HSP* was Bhatkhande's final writing project. His failing health and the noises in his head grew burdensome, but his devotion to music never flagged. In 1923, he had been asked by the ruler of Indore, Tukoji Rao Holkar, about the superiority of singers over instrumentalists. His response had been careful and prompt: singers were superior, he claimed, and he had it on good Sanskrit authority that this was so.[68] In 1931, the zeal to answer any question about music, no matter where or how, had not diminished at all, as one sees in his correspondence with his old friend, Rai Umanath Bali. This time the issue at hand was not conferences but high-school music textbooks for the schools of the United Provinces (UP). In what seems to have been a somewhat tense correspondence, he wrote, "I am sorry to learn that the Allahabad people have successfully stolen a march over you in the matters of School text books. It appears they worked secretly in the matter and managed to get their books approved."[69] By Allahabad, he was referring to a rival music institution. In Bhatkhande's identification of the problem, Bali had been tricked because the UP government had simply gone about producing textbooks the wrong way. The Bengal provincial government, on the other hand, had done it correctly. What was the difference? In the same letter, Bhatkhande wrote "they appointed a committee of music knowing people to consider the whole subject and then asked publicly writers to submit their work. Even a man living in Bombay like myself was put on the committee. *My* views on the Hindusthani System were accepted by that Govt. Rev. Popley will tell you all that happened in Calcutta. Prof. Mukerji of Lucknow knows about it.[70] *My name* was suggested to the Bengal Govt. by Dr. Rabindranath Tagore himself. In his own institution at Shanti Niketan, *songs*

*from my book*s were taught by his music teachers. Bhimrao Shastri and Dr. Rabindra Nath Tagore know me personally and also know of *my work*" (emphasis mine). Boasts apart, Bhatkhande was once again bothered by the lack of a nationalized system by which music curriculum was to be determined.

Obviously peeved at being passed over, Bhatkhande expressed restrained annoyance to Bali:

> I must state honestly here, that you never asked either myself or Shrikrishna [his student, and principal of the Marris College, Shrikrishna Ratanjankar] to prepare small textbooks for the schools of the province. If you had done that we could have finished the thing in a couple of weeks. . . . Our college textbooks are enough to supply material for 50 books if necessary at a moment's notice. The fact is that you yourself did not know what was being done behind the Purdah in Allahabad and failed to ask me to prepare the books. How can you then blame either myself or Shrikrishna for negligence in the matter?

Putting aside his ire, he volunteered to help get the books published, suggesting ways to popularize them quickly, but he was not pleased by his friend's suggestion that he needed to secure favorable opinions of his work.

> You want me to go round to important people and obtain their favorable opinions on my books and notation! At this time of the day it would look rather awkward on my part to make an attempt like that. I used to receive hundreds of letters from people appreciating my books but I have not preserved them. I always wanted to stand on my own merits. I do not think I shall be able to approach big people now after writing for 25 years for favorable opinions. I shall consider it below me to do it. The very fact that our books are now taught in (1) The Benares Hindu University, (2) The Madhav Sangit College and its branches (Gwalior), (3) The schools of Nagpur city, (4) The Baroda School of Indian Music and its branches, (5) In the Hindu Women's University and its affiliated Schools in Surat, Ahmedabad and Baroda, Satara, etc., (6) In all the 200 primary Schools of Bombay in the control of the Bombay municipality, will be enough recommendation for the books and the Notation in them. For me to now approach big men who understand nothing about the subject, soliciting favorable opinions would look a bit ridiculous.

Finally, putting an end to this part of the conversation, he declaimed, "[my] books are looked upon as standard authorities on the subject." Not even his competitor Pandit Paluskar had been quite as rigorous in the imposition of standards. "None of Digambar's pupils has cut a good figure before our Gwalior boys trained in our system which speaks for itself." He was arrogant, no doubt, but also upright. "We do not work underground for success," he wrote to Umanath Bali, apropos of Allahabad's secretiveness, "but work in the open and leave the public to judge. Even if Allahabad books hold the field for a time, be sure the success will be short lived. . . . Have faith in God and try your honest best and leave the rest to him."

Bhatkande had spent most of his life after the death of his wife and daughter roaming around the country conducting music examinations and inspecting music schools. His travels came to an abrupt end in 1933, when he suffered an attack of paralysis that left him bedridden for almost three years.[71] In February 1933, he wrote to his student Shrikrishna Ratanjankar, "Life has reached the end of its journey. . . . I have done whatever I deemed my duty. Whatever material I could collect I have recorded and protected it. I have full faith that in future, there will be worthy people to use it suitably. While writing sometimes with over enthusiasm I have used sharp words in discussing the theory of music. But believe me, it was not intended to hurt anybody's feelings."[72] On September 19, 1936, at the age of seventy-six, Bhatkhande died in Bombay.

Conclusion

Bhatkhande had cofounded the Marris College with Rai Umanath Bali in 1926. He was neither robust nor healthy at that point. He had begun to suffer from high blood pressure and, as a result, heard "singing noises" in his head all day and night.[73] He had also suffered a severe hip injury and needed sedatives to tackle his unrelieved insomnia. His physical discomforts notwithstanding, he remained involved in the administrative affairs of the Marris College and embroiled in a power struggle with an old friend, Nawab Ali, over the hiring of a music teacher and the firing of an unpopular principal.

Bhatkhande had lived for the previous twenty-five years without either the comfort or the financial and emotional responsibilities of married life. He

traveled incessantly even when his health did not permit it, but as he wrote to Rai Umanath Bali,

> You need not worry about my health. My chief complaint is loud head noises which prevent sleep. . . . They have increased my deafness considerably. . . . I shall never allow my health to come between me and my duty to the College. I would rather die in the College than in a sick bed here. I eat well, take fair exercise, and with one grain of Luminol get enough sleep. An old and deaf man has necessarily to go through these difficulties and I have no reason to complain.[74]

Had he been given a choice, he would have chosen one of two sacred sites in which to die, sites that he had kept apart—either Kashi (Benares) or the Lucknow Music College. As it happened, he died in Bombay, the city of his birth, ten years after the founding of his college.

With Bhatkhande's death, a newly formed practice of music scholasticism seems to have died as well. Not only had he laid out a theory and history for Hindustani music that musicologists, musicians, and historians would need to contend with seriously in any further study of the subject (more than any other musicologist of his time or since), he had set the terms for rigorous, erudite scholarship on music. Bhatkhande not only documented all he wrote, he made his sources public. In so doing, he established a standard for music scholarship that, regrettably, has not followed his example. Instead, letters, diaries, original compositions, and rare books have been kept hidden for decades, rarely shown even to research scholars, and mostly made available only to a deeply entrenched insider community that accepts hagiography as the sole acceptable mode of historical writing. On occasion, fragments of primary sources are published but no citations are given; this makes it impossible for anyone else to have firsthand access to them. Such secrecy would have been anathema to Bhatkhande.

Bhatkhande was by no means alone in his desire to bring some order to the performance and pedagogy of music, but his genius lay in the curious mix of his approach. He blended high-minded scholasticism with rigorous attention to citation, documentation, and proof, always driven by a desire to make music more accessible to a larger public. Bhatkhande's textbooks facilitated the teaching of music out of as many homes as there were teachers and in as many homes as there were students. The early decades of the twen-

tieth century witnessed a large middle-class expansion of music appreciation and learning. Given the growing respectability of music—already set in motion by other music reformers, music appreciation societies, and public performances—musical learning became not only acceptable but a required component of a certain middle-class education, particularly for young women, as we shall see in a later chapter. Lastly, Bhatkhande's sense of the nation extended beyond the boundaries of his native region.

Bhatkhande argued this cause in impassioned prose: "The leaders of the Nation who are for the present engrossed in saving the political future of the country should lend some portion of their energies to the regeneration of this art, so as to bring it within the vision of the nation and to rescue it from the decay which ends in death. The New India must be a full blown entity, and it would never do to omit the regeneration of our music from the programme of our workers."[75] Music, he claimed, had "metabolic value" and would be "the best tonic for reviving the energies of our hard-worked nation-builders, some of whom have themselves remarked to me that they would have been much better equipped for their exhausting work if they had this natural tonic and restorative to fall back upon." For Bhatkhande, music was both medicine and magic.

Bhatkhande's commitment to music allowed for a random practice to be disciplined by a connected history, a stern typology, and a documented musicology. These are not mean achievements, but they are predicated on the assumption that musicians qua musicians had destroyed music. The same performing artists who had organic and embodied knowledge of their art (and its craft) and in whose families music had resided and flourished for generations were the main problem confronting music. Perhaps it had been caused by their Muslimness, perhaps not. Bhatkhande alludes to this possibility but leaves overt assertions about Islam unsaid. He is clear, however, about the solution to the problem: namely, to impose on these practices a nationalized and textual solution. The solution was as incongruous and ill-fitting as the initial claim was preposterous. Despite his desire for an "Indian" music, it is precisely Bhatkhande's connected history that might have given people like Paluskar the needed weight to turn classical music into Hindu music.

What then, can we make of this complex man? For all his egalitarianism and high-minded secular approach to musical pedagogy and performance, we cannot ignore the fact that his politics included overt and disquieting prejudice toward musicians as a group and Muslims as a community. Hundreds of

Muslim musicians thronged the halls of the All-India Music Conferences, but within twenty years of the last All-India Music Conference in Lucknow in 1926, the numbers of Muslim musicians declined sharply. Bhatkhande had himself bemoaned the fact that all "first class musicians were rapidly dying out,"[76] but what, if anything, had he done to maintain their claim to music's historical heritage? Instead, the narrative history of music is couched in evolutionary terms as the inevitable "transfer of power" from feudal Muslims to national Hindus. What responsibility might we place at Bhatkhande's doorstep for the decline in the number of Muslim musicians? And how might we assess the cost of the rebirth of national music in the terms he laid out for modern India?

In the course of conducting research for this book, I posed the question of the possible decline in the number of practicing Muslim musicians to a few musicians and musicologists. My interlocutors consistently gave me one of three answers, all of which placed the blame on Muslim musicians. The first was couched in terms of inadequacy and insecurity: "Muslim musicians were uneducated and secretive; once the music was made available to everyone, they could no longer maintain their self-importance." The second answer focused on the deficiencies of Islam and the community of Muslims: "They have always been fanatical and backward. It is because of them that music almost came to an end in this country." The third response was simply to disagree about the decline in numbers by listing the names of Muslim musicians in India; proponents of this line of thought advised me not to overread "communalism" in my historical analysis.

All these answers, including the so-called liberal one stressing that Muslims were by no means absent from the current field of musical performance, can be drawn from Bhatkhande's corpus, yet he never made any one of these claims with such absoluteness. Still, one does see repeated iterations of the idea of something he identified as "our" music in his work to which Muslim musicians had, at best, contributed. If the practitioners of music were seen as so ill suited to dealing with the forces of modernization, why then were they not better protected by music's self-proclaimed saviors? Instead of blaming musicians for their poverty and illiteracy, why did Bhatkhande and others not lavish attention on their recuperation? Had there been as many Hindu musicians as there were Muslim musicians, would Bhatkhande and others have approached their demise with such indifference? Instead of paying attention to these questions, music's reformers sought rather to liberate music from the

musicians. Such a violent transformative separation could hardly have been inevitable or natural.

In the very deliberate particularity of Bhatkhande's choices lie some of the troubling answers as to why, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, his historical narrative of music developed as it did. Had he been able to incorporate, in some fashion, the legacy of the *gharana* system without appropriating it, he might have had greater success. His many exclusions, not just of Muslims but of women, South Indian music, and musicians, except in the most instrumental terms, can be seen as the inevitable and unintended consequence of a flawed project that could not relinquish the desire for a single origin of music. In theory, Bhatkhande's academy would belong to all Indians irrespective of religion or caste or gender. But while he could claim that his work was known by stalwarts of India's rapidly expanding nationalist movement, the national academy never took shape except in bits and pieces. In that light, if one were to read Bhatkhande generously, one can see his most vituperative statements as prescient expressions of frustration at being thwarted in his desire precisely by the *gharana*s that survived the onslaught of modernization and classicization.

Bhatkhande was unpopular during his lifetime, and his writings were criticized immediately upon publication. A certain kind of failure was a very large and intrinsic part of his success. In 1931, at the age of seventy-one, in another letter to Rai Umanath Bali, he could claim countrywide fame without sounding boastful.[77] In 1926, Bhatkhande had met and advised Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore on how to teach music in their respective institutions.[78] In 1929, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, a leading Hindu nationalist, had invited him to inspect the music teaching at Benares Hindu University.[79] Having secured the respect of such prominent nationalist leaders as Gandhi, Tagore, and Malaviya, Bhatkhande could state matter-of-factly and with good reason that Hindustani music scholars and patrons from Bengal to Gujarat, the United Provinces to Maharashtra, recognized him.

For all his fame, musicians disliked him intensely for presuming to instruct them on the rules of music when he himself was not a performer.[80] Scholars such as K. B. Deval and E. Clements, whom he criticized—whether about the appropriateness of the harmonium as an accompanying instrument for vocal performances, or about the accuracy of their scientific calculations about microtones—were not well disposed toward him.[81] Pandit Paluskar,

his rival, dismissed his notation system and pedagogy and kept his distance from him. And this is precisely where the question of failure and success and the attendant politics of both men need to come into dialogue. The fundamental distinction between the two men lay in the actual countrywide success of Paluskar's agenda, a success markedly different from Bhatkhande's. Bhatkhande had dispelled spiritualism, religious rituals, superstition, and sacralization from his agenda. With Paluskar the exact opposite prevailed. The culture of sacrality was everywhere in his schools. The musician was transformed into a spiritual teacher, and the students were incorporated into a reworked *gurukul*. Women had been harnessed to play the roles of the "inside" proselytizers.

It is ironic—against Bhatkhande's wishes but not without resonance in his method and manner—that Hindu music was further turned back into what he most disliked, namely, a music linked to spiritualism and divinity. He claimed he was not averse to Hindu music being changed, merely to the change not being recorded for posterity. The ostensible issue at hand for him was history, not religion or politics per se. Nonetheless, the distinction between the performers and national owners that had been allowed to fall into the wrong hands creates a separation between a Hindu "us" and a Muslim "them." When one adds Bhatkhande's many other assertions about Muslims, one is presented with a politics that appears far more contradictory, troubling, and narrow than has been conceded so far.

Given the many prejudiced assertions made by Bhatkhande, can one rest on the tired cliché that some of his best friends were Muslim, and that he had nothing against Islam qua Islam but merely against musicians who merely happened to be Muslim and who expressed their Muslimness in antiprogressive ways? Can one justify Bhatkhande by saying that he merely reflected the politics of elite Hindu Brahmin males of his time? Alternatively, should one agree with Vinayak Purohit, who lambastes Bhatkhande for being a colonial collaborator and an arch communalist?[82] None of these claims combines an in-depth critical examination of Bhatkhande's enormous contributions with his opinions. How does one put his writings on Muslims in a historical perspective that is neither presentist nor apologist? If this is a difficult question to ask, it is all the more difficult to avoid. And yet, with the exception of Vinayak Purohit, whose diatribe is so sweeping that it cannot be seen as a serious attempt to understand the man or his music, not one of the commentators on Bhatkhande writing in English, Hindi, or Marathi has brought to

public attention any of the passages cited in this chapter. If nothing else, I hope to bring to the fore undeniable evidence of Bhatkhande's own anti-Muslim sentiment without making this the only part of the story.

Bhatkhande was not popular in his native state and believed he had been misunderstood, mistreated, and unjustly criticized by his fellow Maharashtrians.[83] In the years between 1881 and 1936, when Bhatkhande had acquired a name for himself, the Marathi nationalist newspaper *Kesari* reported only that Professor Krishnarao Mule, author of a book on Hindustani music, had noted that Bhatkhande's system of *thaat*s was without a solid foundation.[84] Pandit Paluskar, on the other hand, could count on the paper to report his every activity, act of nationalist defiance, conference, and dispute with another musician.

In addition to his unpopularity, the college Bhatkhande founded never lived up to his ideals. In fact, three years after its founding, the college confronted virtual bankruptcy, and Bali, who ran its day-to-day affairs, considered handing it over to the university.[85] And in retrospect, if by some stroke of prescience Bhatkhande could have witnessed his future students and supporters paying homage to his memory by garlanding his photograph with flowers and laying beside it a stand of *agarbatti* (incense) before doing *namaskar* to his painting, his lament about the direction and future of music might have been even more intense. Bhatkhande believed that all the ghosts and spirits that were part of music's performative culture needed to be exorcised. The future of music lay in order, systematic pedagogy, archival depth, and classical learning.

The accolades Bhatkhande received posthumously also might have troubled him greatly. The Marris College was renamed the Bhatkhande Sangeet Vidyapeeth in 1947, the year of India's independence from British colonial rule.[86] That might not have bothered him, but two years later, in 1949, a leading Hindi journal of the arts, *Sangeet Kala Vihar*, published his horoscope and reproduced a letter written by him in English to a noted scholar of music, Professor G. H. Ranade, under the heading, "The late Pandit V. N. Bhatkhande's handwriting."[87] The letter was reproduced with no apparent intent other than to provide a sample of his handwriting. In 1967, the government of India issued a postage stamp in his name. At last, he had received nationwide recognition, even though most of his projects would have disappointed him had he lived to see them through the next few decades.

The spotlight of this chapter has been Bhatkhande's many Pyrrhic successes. However, we need to remember that he was and remains a figure of

enormous national importance to the fortunes of Indian classical music, seen as the icon of music's theoretical modernity. In a fundamental sense, Bhatkhande believed he was affirming music, and in the process he would make it available to all Indians, regardless of caste, religion, and gender. Bhatkhande's supporters rightly tell us that he did what he did for the larger glory of Indian music, and without him, India would have lost part of its cultural heritage. That would not be untrue. All the same, to highlight Bhatkhande as a failed visionary, we need to turn to his competitor and contemporary, who oversaw the unqualified successful completion of the Hindu agenda for music. We turn now to another musician who shared a first name with Bhatkhande but was frequently a thorn in his side: Vishnu Digambar Paluskar.

the 1960s, with his most famous stage adaptations of Brecht's Three Penny Opera called *Teen Paishyacha Tamasha*, and his most radical critique of Peshwai Brahminism in *Ghashiram Kotwal* in 1976.

101. Ranade, *Stage Music in Maharashtra*, 24.
102. Ibid., 10.
103. Ibid., 29, 40, 54, 56.
104. See Kapileshwari, *Abdul Karim Khan*, and chapter 1.
105. Abdul Karim Khan recorded *"Chandrika hi janu"; Dev Gandhar*, 78 rpm.

Chapter 3

1. Letter to Rai Umanath Bali, May 26, 1922. Property of Rai Swareshwar Bali, Lucknow. Published in *Bhatkhande Smruti Grantha* (Hindi and English), Indira Kala Sangeet Vishwavidyalaya, Khairagarh, 1966.
2. Bhatkhande's musicological contributions were as follows: (1) he established ten *thaat*s, or groups, into which he placed all of the 150 ragas most commonly sung or played. These were *kalyan*, *kafi*, *khamaj*, *bhairav*, *bhairavi*, *bilaval*, *todi*, *marwa*, *purvi,* and *asavari*. Each of the ragas belonging to a group followed a set of rules about the combination and order of pitches that both distinguished it from other ragas within the same *thaat* but also from other *thaat*s themselves. (2) Bhatkhande also explained the "theory of time," which was fundamentally important for the performance of ragas. Every raga according to this classically derived system has a stipulated time for its performance, so designated as to maximize the force of its affective qualities. Ragas typically convey a mood, an affect or emotion, and there are suggested rules for the appropriate time of day or night when they should be performed. There are early morning ragas, afternoon ragas, early evening ragas, night ragas, and late-night ragas. (3) In addition to formulating a notation system, partly borrowed from a Western high art music, he wrote down the basic definition of a raga: five pitches are minimally necessary in both the ascension and descension of the raga, without which its character can not be gauged; *sa* (the fixed first pitch of any scale) can never be discarded and both *ma* (the fourth pitch) and *pa* (the fifth) cannot be discarded, so all ragas have either *sa* and *ma* (the interval of a fourth) or *sa* and *pa* (the interval of a fifth); ragas can be broadly classified under three categories, *audava*, five pitches; *shadava*, six pitches; and *sampurna*, which means complete, and thus seven pitches.

   In other words, for a raga to be classified as such, it must minimally contain five pitches and an interval of either a fourth or a fifth; Bhatkhande's most esoteric contribution related to microtones and pitches. In Bharata's *Natyashastra* (from the second century B.C. to the second century A.D.), a Sanskrit treatise on

the performing arts, the author gives us the gamut of twenty-two *shruti*s (microtones) that we can hear. In order to arrive at a fixed scale, the seven principal notes, or pitches, were placed along this spectrum. The pitches are *shadja* (*sa*), *rishabh* (*re*), *gandhara* (*ga*), *madhyama* (*ma*), *pancham* (*pa*), *dhaivata* (*dha*), and *nishad* (*ni*). According to the couplet in the *Natyashastra*, the formula for the number of microtones contained within each successive pitch is as follows: 4-3-2-4-4-3-2. In effect, the number of microtones denoted the range within which the pitch could be located. We are told that in ancient times the fixed scale was derived by fixing the pitches on the *last* microtone in the range of microtones contained within each pitch. By this definition, the first pitch, *shadja*, would be located on the fourth *shruti*, *rishabh* on the seventh *shruti*, *gandhar* on the ninth *shruti*, *madhyam* on the thirteenth *shruti*, *pancham* on the seventeenth *shruti*, *dhaivat* on the twentieth *shruti,* and *nishad* on the twenty-second *shruti*. To determine the actual measurement of a microtone, the text tells us that two *veena*s (an ancient instrument that predates the sitar) were used. The first one was tuned according to the microtonal formula; the second one was lowered by one microtone on one pitch. *Pancham* (the fifth scale degree) was lowered by one microtone, and the difference between the *pancham* of the first and second *veena* was considered the sound gap between two *shruti*s. Bhatkhande found this scale inadequate as the basis for contemporary music performances and arrived at a slightly different formula, which had one difference: he located the pitches on the first *shruti*s, as opposed to the last. The new ascription was *shadja*—first *shruti*, *rishabh*—fifth *shruti*, *gandhara*—eighth *shruti*, *madhyama*—tenth *shruti*, *pancham*—fourteenth *shruti*, *dhaivata*—eighteenth *shruti*, and *Nishadh*—twenty-first *Shruti*. This new configuration coincided with the pitches belonging to what is known as the *bilaval saptak* (*saptak* means seven notes, as opposed to an octave; in Hindustani music the high *sa* is the first note of the next *saptak*). This scale is widely used as the foundational scale of modern Hindustani music by Bhatkhande's students.

3. See Sobhana Nayar, *Bhatkhande's Contribution to Music* (Bombay, 1989), 66–67.
4. Ibid., 350. Nayar defines *dhrupad* as "a type of classical song set in a raga having intricate rhythmic patterns which flourished in the 15th and 16th centuries" and *khayal* as "the highest form of classical art in North India. It allows melodic variation and improvisation within the framework of a raga and is more free and flowery compared to Dhrupad."
5. All biographical information is taken from the preface to *Hindusthani Sangeet Padhdhati* (*HSP*), vol. 1 (in Marathi; Bombay, 1992); Nayar, *Bhatkhande's Contribution to Music*; Shrikrishna Ratanjankar, *Sangeet Acharya Pandit V. N. Bhatkhande* (Bombay, 1973); Gokhale, *Vishrabdha Sharada*, vols. 1–3; and articles from the Marathi journal *Sangeet Kala Vihar*. All translations are mine.

6. See Nayar, *Bhatkhande's Contribution to Music*, 69. Also see prefatory remarks to all volumes of his diaries.
7. The five volumes of diaries are the property of Ramdas Bhatkal, Popular Prakashan, Bombay. I shall refer to the diaries hereafter as BD, vols. 1–4. Volume and page numbers are here cited as they are given in the unpublished manuscripts. All translations mine.
8. BD, 4:110.
9. See, for example, his conversation with Mr. Tirumallya Naidu, November 17, BD, 1:21, and November 21, 1904, 1:44.
10. The *Sangit Ratnakara* is a thirteenth-century text that was partially reprinted in Calcutta in 1879. In 1896, the first complete edition in two volumes was published in Poona, edited by Mangesh Ramakrishna Telang, with some critical notes in Marathi. The best-known critical edition was published by the Adyar Library and Research Center, Madras, in 1943. It included the entire text in Sanskrit, with two commentaries by Kallinatha and Simhabhupala. For my purposes, I am using an English translation of the Adyar edition of the Sanskrit text, by R. K. Shringy and Prem Lata Sharma (Delhi, 1991).
11. BD, 1:21, and November 21, 1904, 1:44.
12. Ibid., 46.
13. See B. R. Deodhar, "Pandit Vishnu Narayan Bhatkhande: Vyaktitva tatha Karya" (Hindi), *Sangeet Kala Vihar* 10 (1947): 24–34.
14. In the diaries, Bhatkhande spells Dikshitar's name incorrectly, and throughout the chapter I have chosen to use the correct spelling. In her review of the Hindi translation of his Southern Tour Diary, Sakuntala Narasinhan notes that "like most lay north Indians, Bhatkhande too mis-spells south Indian names. Subbarama Dikshitar is given as Subram Dikshit. . . . Most long and short vowels are messed up." Narasinhan goes on to ask a most pertinent question: "One wonders how he missed the correct names of those he sought meetings with" (book reviews, *Journal of the Indian Musicological Society* 18.1 [1987]: 54–59).
15. BD, 2:186.
16. BD, 2:273–306.
17. BD, 2:184.
18. BD, 1:52.
19. "I had heard that Southern music was systematic. In one sense, this is absolutely true. . . . they even have some knowledge of Swaras . . . However, it would be wrong to claim that there is knowledge of Sanskrit *granthas* here or that Sanskritic music is performed here" (BD, 1:37).
20. BD, 2:219.
21. BD, 2:220.
22. In Ranade's *Hindustani Music*, n. 123, S. M. Tagore is listed as having written the

following books: *Jatiya Sangeetvishayak Prastav* (1870), *Yantra Kshetra Deepika: Sitar Shiksha Vishayak Grantha* (1872), *Mridangmanjari* (1873), *Harmonium Sootra* (1874), *English Verses Set to Hindu Music* (1875), *Yantrakosha* (1875), *Six Principal Raga-s-with a Brief View of the Hindu Music* (1876), *A Few Lyrics of Owen Meredith Set to Hindu Music* (1877), *Hindu Music from Various Authors* (1882), *Sangeetsara Sangraha* (1884), and *Nrityankura* (1885). Complete citations for these titles are absent. A few pages after giving the list of Tagore's publications, Dr. Ranade gives a chronological list of publications on music, in which the date of publication of one of Tagore's works is different than that given earlier. Balkrishnabua Ichalkaranjikar is listed as having authored a book in 1881, yet his biographers claim he could not read or write. Yet Dr. Ranade's work is a beacon of light and I am deeply grateful to him for his help.

23. BD, *My Eastern Travels*, 4:115. Conversation with Gaurihar Tagore.
24. BD, 4:76.
25. BD, 2:226.
26. In Ashok Ranade's *Hindustani Music* (26), Tohfat-ul-Hind is given as a text written in the early eighteenth century for the son of the last powerful Mughal emperor, Aurangzeb (1666–1707).
27. BD, 3:44–45.
28. BD, 3:160.
29. BD, 3:170.
30. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983).
31. See Anupa Pande, *A Historical and Cultural Study of the Natyasastra of Bharata* (Jodhpur, 1996), chapter 1.
32. This assertion is made even more forcefully in contemporary India, where musicians will claim that there is no need for proof since it is all given in the *shastra*s. Personal communications with musicians, February 2000.
33. *HSP,* 1:161.
34. *HSP,* 1:181. In the most recent translation of the *Natyashastra*, the most precise dating of its origination remains unclear and the most that scholars can claim is that it was probably published between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D. Not merely is the dating of the text a problem, it remains a thorny and contested issue whether there was actually someone named Bharata who wrote the text or whether it was a pseudonym. See Pande, *A Historical and Cultural Study of the Natyasastra of Bharata.*
35. *HSP*, 2:8.
36. *HSP*, 1:129.
37. BD, 5:96.
38. BD, 5: 51, 103.

39. See *HSP*, 3: 1–2, in which Bhatkhande wrote, "Remember that because a few Muslim musicians have succeeded in capturing our music, it doesn't stand to reason that there is a Yavanick text that can do the same." He went on to cite as necessary milestones the same authors he had earlier mentioned, Bharat, Sharangdeva, Lochan, and Ahobal. Also see 48 and 49, in which he narrated an encounter with a "Khansaheb" that sounds very much like his meeting with Karamatullah Khan in Allahabad.
40. See Jones, *On the Musical Modes of the Hindoos*.
41. For a literary history of the debate between Anglicists and Orientalists, see Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (New York, 1989), and Bernard Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge* (Princeton, N.J., 1998).
42. B. R. Deodhar, *Pillars of Hindustani Music*, trans. Ram Deshmukh (Bombay, 1993), 45.
43. The first volume did not have a table of contents, unlike the other three. *HSP* was translated into Hindi and Gujarati, but the second Marathi edition of these texts was published only in 1999. In the new edition, a few changes were made, but the attempt was to keep the text in the original as untouched as possible. In a few places the Marathi has been copyedited, but most of it has been left unchanged. Editorial changes to the original text are in the form of introductory prefaces, lists of texts referred to in the original, an annotated chronology of Bhatkhande's life, select quotations from his diaries and explicatory glosses of his theory, all written by his student Prabhakar Chinchore. The actual text of the original *HSP* has been left basically unchanged. Finally, a new table of contents, in conformity with the style of the original volumes 2, 3, and 4, was also composed for the new edition of volume 1, and volume 4 was divided into two.
44. Letter to Rai Umanath Bali, May 30, 1929. Property of Rai Swareshwar Bali, Lucknow.
45. Nayar, *Bhatkhande's Contribution to Music*, 100.
46. *HSP* 2:9.
47. These were *Raga Tarangini*, *Hridaya Kautuk*, *Hridaya Prakash*, *Sangeet Parijat*, *Raga Tattva Vibodha*, *Sadraga Chandrodaya*, *Raga Manjari*, *Raga Mala*, *Anupa Sangeet Ratnakar*, *Anupa Sangeet Vilas*, *Anupankush*, *Rasa Kaumudi*, *Swaramelakalanidhi*, *Raga Vibodha*, *Chaturdandi Prakashika*, *Sangeet Saramrit*, and *Raga Lakshana*. For more on these books, see Nayar, *Bhatkhande's Contribution to Music*, 101–109.
48. *HSP*, 1:14.
49. *HSP*, 1:23.
50. *HSP*, 1:58.
51. *HSP*, 1:163.

52. *HSP*, 2:190.
53. *HSP*, 1:192–93.
54. These are all names of ragas that clearly bespeak their Muslim origin, or as Bhatkhande might say, derivation.
55. *Shastra* is one of those words, common now to a few modern Indo-Aryan languages derived from Sanskrit, which is impossible to translate accurately. The acceptable translation would be "science" but also "classicism" and "rules."
56. *HSP*, 1:59; emphasis mine.
57. *HSP*, 1:80.
58. The *Panchatantra* was a collection of Puranic fables that had hortatory morals at the conclusion of each tale.
59. *HSP*, 3:160–65.
60. See, for example, *HSP*, 2:139.
61. It was a common myth that in Akbar's time, the singer Tansen was able to light fires by singing the raga *Deepak*—which means light—and needed to immerse himself in water before doing so in order to avoid being burned to death by the power of the raga.
62. *HSP*, 2:146.
63. *HSP*, 1:141.
64. *HSP*, 1:160.
65. *HSP*, 3:1.
66. By 1932, when Bhatkhande published his fourth and final volume, he had left much of his anger behind. By now, he had countrywide fame and had less to prove than in the earlier volumes, written soon after his tours. In the last volume, he concentrated on the explication of the differences between the various Sanskrit and Persian texts, on more esoteric matters such as the theory of affect related to music (*rasa*), and on the mathematics of microtones (*shruti*). There are fewer polemical utterances in this last volume than in the first three. He even provided a genealogical list of Muslim musicians going as far back as the early twelfth century. The tone is not angry, sarcastic, or denigrating, as in the other volumes. His most expansive anecdote in this volume points to the ignorance of princely state rulers about music. The moral of this story for his students was simple and even gracious, advising his students against demanding the performance of rare ragas by musicians in public forums so as not to needlessly humiliate them. From a man who spent a great deal of his life finding ways to provoke and dismiss musicians, this is a rare change. Bhatkhande expresses genuine sympathy for the plight of a musician subjected to the whimsical and ignorant demands of rich princes (*HSP* 5:177). It is not that there are no dismissive paragraphs on musicians at all to be found in this volume, but there is a marked difference in both the number and quality of his comments compared to those in earlier volumes. In this one, they are still ignorant

but not arrogant and willing to concede their lack of knowledge in Bhatkhande's presence. When confronted with a question they could not answer, they deferred to Bhatkhande's superior knowledge of the subject and freely confessed that their education was not bookish or systematic. Of course, Bhatkhande does here what he did in his tours, which is to show off his excellence. But in 1932, he was seventy-two years old, and perhaps he had mellowed a little.

67. In addition to these publications, his speech at the first All-India Music Conference in 1916, "A Short Historical Survey of Hindustani Music and The Means to Place it on a Scientific Foundation with a View to Make its Study as Easy as Possible," was published as a short book. In it, he summarized what he had observed in his tours, written in his Marathi volumes, and believed about music's history. In his grandiosely titled *Music Systems in India: A Comparative Study of Some of the Music Systems of the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries*, he evaluated a number of Sanskrit texts for their musicological contributions to the study of music. Both booklets are condensed and shortened versions of his writings in Marathi, so I will not dwell on them here. He also collected "popular" songs in Gujarati and Marathi and wrote some journal articles. At the time of his death, he had published sixteen music-related works, and two additional ones were released posthumously.
68. See Gokhale, *Vishrabdh Sharada*, 2:177–79, in particular, Gokhale's comment about Bhatkhande's constant willingness to clear up a misunderstanding about music.
69. Letter to Rai Umanath Bali, May 15, 1931. Property of Rai Swareshwar Bali, Lucknow.
70. Popley was the author of *Music of India* (Calcutta, 1910) and a key member of the music conferences.
71. Nayar, *Bhatkhande's Contribution to Music*.
72. As cited in ibid., 343, from *Bhatkhande Smriti Grantha*, ed. N. Chinchore (Khairagarh, 1967).
73. Unpublished letter to Rai Umanath Bali, February 4, 1928.
74. Letter to Rai Umanath Bali, July 28, 1928. Published in *Bhatkhande Smruti Grantha* (in Hindi and English; Khairagarh, 1966).
75. V. N. Bhatkhande, "Propoganda for the betterment of the present condition of Hindusthani Music" (Delhi, 1922).
76. Unpublished letter to Rai Umanath Bali, May 26, 1922. Property of Rai Swareshwar Bali, Kaisar Bagh, Lucknow.
77. Unpublished letter to Rai Umanath Bali, May 15, 1931. Property of Rai Swareshwar Bali, Kaisar Bagh, Lucknow.
78. See Prabhakar Chinchore, "Ullekhaneeya Ghatnakram," preface to new edition of *Hindusthani Sangeet Paddhati*, vol. 1 (in Marathi; Bombay, 1999).

79. Letter to Rai Umanath Bali, May 30, 1929. "I may have to go to Benares to see what they are doing in the H. University. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya came to me yesterday and requested me to spend a week in Benares." Property of Rai Swareshwar Bali, Lucknow.
80. See B. R. Deodhar, *Thor Sangeetkar*, trans. Ram Deshmukh (in Marathi; Bombay, 1993), 38–50.
81. See K. B. Deval, *Music East and West Compared* (Poona, 1908), *The Hindu Musical Scale and the 22 Shrutis* (Poona, 1910); and *Theory of Indian Music as Expounded by Somnatha* (Poona, 1916); E. Clements, *A Note on the Use of European Musical Instruments in India* (Bombay, 1916). Deval and Clements founded the Philharmonic Society of Western India at Satara in 1911. Clements was a retired district judge and Deval was a retired deputy collector. Both came from the district of Satara, in western India. Deval had published the first "scientific" work on microtones and constructed a harmonium in accordance with his findings. He had presented it at the first All-India Music Conference, where it was soundly rejected by Bhatkhande and others.
82. See Vinayak Purohit, *The Arts in Transitional India*, vols. 1 and 2 (Bombay, 1997).
83. See Deodhar, *Thor Sangeetkar*, 43–44.
84. *Kesari*, June 3, 1924. The article reported a talk given by Professor Krishnarao Mule at the house of one of Poona's most respected music patrons, Abbasaheb Muzumdar, on the subject of music and musicology.
85. Unpublished letter to Rai Umanath Bali, May 30, 1929. "D. K. from Poona wrote to me asking if it was true that you are trying to hand over the college to the University on the ground that you were unable to go on with it. . . . The only difficulty with me is that I have never asked anybody to give me money for any of my activities and find it awkward to begin to do it now." Property of Rai Swareshwar Bali, Lucknow.
86. See *Acharya Shrikrishna Ratanjankar "Sujaan": Jeevani tatha Smritisanchay* (in Hindi, Bombay, 1993), 372.
87. *Sangeet Kala Vihar* 9 (1949): 9–13.

Chapter 4

1. For a festschrift on Paluskar, see Akhil Bharatiya Gandharva Mahavidyalaya Mandal, *Vishnu Digambar Paluskar Smriti Granth* (Miraj, 1974).
2. See Gurandittamal Khanna, *Gayanacharya Shriman Pandit Vishnu Digambarji Paluskar ka Sankshipt Jeevan-Vritaant* (Lahore, 1930). All translations from the Hindi are mine.