Tradition and Modernity

Narayana Menon

THE CULTURAL SCENE today. A hundred years of change and growth and productivity. What was it like, the cultural scene, a hundred years ago?

The whole of the South, where Carnatic music is heard and practised, had been revitalized and tremendously enriched by three of the great creative minds in Indian music: Syama Sastri (1763–1827), Thyagaraja (1767–1847) and Muthuswami Dikshitar (1775–1835). There must have been many in 1888 who had heard them sing, met them and remembered them with happiness and nostalgia.

Subbarama Dikshitar, Muthuswami Dikshitar's adopted son, a youngish man of 49, was collecting, codifying, editing and making available to us and to posterity a prodigious repertoire of Carnatic compositions to date, not to mention authoritative accounts of *raga-lakṣaṇas*, and *gamakas*, in his monumental *Saṅgīta Sampradāya Pradarśini*. In 1888 Maha Vaidyanatha Iyer was 44; Patnam Subramania Iyer, 43. Tirukodikavil Krishna Iyer, at 38, must have been revealing to his contemporaries the finer points of the new instrument on the Carnatic musical scene, the violin. In Mysore a young Veena player, Veena Seshanna, only 35, was capturing the public imagination with what that great instrument could do. Twenty-five-year-old Vasudevachar was doing his *gurukulavāsam*. A twenty-one-year-old girl called Dhanam was astonishing her family and her teachers with her precocity.

And what was happening in the North? Nathan Khan was 46, about the same age as Subbarama Dikshitar. Balakrishnabuwa Ichalkaranjikar was 39. Alladiya Khan, the great teacher of Kesarbai Kerkar and Moghubai Kurdikar, was an up-and-coming young musician of 33. Shankar Pandit of Gwalior and Allauddin Khan, the teacher of Ali Akbar, Annapurna and Ravi Shankar, were in their early twenties. Vishnu Narayan Bhatkande, who tried to classify Hindustani *rāgas* within a logical and systematic framework, was a young man of 28.

In 1888 the dance scene was a lively one. The Tanjore Quartet, contemporaries of the great Trinity in music, were creative forces both in dance and music and their successors and descendants worked closely with composers like Dharmapuri Subbarayar, the son of Syama Sastri. The home of Dhanam's mother Sundaram and her mother Kamakshi was a meeting place for composers, musicians and dance

teachers. The close affinity of music and dance was being continually refined and reinforced. Melattur and Kuchipudi had fine exponents of the *nātya* tradition. The great Bindadin and his brothers Kalika Prasadji and Bhairav Prasadji revealed to the North the niceties and the splendour of Kathak dancing, enriching its repertoire with some of the greatest compositions that we know today. In Kerala, Koodiyattam flourished, the *koothambalams* of temples like the Vatakkunnathan Kshetram in Trichur and the Koodalmanikya Kshetram of Irinjalakuda resounding with the beats of the Mizhavu and the superb *abhinaya* of the Chakyars, raising huge shadows of wonder in the audience.

In Kathakali, the second half of the 19th century witnessed an era of documentation and publication of the great classics. The great Irayimman Thampi, the creator of *Keecakavadham, Uttarāswayamvaram* and *Dakṣayagam,* was the grand old man of the day in 1888. Vayaskara Muthathu, the creator of *Duryodhanavadham,* was a young boy of 11. Killikkurissimangalam, the cradle of many great artists and art forms of Kerala, was nurturing the talents of such brilliant creative artists as Manthredath Nambudiripad (*Subhadrāharaṇam*) and Elayitathu Nambudiri *(Rājasūyam).* In and around 1888 some of the great Kathakali dancers of all times, legendary figures — Kunchu Karthavu, Ittiraricha Menon, Kesava Kurup, Ambat Sankara Menon — made their patrons and audiences aware of the depth and sophistries and subtleties inherent in perhaps the greatest form of dance-drama that the world had witnessed.

Music and dance were in abundance — in abundant vitality, mature developed traditions in all their resplendent glory before commercialism and urbanization gave their growth a new dimension and a new twist. The other arts were in disarray. The onslaught of imperialism and foreign rule created a period of unloveliness and pridelessness in the arts. Outside of music and dance, it was not a period of which we could be very proud or happy.

We often tend to overlook the role of the arts in the development process. The arts do have political and ideological implications. The recognition, the restoration of human dignity is a prerequisite of freedom. And in this we are motivated and inspired by the arts. Full freedom is not possible without cultural identity. We need to fulfill ourselves in our own environment, against our own background, if the arts are to bloom as a continuing process.

Today there is a realization of this. On the cultural scene today, tradition and modernity should meet. They are no longer to be treated as inimical. One is not destructive of the other. There is fuller, more meaningful awareness of tradition today. We have shed or are shedding our sentimental association with words like tradition, let alone associations of divinity or invulnerability. As the great poet, thinker and critic T.S. Eliot has said, it is dangerous to cling to an old tradition, to confuse the vital with the unessential, the real with the sentimental. Tradition does not mean a return to some previous condition so as to preserve it in perpetuity. It should stimulate our living and our think-

ing. What may have been a legitimate healthy belief or practice yesterday may well be a pernicious belief today. Eliot has also stated:

> What we can do is to use our minds, remembering that a tradition without intelligence is not worth having, to discover what is the best life for us ... as a particular people in a particular place; what in the past is worth preserving and what should be rejected; and what conditions with our power to bring about would foster the society that we desire.

There is certainly an awareness of this today as we can see if we examine and analyze the cultural scene in India. If it were not so, our arts would appear an anachronism in 1988. Today we are very conscious of the world we live in — atomic energy, guided missiles, sputniks, industrial psychology, vitamins, sulpha drugs, international finance. We are a modern nation acquiring rapidly a modern international outlook and consciousness. The expression of this consciousness would need new techniques, new idioms, new styles. Our most significant painters, sculptors, architects, poets, dramatists realize this, that art and life are not things apart.

I do not want to say much about music and the dance. These are the two major art forms which have stood the ravages of colonialism and foreign rule and emerged unscathed. Even at the most turbulent and unsettled periods in the history of modern India, such as the first half of the 19th century, when siege and conquest, petty and big political intrigues, treachery and calumny, greed and ambition were the order of the day, music and dance flourished. The court of a ruling prince like Swati Tirunal in Trivandrum was, even in those difficult days, a meeting point for scholars and musicians and dancers from all over India. We know that in Tamil Nadu, Syama Sastri, Thyagaraja and Dikshitar were composing the greatest works the repertoire of Carnatic music had witnessed and changing the face of it in the process; also that the Tanjore Quartet was revitalizing the traditions of dancing as set forth in the *Nāṭyasāstra*. In Bengal a new genre of music, Kavigana, was being evolved and perfected. And at the court of Nawab Wajid Ali Shah, the great court musician and dancer Thakurdas was adding subtle shades of refinement to the Kathak dance.

Dance and music are the great pride of our cultural scene today. Of course, one can come across voices of orthodoxy and nostalgia moping and grumbling about standards going down and the tradition getting defiled. But this is a standing complaint that every generation makes about its succeeding generation. I have no doubt that the interest in the arts in India today is greater than ever before; that we have talent in abundance, and, what is more, access to that talent through public performances, exhibitions and the mass media. The vogue of Indian music, Indian dancings and of Indian films abroad would need a whole article to itself.

The exchange of artistes and of cultural delegations with countries the world over is giving a new dimension to the cultural scene. This is a two-way traffic. We have more and more artists, musicians and groups from Europe, the Americas and the East every year, and more and more

of our artists, dancers, and musicians are seen and heard beyond our frontiers.

What we are witnessing today — without our being aware of it all the time — is a flowering of our old traditions and values in the context of the 20th century. And, what is more, it is being achieved without seriously violating their character, their strength and their uniqueness. And this is taking our arts out of their traditional sheltered backwaters and placing them in the mainstream of international creativity, enriching them, and being enriched by them.

The cultural scene of a country like India with its vast population, its linguistic problems, an ancient tradition which has to come alive in the context of today, is an area which needs careful study and investigation and documentation. I have sketched it briefly, making a point here and there, leaving out much. There is the rapid growth of the mass media which may turn out to be the biggest instrument of change. There is the problem of harnessing tradition to modernity. There are the growing needs of socio-economic development and the role of the arts in it. These are problems and challenges to be faced fairly and squarely. It is an exciting prospect, full of pride and prejudice tempered with sense and sensibility.

★

And now a word about the Soviet situation. The reaction against Italianism in music — and Germanism.

Nineteenth century — and the period is close to the Indian situation:

Glinka (1804 - 57)	
and	
Dargomijsky (1813 - 69)	
The group of Five :	
Balakiref	1836 - 1910
Cui	1813 - 1918
Borodin	1833 - 1987
Mussorgsky	1839 - 1981
Rimsky-Korsakof	1844 - 1908

On to modern Russia:

Stravinsky: *The Rite of Spring* (1913)
Scriabin
Prokofief
Miaskovsky

And on to:

Shostakovich
T. Khrennikov

A. Eshpai
Shchedrin
(*The Lady with a Lap-dog*: Chechov)
Taktakishvih (Georgia)
Kachaturian
Kabalavsky (teacher)
Yarustovsky (scholar)

★

What I would like to see is a flowering of our great melodic tradition in the context of the 20th century and of our rapidly changing social organization. This can and should be achieved without violating the character, strength and individuality of the tradition. I do not share the views of those who fear that all this may be the beginning of the end of our traditional arts. There are two points here. One is that the most unorthodox experiments and revolutionary innovations in creativity have often turned into accepted practice in the course of a generation. The other is that new developments do not necessarily mean the destruction of old styles and forms. In Europe the growth of the symphony orchestra and, more recently, of concrete and electronic music has not killed the writing of chamber music or the singing of unaccompanied folk songs. Nor have Palestrina or Purcell or Bach or Mozart been forgotten in the 20th century. The brilliant innovation of Merce Cunningham has not affected the work of the traditional Bolshoi; nor the plays of Becket put Shakespeare in cold storage.

Finally, let us remember that modernization does not mean westernization. Modernization means the fullest use of our great tradition in the context of today. Westernization implies imitating, borrowing idioms and techniques which are often alien to us. □

II CULTURE AND TRADITION

The collective consciousness of a people in generating its culture operates in certain distinct modalities which may be reduced to and are expressible in terms of concepts. These concepts are foundational to, and formative of, the respective culture. In number, they conform to the law of parsimony. They constitute the necessary and sufficient condition to generate, sustain and express the various culture modalities. The selfsame concepts recur in the given culture continuum at different levels in varying forms and thus give rise to the modalities. A people and their culture may be generally characterized through a corpus of such concepts.

Spatiotemporal continuity is one such primary concept, corresponding to a cultural modality. It operates through secondary concepts such as change, repetition, recurrence, regeneration, etc. Such continuity may be linear or spiral. Tradition is a linear continuity in the behaviour and/or expression of a group of people. It is dynamic in a living culture. If dynamism accrues merely from repetition or imitation, tradition becomes stagnant, as happened, for instance, in Indian music in about the 10th-11th centuries and in Carnatic music about a hundred years ago. Then the modalities tend to wither away and the culture tends to become barren, unless it is revitalized and succoured. If dynamism accrues from continuous change, such change should be in response to

i. flux in the totality of human culture and flux in national culture;
ii. need for realignment with the past;
iii. contemporary needs and functional relevance;
iv. aspirations for the future of the people who generate, sustain and express the culture.

If it does so respond, the culture grows in vigour and vitality.

No art or artist can exist in an isolated present. For, the present is not a vacuum but is the end product of a series of presents in the past, each of which was in turn such an end product in history, the culmination of countless generations, each of which grew out of its reactions to its own past and its own present, i.e., its environment. Therefore, I fully endorse the view of Alexander Myaskinov when he says

> The artist comes into a world already full of works of art, created before him. He studies not only the real life of his own contemporaries and ancestors, the whole complex and frequently contradictory system of human relations, but in addition the history of art stretching over many centuries. His link with life is not simply a link with actual events, but as Johannes Becher emphasized, with the spiritual culture of society.[3]

What Hector Agosti said at a meeting of Musicians in Buenos Aires in 1959 is equally relevant to this context:

> Tradition can serve only as an element of national succession and not as fetters. It is absurd to attempt keeping to traditional norms all the time, as it is to renounce them altogether.[4]

"Keeping to traditional norms all the time" is the repetition and imitation I mentioned just now. It is not only absurd; it is fatal to the culture. "Renounce them altogether" is like cutting the topmost sprout of a tree from its stem and roots. A culture remains vital and continues to grow only as long as change is motivated by the four factors mentioned above.

Tradition and change, therefore, are not mutually incompatible; indeed, they are interdependent. They grow together by mutual interaction and feedback. A tradition can grow only if it continues to be modern. A traditional mode of cultural expression can remain alive only if it is relevant to the trends, attitudes, needs and aspirations of its practitioners at all periods of time. This is the fourth motivation for change which I mentioned a little while ago. Vakhtangov has rightly said: "Open the windows. Let the fresh air in. Let life in. We must not fear life. We must join it."[5] Indeed, Alexander Myaskinov proposes not one, but three intertwining traditions: a tradition of world arts, national traditions, and socialist realism traditions.[6]

III CULTURE AND MODERNISM

Growth in tradition involves a dual, simultaneous process of both addition and subtraction: it must lose the deadwood of archaism and obsolescence of the past; it must gain the modifications and innovations of the present; it must also contain in its womb the seed of the trends of the future. Thus tradition is constantly in the crucible of change and is constantly minted anew to retain its currency. In other words, tradition is the summation of the modernities of the past. Modernity should be distinguished from modernism. The former involves the concept of updating tradition so as to include contemporary needs, requirements, conventions and aspirations. The latter involves the idea of renouncing tradition altogether. The words of Alexander Dymshits are pertinent in this connection:

> . . . modernism is today synonymized in Western art idiom with symbolism, acmeism, futurism, imagist and other schools such as expressionism, cubism, suprematism, dadaism, surrealism etc. Modernism is the offspring of all these 'ism's which are openly asocial and antirealist, which have their roots in subjective idealism, aestheticism and formalism.[7]

Modernism in music and the other arts is divorced from the people; for, their expression is almost entirely subjective and lacks the firm frame of referability. Therefore their capacity for communication is very limited, and too vague to be able to bestow definition or clarity.

Music, like the other arts, flows on a bed of theory, within the banks of tradition. Theory is synonymized in modern Indian parlance with *śāstra*, discipline. Its function is regulative and directive. In India *śāstra* is twofold: it may be descriptive (*varṇana*) or regulative through prescription and proscription. Music theory functions at two levels. At the foundational level it is regulative and is a corpus of concepts, hypotheses, axioms, laws, theoretical models, etc. At the level of practice it is descriptive. But the descriptive superstructure always implicitly assumes the regulative infrastructure. A theoretical treatise (*śāstra*) generally contains three elements: abstraction, generalization and description. It tends to be historical and philosophical in the first two; in the third, it describes specific and actual materials of practice. This is true of nearly every treatise on Indian music. Since it describes both past and contemporary music, it serves as a sentinel of tradition. A distinguishing feature of textual transmission in Indian music is that almost every treatise, written over the centuries, always emphasizes that the practice of music is immensely more important than its mere theory and that theory should always follow and elucidate practice and not *vice versa*. By and large, the *raison d'être* for the composition of a theoretical treatise on music has been, throughout the centuries, conciliation of precedent practice, prescription or theory with the actual music of the day[8]. In other words, people and their participation is always preferred to the elitist, conservative few. I shall refer to this preference again presently.

IV INNOVATION

Innovation is introduction of novelty. Novelty is of the highest importance if the flow of music is to be continuous and creative. But no novelty can be entirely self-generating, no artist can be creative in a vacuum. For, something can be new only in a context; it is therefore the product of the interaction of the individual with his inner and outer worlds. What Leonid Leonov states in respect of literature applies equally to music: "All literature is bound to be a diagonal in the parallelogram of the individual author and the whole heritage of the world literature."[9]

Innovation is more specific and individualized in art music and its cognates than in folk music, etc. where it is largely general and anonymous. For, the former proceeds from the ontogenic creative activity of a particular consciousness while the latter emerges from the phylogenetic creative activity of a collective consciousness. Further, the innovating individual is a product of both the past and the present and is moving on the path of the future.

Music and other arts are like an ancient tree, hoary with tradition but full of fresh flowers and fruits of innovation; thus innovation gives a new lease of life and continuity to tradition. Alexander Myaskinov says:

> True art is always the discovery of something new. Here one should be aware of the dogmatic repetition of old formulae.[10]
>
> Respect for traditions, hatred of imitation, love of bold innovation — these are the basic principles of all true realistic art.[11]
>
> The socialist realist is guided by the laws of art discovered by the classics of world literature, in particular, the law of dialectical unity of tradition and innovation.[12]

The Soviet poet Leonid Martynov expressed the same view in relation to poetry at a meeting of poets in Rome in 1959: "Tradition must be continued, not imitated."[13] An inherently strong innovation soon becomes tradition if it gains general acceptance; for, it is a reinterpretation or reexpression of the inner values and of the formative concepts underlying the culture. Therefore tradition progresses as a combined function of modernity and innovation. It grows through incessant triangular interaction among collective consciousness, individual consciousness and environment.

V INDIAN MUSIC

'Indian music' is a comprehensive term; it does not mean that the selfsame, single music — same in content and form — is practised identically in every part of the huge subcontinent which is India. It is moot whether it was ever so practised in the past, either. Even now, music changes contiguously and continuously along three axes drawn from the southern tip of India along the east coast, west coast and along the middle to the northernmost extremity. The music changes imperceptibly at contiguous points on each axis; the music on a point on the mid-axis is roughly the average of the musics at the extremities. But the music is widely different at the farthest points. Further, the music performed in any given region carries its own characteristic flavour, style and tradition, despite considerable interdiffusion. These micro-variations form the mosaic which is Indian music. Again, Indian music comprehends many modes such as classical (art), folk, tribal, traditional-ritual (*sampradāya*), light-classical, light, film, etc.

Whatever the mode, Indian music is always composed and performed in terms of the quadrology of *rāga, tāla, prabandha* and *vādya*. The first three reveal distinct traditions in both textual and oral transmissions in both Carnatic and Hindustani music. Each reveals frequent attempts at modernization and innovation during its evolution; practically every music treatise composed during the past two millennia has for its core the updating of *rāgas, tālas, prabandhas*, and occasionally the *vādyas* in terms of contemporary usage. These are invariably accommodated into a stream of past usages so that a tradition is built up. If innovations and creations introduced by individual genius such as a new *rāga, tāla* or *prabandha* gain sustained, general acceptance, the novelty fades gradually, and after passing through a

transition of ambiguity or resistance, they merge into the mainstream of tradition. This process is continuing even in our own times; for, there is vigorous activity in innovation and modernization in both Carnatic music and Hindustani music, albeit in a frame of somewhat conventional creativity. Kallinatha provides an instance of such updating in *rāga, tāla* and *prabandha* in the 15th century[14].

VI TRADITION AND CONTINUITY

A distinguishing feature of Indian culture is its persistent love and respect for tradition. Tradition is regarded as beginningless and eternal (*sanātana*). All changes in both theory and practice are sought to be accommodated by modification, extension, expansion or reinterpretation of an already existing prescription or description. This is true of every time-honoured prescriptive or descriptive discipline in India. This is true of music also. This is why every significant or critical addition or subtraction in theory or practice over the centuries is sought to be aligned to an existing tradition. Every important innovation or creation introduced into the body of our music is similarly sought to be presented as an extension, expansion, modification or reinterpretation of an extant or archaic principle, technique or material. South India in particular has endeavoured to maintain continuity in its cultural and other modalities throughout the ages through such a methodological device. This is specially true of Carnatic music.

The earliest instance of this in Indian culture is found in the secular arts. These were sought to be integrated into vedic culture by deriving them from the Veda itself. Bharata, Nānyadeva, Śārṅgadeva and others have done this: indeed, Bharata bestows on the theatre art the status of the (fifth) Veda itself; according to him, Brahmā created *nāṭya* by drawing its elements from the four Vedas. Matanga confers on music affiliation with the Tantra. Nāradīya Śikṣa serves as a bridge between the music of the Samaveda and secular music.

The evolution of Indian music is marked with several such attempts to accommodate the present into the past and *vice versa*. Examples of this are: accommodation of melodic admixtures into their lowest common multiple — into a genre called *jāti*; accommodation of progressive departure/variation of *grāma-rāgas* from their archetypes within an extended frame of *bhāṣā, vibhāṣā* and *antarabhāṣā*; accommodation of their further variation/departure into *upa-rāgas, rāga-aṅga, bhāṣā-anga*, etc.; accommodation of the *grāma* and its paraphernalia into the *mela/thāṭa*; collimation of the structural aspects of the totality of the *rāgas* into ten vital elements (*rāga-daśa-prāṅa*); accommodation of the *deśī tālas* into a general matrix of ten vital elements (*tāla-daśa-prāṅa*); accommodation of the *sulādi tālas* into the framework of the *deśī tālas*; accommodation of the numerous *deśī rāgas* and *tālas* within the perimeter of 'classical' music, etc.[15] The introduction of the drone instru-

ment, viz., the *tambūri*, in the 14-15th century, the induction of violin, saxophone, clarinet, mandolin, Khañjira, Morsing, etc. into classical music are further instances of such accommodation taking place in our times.[16]

VII MUSIC FOR THE PEOPLE

Tradition ensures canalization of individual genius, firmness and stability of form, consolidation of objectives and values, focusing on perspectives and integration with other culture modalities and intimacy with the total culture. But it does not address only the elite, the conservative and the purist. For, a work of art is a social phenomenon; it should afford genuine aesthetic enjoyment and arouse noble feelings in man. In the words of Yakhtangov, it

> must enact the turbulent spirit of the people.[17]
>
> If it has not been heard in the soul of the people, if it has not been divined in the heart of the people; then it can never be of lasting worth . . . One must draw creative strength from the people; one must contemplate people with the whole of one's creative being.[18]

Did not Mussorgsky say:

> Music is meant to speak with the people at large and not with a narrow audience of the composer's closest associates.[19]

Music derives its inner spirit and strength from the people. What Anastasyev said of Soviet theatre is equally valid for music.

> What saved theatre for the people and gave it the power of self-renewal were its profound inner ties with the native land, an ardent loyalty to its democratic art, and above all, the feeling that the new government understood it and was concerned for its welfare.[20]

Lenin said that music should be inextricably interwoven into the fabric of people's lives:

> Art belongs to the people. It must have its roots in the very thickness of the broad, working masses. It must be comprehensible to the masses and be loved by them. It must unite the feelings, thoughts and will of the masses, elevate them. It must waken the artist in them and educate them.[21]

I would therefore join Sergei Prokofiev in calling to the composer:

> There is no time for composing for a tiny group of aesthetes. Today the broadest strata of people stand facing great music expectantly. Composers! Please pay particular attention to this. If you drive the people away, they will leave you for jazz or for tearful trash . . . But if you succeed in attracting them, you will have an audience the like of which has not been known at any time, anywhere. It does not follow from this, however, that you should play down to the audience. Playing down always contains a trace of insincerity.[22]

He appeals to the artist to combine the essential democratism of his music with his own creative teachings, striving for a new kind of simplicity, a new kind of clarity.

What is the role of music in our society of today and tomorrow? Yarustovsky describes this well:

> Music must exert a very strong influence on the development of the people in a new society. But to accomplish this, it must possess a high ideological content and should be addressed mainly to the audience. Music can be made popular first of all through lifting the broad masses to an intellectual level where they can appreciate great music—and let us add,—where they can judge music professionally; this can be attained through encouraging musical creativity on a mass scale. Our composers and musicians therefore do not limit themselves to creating and performing new musical works of high artistic value but hundreds and hundreds of them devote themselves to propagandizing great music.[25]

VIII INDIAN MUSIC: DEMOCRATIZATION

Indian music has been keenly alive to this principle throughout its career. Whenever conservatism and elitism tended to shrink its aims, scope and functions, Indian music has always responded with reactionary revolution so as to embrace the people intimately again. Thus as long ago as the 7th century A.C. Matanga has called the entirety of music as *Bṛhad-dēśī*, i.e. great, enormous *dēśī*, because it comprehended the whole people—music which is for everyone, including women, children, cowherds and kings, which they sing for themselves, in their own country[24]. He includes the music of the jungle tribes *śabara, pulinda, kāmboja, vaṅga* and *bāhlīka* as well as the *avakriṣṭa dhruva* of the theatre, which was delimited to the use of only four notes[25]. He describes many *rāgas* of folk origin which were being embraced by art music. The majority of song forms he describes were composed in the languages of the people and addressed to them[26]. This has remained the guideline for evolution of Indian music throughout its history. Nanyadeva, Śaṅgadeva and a host of others have echoed in their works the *dēśī* music which resounded in the edifice of classical music of their times. Kallinātha says in the 15th century that whatever be the changes in the state of music, its most important criterion for survival, or justification for its existence, is its appeal for the people.[27] The several hundreds of music composers of India, especially in the South, such as the Śivaśaraṇas, Haridāsas, etc. of Karnataka, *śaiva* and *vaiṣṇava* Alvārs of Tamil Nadu, the Tāḷḷapākam triad and many other composers of Andhra and Kerala, Thyagaraja, Muddusvāmi Dikṣita, Śyāma Sāstri and a huge train of their schools have given a new dimension to our music and have restored it to the people. In consequence, music has shifted its platform from temples and royal courts to homes and streets; it has become a necessary cultural accomplishment for the common man in South India. This is largely true in North India also.

IX NEW CHALLENGES

Not that our music is without problems: its very proliferation has brought in many problems. Excessive diffusion, tremendous growth in media, high technological advances in preserving, perpetuating and amplifying music, stresses and strains of modern living, etc. have introduced problems in the preservation of tradition, preservation of the intimate relationship between teacher and taught, between composer and performer, and between performer and listener. It is now very important for quality to keep pace with quantity in innovation and originality.

But it is good to have problems; they are a symptom of a growing and healthy organism; they show that our music is not stagnant. They are also a worthy challenge to systematic, concerted endeavour towards progress. Progress in music is progress of the human spirit. For, is not music the sole instrument for achieving the fourfold human goal?

dharma-artha-kāma-mokṣāṇām idam-ev-aika-sādhanam[28]

It is ascent, the human spirit beholds Beauty also as Truth and Auspiciousness; *satyam-śivam-sundaram.*

Let us help our music to help us achieve peace, harmony and love between man and man, between people and people. □

REFERENCES

1. Marx and Engels, 1848, Communist Manifesto in *Selected Works*, vol.I, p.38.
2. Trofimov, Pavel, 1969, 'Drawing Together and Mutual Enrichment of National Arts in USSR'.
3. Myaskinov, Alexander, 1969, *Problems of Modern Aesthetic*, Moscow, p.187.
4. Agosti, Hector, 1959, *Nation and Culture*, Buenos Aires, p.139.
5. Vakhtangov, Y., 1930, cit. Zakhova; 'Vakhtangov and His Studio'.
6. Myaskinov, Alexander, op.cit., p.196.
7. Dymshits, Alexander, *Realism and Modernism* cit. Myaskinov, Alexander, op.cit. p. 262.
8. Śārṅgadeva, *Saṅgītaratnākara* (c.1230), 1.21; 6.335
   Siṁhabhūpāla, c.1330, *Saṅgītasudhākara*, comm. Śārṅgadeva, op.cit. loc.cit.
   Kallinātha, c.1440, *Saṅgītakalānidhi*, comm. Śārṅgadeva, op.cit. loc.cit.
   Haripāladeva, c.1175, *Saṅgītasudhākara*, 1.2.16-17.
   Sudhākalaśa, c.1350, *Saṅgītopanisat-sāroddhāra*, 1.4.
   Rāmāmātya, 1550, *Svaramelakalānidhi*, 1.24.
   Puṇḍarīkaviṭṭhala, c.1550, *Sadrāgacandrodaya*, 1.7.
   Tulaja, c.1730, *Saṅgītasārāmṛta*, 1.19.
9. Leonov, Leonid, cit. Bat.L: *Leonid Leonov on Writing: Conversations with the Writer*: Voprosy Literaturi, 1960, Moscow, 1960.
10. Myaskinov, Alexander, op.cit. p.201.

11. Ibid. p.202.
12. Ibid. p.206.
13. Martynov, Leonid, 1957, Meeting of Poets in Rome, cit. Myaskinov, Alexander, op.cit. p.206.
14. Kallinātha, op.cit. on op.cit. 2.2.159-160, pp.114-116; 4.314-316, pp.336-342; 6.261-262, pp.139-142.
15. Sathyanarayana, R., a) 'Karnataka Music: A Synoptic Survey' in *Aspects of Indian Music*, pp.37-39, 46-49: Sangeet Natak Akademi, New Delhi, 1987.
b. idhem. *Karnāṭakadalli Kalegaḷu, Saṅgīta*, pt.1, pp.54-58, 64-70.
c. idhem. *Karnāṭakasaṅgītavāhini*, pp.63-65, 268-271, etc.
16. Idhem. vide 15(a), pp.57-65.
17. Yakhtangov, Y, 1959, Materials and Articles, passim.
18. Ibid. pp.246, 166, 240-242.
19. Mussorgsky, cit. Myaskinov, Alexander, op.cit, inter alia.
20. Anastasyev, A., *Tradition and Innovation*, inter alia.
21. Lenin, 1967, *Literature and Art*, p.603.
22. Prokofiev, Sergei, cit. Morozov, cit. Myaskinov, op.cit.
23. Yarustovsky, B., *Notes on Music*, pp.287-288.
24. Matarṅga, Bṛhad-deśī, 13, p.2.
25. Ibid. p.59.
26. Ibid. pp.149 et seq.
27. Kallinātha, op.cit. on op.cit.4.314-316, pp.336-342.
28. Śārṅgadeva, op.cit.1.1.30.