

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

DEPARTMENTAL FORMAT APPROVAL

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE FORMAT AND QUALITY OF PRESENTATION OF THE
THESIS SUBMITTED BY Richard Kent Wolf AS ONE OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF Master of Music
IS ACCEPTABLE TO THE School of Music.
(Full Name of Department, Division or Unit)

April 4, 1989
Date of Approval

Barbara J. Mullinger
Departmental Representative

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

APRIL 1989

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS BY

RICHARD KENT WOLF

ENTITLED INNOVATION, INTERPRETATION, AND THE MAINTENANCE

OF TRADITION IN THE KARAIKKUDI STYLE OF VINA PLAYING

BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF MUSIC

Charles Casper

Director of Thesis Research

Jim V. Thross

Head of Department

Committee on Final Examination†

Chairperson

† Required for doctor's degree but not for master's.

© Copyright by
Richard Kent Wolf
1989

INNOVATION, INTERPRETATION, AND
THE MAINTENANCE OF TRADITION IN THE
KARAIKKUDI STYLE OF VINA PLAYING

BY

RICHARD KENT WOLF

B.A., Oberlin College, 1984

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Music
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1989

Urbana, Illinois

This Thesis is Dedicated to
"guruji"
the Late
Karaikkudi Veenai Lakshmi Ammal

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The generosity and efforts of numerous people have contributed to the completion of this work. Foremost among those who have helped me are my teachers, Karaikkudi Smt. Veenai Lakshmi Ammal and Smt. Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, and I must also thank all the musicians who allowed me to record and interview them, including Smt.-s Raajeswari Padmanabhan, Srividya Chandramouli, Sashikala Suryanarayana, Sugantha Sridharan, Karaikkudi Meenakshi Ammal, Karaikkudi Sankari Ammal, R. Sheela, V. Shanti, S. Mallika, and S. Sharmila. I owe deep thanks to my advisor Professor Charles Capwell for his tireless assistance and suggestions for preparing this thesis. Paul Butler, John Nelson, and David Reck have all been generous enough to share their own recordings and other research material as well as to discuss their own experiences as students of the *viṇā* in the Karaikkudi style. The research for this thesis was supported, in part, by two grants from Rāga-Mālā Performing Arts of Canada and funding from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. I would also like to thank Professor T. Viswanathan, Professor K. S. Subramanian, Professor Bruno Nettl, R. Srinivasa Gopal, Professor G. Ramamurthy, and Mrs. Kamala Ramamurthy, D. Samuel Sudanandha, D. K. Narayana Iyer, N. Chandramouli, Michael Nixon, Professor Joan Erdman, Melinda Russell, Carol Babiracki, and David Buck for the help they provided in the completion of this project. Finally I would like to thank my parents, David and Claire Krantz, for their encouragement in the years it took to complete this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
List of symbols	vii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction: Background of the author.	1
1.2 Terminology	6
1.2.1 Defining style	6
1.2.2 <i>pāṇi</i> , <i>vali</i> , and <i>palakkam</i>	7
1.2.3 <i>gharāna</i> , <i>bāj</i>	9
1.2.4 <i>pāṭhāntara</i> , <i>paramparā</i>	12
1.3 Other studies	14
2. The Karaikkudi Style	17
2.1 Members of the Karaikkudi style	17
2.1.1 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan.	25
2.1.2 Raajeswari Padmanabhan	27
2.2 The style represented by Sambasiva Iyer	29
2.2.1 Technique.	29
2.2.2 Training	37
2.2.2.1 Musical materials: Exercises and composi- tions used for initial musical training	38
2.2.2.2 Manner of teaching.	40
2.2.3 Compositions	43
2.2.4 Innovations.	44
2.2.4.1 Organological: Innovations on the <i>viṇā</i> itself.	44
2.2.4.2 <i>sāṅgati-s</i>	46
2.2.4.3 <i>cittasvara-s</i>	54
2.3 Implicit and subtle markers of style.	63
2.3.1 Body motion.	63
2.3.2 Tempo.	65
2.3.3 Interest in rhythm	67
2.3.4 Techniques eschewed or rare.	70
2.3.5 "note"-s ending on <i>madhyama</i>	73
2.3.6 Borrowing.	75
2.3.7 Relationship to audience	77
2.3.8 Domains of individual expression	78
2.4 <i>śakti</i>	79
2.4.1 Restrictions placed on women	79
2.4.2 Iconography and mythology.	84
2.4.3 Sambasiva Iyer and worship of the goddess.	85
2.5 Basic lessons as models for style	87
2.6 Complementarity between the brothers.	90
2.7 Other styles.	93
2.7.1 Dhanammal style.	93
2.7.2 Mysore school.	95
2.7.3 Andhra school.	97

2.7.4	Trivandrum school.	99
2.7.5	Balachander.	100
3.	Change and Development	103
3.1	Values.	103
3.1.1	Religious.	103
3.1.2	Talking about music, research, and theory.	106
3.1.3	Transmission	108
3.1.3.1	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan	108
3.1.3.2	Raajeswari Padmanabhan.	109
3.1.3.3	Lakshmi Ammal	110
3.1.3.4	Revitalization.	112
3.2	Repertoire.	114
3.2.1	"Old" repertoire	114
3.2.1.1	" <i>padavini</i> ": An example of stability and change	115
3.2.1.2	Dropping repertoire	128
3.2.2	New repertoire	129
3.2.2.1	Composing	130
3.2.2.2	Learning new songs.	131
3.2.2.2.1	Maintaining <i>pāṭhāntara</i>	131
3.2.2.2.2	Developing <i>saṅgati</i> -s	136
3.3	Rendition	138
3.3.1	<i>kalpita saṅgita</i>	138
3.3.1.1	Variation by replacement of <i>gamaka</i>	139
3.3.1.2	Variation by replacement of <i>prayōga</i>	147
3.3.1.3	Variation by replacement of <i>saṅgati</i>	151
3.3.1.4	Variation by adding new <i>saṅgati</i> -s	154
3.3.1.5	Other insertions.	168
3.3.1.6	Summary	170
3.3.2	<i>manodharma saṅgita</i>	172
3.3.2.1	Extension and embellishment of phrase ideas	172
3.3.2.2	Fixed patterns.	182
3.3.2.3	Individual habits	185
3.4	Techniques.	190
3.5	Factors promoting style change.	197
3.5.1	Changes in audiences	198
3.5.2	Changes in teaching of music: Time and institutions.	203
3.5.3	Role of family in 20th-century musicianship.	208
3.5.4	Media: Radio and recordings.	212
3.6	Conclusions	215
Appendix I:	Basic exercises for <i>vīṇā</i>	221
Appendix II:	Compositions	224
Appendix III:	Analytical index of taped examples.	230
Glossary.	256
References.	264
Index	275

List of symbols

All Indian terms are transliterated according to the Library of Congress system except the vowel *ṛ*, which is transcribed *ṛi*. Tamil and Telugu terms borrowed from Sanskrit are transliterated according to the Sanskrit spelling. Languages from which most terms are transliterated are provided in the glossary.

Musical transcriptions consist of Indian *sargam* syllables, *s r g m p d n ś*, and notations for the *tāla*. The *sama* is indicated by "//" and each *ghāta* beat is indicated by "/". Rather than adopting the south Indian convention of indicating *kārvai*-s with semi-colons, commas, and periods, I have indicated the smallest rhythmic subdivisions (usually *akṣarakāla*-s) of each *kārvai* with periods only. Unless otherwise explained, ">" indicates right hand finger plucks in transcriptions of *vīṇā* performances. *svara*-s in octaves below the main octave appear as *sargam* syllables with dots below them, and those in octaves above the main octave appear with dots above them. "av" is an abbreviation for *āvarta*; "ak" is an abbreviation for *akṣara*; and "akk" is an abbreviation for *akṣarakāla*.

1. Introduction

This thesis is a study of how musical style is transmitted, developed, and/or changed by members of the Karaikkudi style of *viṇā* playing. In south India, musical styles involve such features as values pertaining to the performance of music as well as religious behavior and aspects of musical sound. Because each musician in the Karaikkudi style has a different understanding of how the past is to be linked to the present in a "traditional" performance, attention will be devoted to explaining how such musicians reconcile their innovations within the context of the Karaikkudi style.

The text is organized into three parts: the first is an introduction containing a discussion of the author's background and motivation to carry out this study, a consideration of terminology for style used by Indian musicians, and a brief mention of the pertinent literature on style in south Indian music. The second part of the text is a description of the history of the style and its members, and the third is an analysis of how the style has changed and/or developed.

Because the questions posed and the interpretations in this thesis ultimately derive from my personal background and experiences in south India I will begin by briefly discussing how I came in contact with the field, why I decided to research this topic, the extent of my training in south Indian music, and the limitations of this work.

1.1 Introduction: Background of the author

I first came into contact with the classical music of south India during my first year of undergraduate studies at Oberlin College where I was concentrating in the fields of Mathematics and Music. My eventual decision to learn the south Indian *viṇā* was perhaps influenced by my interest at the

time in classical and rock guitar and in the renaissance lute.

In the fall of 1980 the flutist T. Viswanathan and the *mṛidaṅgam* player Ramnad V. Raghavan gave a concert at Oberlin which I attended and which stimulated me to learn *mṛidaṅgam* from Raghavan, who lived in nearby Cleveland. Over the next two years my general interest in Indian music increased and shaped the way I would improvise and compose on the guitar; in addition, the complex rhythmic patterns in my drum lessons dovetailed nicely with my interest in mathematics. Despite the creative stimulation provided by lessons with Raghavan, I felt weekly lessons could not provide sufficient understanding of Indian music and searched for a program that would allow me to spend my junior year in India.

The University of Wisconsin Year in India Program, enabled me to spend ten months of the following academic year (1982-83) in the southern Indian city of Madurai. Although I had come to India with plans to study the *viṇā*, having listened to it on recordings in the U.S., it was quite by chance that I came in contact with my first teacher, Karaikkudi Veenai Lakshmi Ammal. Lakshmi Ammal was the daughter of a famous musician named Karaikkudi Subbarama Iyer (1883-1936)¹ and the niece of Karaikkudi Sambasiva Iyer (1888-1958), who were together known as the "Karaikkudi brothers" and considered to be among the leading *viṇā* performers of their day. The manner in which they played then, and the way in which their disciples play now, is called the Karaikkudi style, the Karaikkudi *pāṇi*, or the Karaikkudi school of *viṇā* playing.

¹R. Rangaramanuja Ayyangar (1972, pl. 17) gives dates as (1883-1938), this is followed by Subramanian (1986, 15 and 24). According to Lakshmi Ammal's husband, this is not correct; 1936 is the date of Subbarama Iyer's death; Subramanian now concurs (Narayana Iyer 1988, pers. com.).

Karaikkudi Lakshmi Ammal initially treated me with rather cool scepticism and rarely gave praise, and because she taught me quite slowly, it took about four months for me to finish the basic exercises on the *viṇā* and to begin learning the basic compositions for the instrument.² As I was learning these, I discontinued lessons on the *mṛidaṅgam*, which I had begun with D. Srinivasa Iyengar,³ because I felt my lessons lacked rigor, and because I wished to concentrate on learning to play the *viṇā*.

Although one initially learns *karṇāṭaka saṅgīta* by imitation and rote memorization, I found the music difficult to imitate and memorize because Lakshmi Ammal would play particular phrases differently from previous renditions, or would omit them or replace them with different phrases--not only from day to day, but even within particular lessons. My frustration at this particular level of learning forced me to think about how these phrases related to one another. Eventually I began to consider how the patterns of variation I observed might relate to performance style and how various interpretations of a composition or of any unit of musical meaning can fall under the category of a particular style.

Pursuing this interest in style I began to pay attention both to differences between styles and to the diversity within styles of south Indian musical performance, and tried to learn as many compositions as I could--these numbered about 10 by the time I left. I returned to Oberlin to

²Though I thought this was a long time, Lakshmi Ammal had compressed the lessons for me since I was a foreign student. Some Indian students are said to remain at this level for as long as five years. Great musicians of south Indian music may practice these lessons every day of their lives as musicians.

³D. Srinivasa Iyengar was the teacher of the late Emmons E. White, author of *Appreciating India's Music*. A picture of Iyengar appears on page 36 of this book (1971).

complete my math degree the next year but pursued ethnomusicology and *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* as primary interests. In December 1984 I returned to Madurai, where I remained for the next 14 months. During this period I began taking vocal lessons from Kamala Ramamurthy, a disciple of T. M. Tyagarajan. Singing lessons with Mrs. Ramamurthy provided me fluency not only in the musical language but also in the theoretical system since she had studied music in a music college as well as privately.

In August of 1985 Lakshmi Ammal died. After about a month of not taking lessons I began to commute regularly to Karaikkudi (a 2½ hour bus ride) for lessons with K. Sugantha (a relative of Lakshmi Ammal's who was about 28 at the time) and to Madras (an overnight train ride) for lessons with Ranganayaki Rajagopalan. I had previously begun lessons with Ranganayaki whenever I happened to be in Madras. Ranganayaki, who studied with Sambasiva Iyer for over 20 years and performed with him regularly, is his senior disciple. My interest in the continuity and change within the Karaikkudi style was further stimulated by the apparent gulf between the playing style of Lakshmi Ammal and Ranganayaki.

To give an approximate idea of how much time I spent with each of my *viṇā* teachers, I have prepared the table below:

<u># of hours</u>	<u>Name of teacher</u>	<u>Teacher's teacher & rel.</u>
300	Lakshmi Ammal	Subbarama Iyer (vocal), father
50	Sashikala Suryanarayanan	Lakshmi Ammal, mother
85	Sugantha Sridharan	Lakshmi Ammal, great aunt

<u># of hours</u>	<u>Name of teacher</u>	<u>Teacher's teacher & rel.</u>
20	K.S. Subramanian	Lakshmi Ammal, ⁴ mother Sambasiva Iyer, ⁵ adopted father Ranganayaki Rajagopalan Raajeswari Padmanabhan, sister
15	V. Shanti	Lakshmi Ammal, grandmother
150	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan	Sambasiva Iyer
5	Raajeswari Padmanabhan	Lakshmi Ammal, ⁶ mother Sambasiva Iyer, granduncle

On my most recent trip to India, in Dec/Jan of 1987/88, I met with my teachers and other musicians to discuss some of the ideas I had developed since leaving India, learned new compositions, and recorded the playing of Lakshmi Ammal's former students to provide reference for comparing their playing in the future.

Limitations of this study

Although I studied Tamil for three years as well as some Telugu, my limited language competence has limited some of my inquiries. I was able partly to overcome this limitation by employing research assistants for formal interviews and partly by working through my teachers' relatives in English. My initial unfamiliarity with Tamil did not hinder my learning the *viṇā* because *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* is usually taught without speaking and, since my lack of fluency in Tamil prevented me from asking questions, I concentrated on learning the fundamentals. In this way, without my awareness, I

⁴She seldom gave lessons to him directly, but his first teacher was his mother by virtue of growing up in that household.

⁵For one year, before Sambasiva Iyer's death

⁶Up to the age of five.

was a little bit closer to a "traditional" setting in which the disciple does not ask questions.

My analyses are based both on my experience learning the pieces to be discussed and on analysis of cassette recordings made in India by myself and others. Because of the inherent limitations of relying on such recordings, I have attempted to consult as many recordings and versions of a piece as possible. Of the Karaikkudi style alone, my pool of recorded examples contains about 150 hours of performances, half of which are radio or live concerts. Commercial recordings and another 150 hours of concert tapes make up the example pool of other styles consulted.

Finally, although I am limited by my own abilities to create within the tradition, I have learned approximately 80 compositions and have some ability to work within the various improvisational forms. And because I have acquired enough technical competence to reproduce nearly all the gestures in the style, I can both determine how each detail is produced when I hear it on tape and describe it reliably in the context of this thesis.

1.2 Terminology

1.2.1 Defining style

One of the first issues to be resolved in finding a working definition (if it is indeed possible) for style, is how to select and understand the words musicians generally use to denote style. The terms discussed below, which include those used by my teachers and those commonly discussed in scholarship about music, are complicated by the sometimes loose and contradictory ways in which they are used. In addition to the English word style, ubiquitous in south Indian rhetoric about music, relevant terms in Tamil, Telugu, and Sanskrit include *pāṇi*, *vali*, *palakkam*, *gharāna*, *bāj*,

paramparā, and *pāṭhāntara*. Let us now consider each of these words in turn.

1.2.2 *pāṇi*, *vali*, and *palakkam*

An examination of the word *pāṇi*, defined by Sambamoorthy (1952, 39) as, "the characteristic style of singing or performing associated with a particular singer or instrumentalist," is a logical beginning for a discussion of indigenous terms contributing to the meaning of style. According to the *Tamil Lexicon*, *pāṇi* is derived from the Urdu *bānī*, and means "style, manner, or peculiarity." Renowned musicians have interpreted *pāṇi* as "path" or "*mārga*"⁷ (Balasubramanyam 1955, 17), or *vali* (Sambasiva Iyer 1953, 18). Although Sambamoorthy conceives of *pāṇi* in terms of technical and performing aspects of music, other musicians and scholars evidently use the term to refer to aspects that extend beyond the music itself.

vali is an etymologically Tamil word which means "manner, method, or mode" in the context of musical style (University of Madras 1982), but, the broad definitions of the term reveal deeper meanings. For example the meanings "a path," "a road," "a way"; "a way in a moral sense"; and "antiquity, or oldness" reflect the traditional attitudes toward cultural institutions in India. A style of music is taught by one's guru; it is seen metaphorically as a "path" to the divine and as a way to fulfill one's *dharma* through right conduct, that is, "way in a moral sense"; and it is in many cases seen to be or claimed to be old. In these broad senses, the term *vali* parallels the term *mārga saṅgīta* found in Sanskrit treatises in reference to classical music.

palakkam means "initiation, training, exercise, use" or "habit, prac-

⁷Sanskrit meaning "a way, manner, method, custom, usage" "the right way, proper course" "a high (opp. to 'vulgar') style of acting or singing or dancing" (Monier-Williams [1899]1979, 812).

tice, custom" (University of Madras 1982, 2544). Karaikkudi Lakshmi Ammal (my teacher) used this word in the context of explaining what was permissible in her *viṇā* style. For example, she used to say that in her *palakkam* one does not allow the instrument to slide along the floor or to tilt back and forth while playing.

The three terms reveal different aspects of style in south India: style is a way or manner in which something (in this case music) is carried out, adherence to which is considered of value, and learning it involves a particular kind of training and initiation. Applied to style in music, these terms can take on, but are certainly not limited to, purely technical meanings. In fact, the old way of transmitting traditional knowledge from *guru* to *śiṣya* (pupil; disciple) almost precludes the possibility of learning how to produce music from the *viṇā* without being exposed to the master's own attitudes, prejudices, quirks, and habits.

The music master's (*guru*'s) attitudes can include the very notion of what constitutes style, making an external analytic description of style in south India rather problematic. An example of this kind of problem lies in the several senses or degrees of breadth in which the term *pāṇi* is used. It can be used to describe traits of individual musicians, to distinguish particular "schools" or "styles" in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta*, and to distinguish south Indian music from Maharashtrian and north Indian music. The *karnāṭaka pāṇi*, according to the late T. R. Mahalingam (1985, 39)⁸, "can mean that which reflects the soil of the South . . . It should reflect that which is peculiarly South Indian, the characteristic make-up of the people populating

⁸It should be noted that this was written when he was only 16 years old. This may not have reflected Mahalingam's thoughts as a mature artist.

the South." In a similar vein, Sambasiva Iyer (1953, 18) states that the "*karnāṭaka, hīntustāni and mahārāṣṭira*" *pāṇi*-s should not be mixed.

This multi-level conception of *pāṇi* is reflected even within an individual's notion of the term, as reflected above by Sambasiva Iyer. Mahalingam (1985, 39) addresses the multi-leveled aspect directly,

This idea now affords us a way of stating what *bani* is. To call it style will be insufficient. *Bani* is style plus something. Style is that which reflects the personality component, if I may so put it, while *bani* is that which reflects the context component. Style is the peculiarity of the individual, while *bani* is the peculiarity of the Universal of which the individual is a part. Considered in this light, *bani* admits of a variety of classes depending on the concept and degree of universality [emphasis mine].

Bonnie Wade discusses the analogous levels of style in *khyāl gharāna*-s in her book *Khyāl* (1984a, 5),

A *khyal* singer must demonstrate in each performance that he or she understands and controls the generalized genre of *khyal*, and more particularly *khyal* in the style of his or her *gharāna*, and that he or she can show personal creativity, imagination, and skill that is demanded of every performance.

The book outlines how various musicians and *gharāna*-s can be described in terms of these three levels. While Wade treats primarily the musical aspect of *gharāna*, the definitions and treatment of *gharāna* in north India are every bit as confusing and complex as the definitions of *pāṇi* in the south.

1.2.3 *gharāna, bāj*

Daniel Neuman's (1980, 145-67) discussion of *gharāna* has served as a point of departure for subsequent scholarship concerning this topic. Two aspects of his discussion are pertinent here, the definition of *gharāna*, and the authority of *gharāna* to determine what is authentic.

Neuman lists the three criteria necessary to establish a musical tradi-

tion as a *gharāna*, "a lineage of hereditary musicians, their disciples, and the particular musical style they represent" (1980, 146).⁹ Recent discussion has centered on the exact nature of this "particular musical style." In instrumental traditions, Neuman de-emphasizes the role of musical style in differentiating *gharāna*-s.¹⁰

In vocal genres, Neuman traces *gharāna* back to four "pre-existent styles," which are called "banis" or "vanis." Unlike the many views on what constitutes a *pāṇi* in the south, Neuman's view is that "Banis could be described entirely in musical terms as pure style, without reference to individuals or lineages." The connection between *gharāna*-s and these "banis" is in part responsible for the stylistic authority of the *gharāna*. As he puts it,

Representatives of today's gharanas are said still to manifest stylistic elements traceable to one of these four banis . . . In most cases, however, the details of possible connections to particular banis are less important than the fact that banis at one time existed and thereby provide a conceptual link to verify the idea of stylistic ancestry, in other words a tradition (1980, 148).

The issue of stylistic authority refers to the degree to which *gharāna*, as an institution, has the ultimate authority to prescribe what is authentic. As Neuman writes:

Seen in a more general light, the question of authority is wedded

⁹Wade (1979, 176) cites Deshpande (1973, 11) in this regard, writing 'A musical tradition is generally considered "of a *gharānā*" when at least three successive generations of able musicians have pursued a distinctive style of singing.'

¹⁰This is the attitude that seemed to prevail in his comments following the session entitled "The concept of *gharāna* in instrumental traditions of North India" at the Ann Arbor national meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology. In his paper, however, he argued for a fundamental distinction between vocal and instrumental *gharāna*-s, the latter lacking cohesiveness as a stylistic school.

to the definition and salience of tradition and the role of pedigrees as the embodiment of tradition. This is a problem which one readily recognizes as not limited to music culture alone; it speaks to the whole question of the place of tradition in any contemporary society.

An analogous situation in south India is the tendency of musicians to ally themselves with recognized styles and respected musicians, even if they have not learned within those styles or from those musicians. This process of legitimation contributes to the formation of what has been called "invented tradition,"¹¹ a phenomenon by no means unique in the history of cultures. The question of stylistic authority is also pertinent to understanding the role of the *guru*, and the role the family member vis-à-vis the non-family member in a given style.

Although the specific attributes of *gharāna* make it different from any institution that operates in south India, the fact that *gharāna* is manifested both in social and musical terms suggests that Indian classical musicians in general (if it is reasonable to speak about a South Asian musical culture complex) conceive of musical traditions in more than purely musical terms.

The term *bāj* refers to the playing styles and techniques of musical performance traditions. The term is applied to accompaniment, usually by tabla players, since the term derives from the verb *bājna*, "to hit or beat" (Neuman 1980, 120); but, it also applies to sitarists and sarodists. It is interesting to note that instrumentalists, and especially accompanists, are grouped together according to *bāj*; it is a point of debate whether accompa-

¹¹"a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behavior by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. In fact, where possible, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a suitable historical past" (Hobsbawm 1983, 1).

nists form actual *gharāna*-s.

Lineage is a feature essential to *gharāna* but, at least in theory, not essential to either north Indian *bāj* or south Indian *pāṇi*. In practice, however, members of both *bāj* and *pāṇi* will claim either blood descent or a direct line of discipleship from a major figure of the past. In order to address the connection between lineage and style we will need to examine the descent of traditional compositions and the lineage of the musicians.

1.2.4 *pāṭhāntara*, *paramparā*

Closely wedded to the idea of individual musical traditions within the larger sphere of *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* is the notion of history, or of handing something down from previous generations. *paramparā*, in this context, refers to the succession of disciples within a given tradition.¹² The phrase *guru-śiṣya paramparā*, meaning roughly "master-student tradition," is commonly used in India to denote the traditional means through which knowledge is passed from one generation to the next. Knowledge, in this context, may be as down-to-earth as knowledge of a craft or trade, or as lofty as the kind of knowledge associated with the study of classic Hindu texts. Because music represents both a craft and a knowledge of higher spiritual order, the teaching of music requires many levels of communication.

The traditional method of teaching, called *gurukula vāsa* ("living in the teacher's house"), ensures that the disciple is exposed to every detail of his or her master's way of life. Through this method of teaching, the disciple learns not only music but also such things as daily routines of ritual conduct, rules for moral conduct, and even peculiar ways of padlock-

¹². A Sanskrit term meaning "an uninterrupted row or series, order, succession, continuation, mediation, tradition" (Monier-Williams [1899]1979, 587), or "lineage" (Rangaramanuja Ayyangar 1972, CLi).

ing a door.¹³ Disciples may not become aware of the significance of such types of ritual, social, and other information until they have grown older.

paramparā provides another example of how musical and non-musical (or not directly musical) aspects of training and tradition are grouped together in the minds of Indian musicians and society as a whole. While the terms *pāṇi* and *gharāna* refer, in a sense, to the traditions themselves, the term *paramparā* refers to the institution of maintaining those traditions through lines of discipleship.

At one time, in south India especially, *pāṇi*-s could be distinguished in part by the repertoire which they controlled. Sometimes the *paramparā* of those who sang a particular song could be traced back to the composer. The descent of the composition itself is called *pāṭhāntara*; the term also means repertoire (Sambamoorthy 1973, 327).¹⁴ So one can at times distinguish the style of a composition as dictated by its history or descent (its *pāṭh-āntara*), from the style in which it is rendered, which is dependant on the *paramparā* and *pāṇi* of the musician who performs it.

Each of these aspects of music tradition in India can be used to construct a working vocabulary for discussing style. Each of the above mentioned terms brings into play many of the extra-musical features that are transmitted as a tradition is passed down. Although the remainder of this thesis does not require the use of many such terms directly, the aspects of

¹³These three examples of possibilities for learned behavior are carefully chosen; in one way or another each of them have been mentioned by students of Sambasiva Iyer as routines or lessons learned from being in contact with him.

¹⁴The Tamil Lexicon (University of Madras 1982) gives the meaning "variant reading." The Sanskrit (Monier-Williams [1899]1979)) derivation *pāṭha* (recitation, study, text) plus *āntara* (interior), yields the sense of the word as [knowing] the inside of the text.

style in south Indian music they reflect serve as points for departure in my discussion of the Karaikkudi style.

1.3 Other studies

The doctoral thesis by K.S. Subramanian entitled "South Indian Vina Tradition and Individual Style" is the work most closely related to this study. He juxtaposes the Karaikkudi *viṇā* style as played by Sambasiva Iyer and himself with that of the Mysore style, as played by Doraisamy Iyengar, using the vocal model of T. Viswanathan as a control; two compositions, *viribhōṇi* and *śaṅkarinīvēyani*, are analyzed in detail. The main strengths in this thesis are the detailed descriptions of the techniques used in the Karaikkudi style. Subramanian's own membership in the Karaikkudi family and tradition seems to have prevented him from taking a closer look at the diversity within his own style and critically examining it.

David Reck, in "A Musician's Tool-Kit: A Study of Five Performances by Thirugokarnam Ramachandra Iyer," describes an individual musician's "bag of tricks" and relates this musician's processes of improvisation to those discussed in Albert Lord's study of epic story telling, *A Singer of Tales*. Ramachandra Iyer is a player within the Karaikkudi Style. Reck's intention was to study a lesser known performer, not a famous artist, and the focus of his attention was given to analysis of five performances of a composition, *sarasīruhā*, for which the Karaikkudi school is famous.

T. Viswanathan's "rāga ālāpana in South Indian Music" provides an analysis of *rāga ālāpana* in five different styles of vocal performance. His approach highlights the structural similarity among all styles in the *kar-ṇāṭaka* tradition. This is an important foundation for any study of the dif-

ferences among styles.¹⁵ Certain points within his thesis are important for my study. He mentions, for example, particular musical gestures within *ālāpana* that are associated with particular artists. Such gestures are also one of the components of a musician's "tool-kit" as described by Reck. Another approach in Viswanathan's study is a detailed examination of how particular structural sections of *ālāpana* are expanded or contracted.

As Viswanathan dealt with *ālāpana* analytically and historically, so does Amy Catlin deal with the *kṛiti* form historically and analytically in "Variability and Change in Three Karnataka Kṛiti-s: A Study of South Indian Classical Music." Her thesis is that the core identity of a *kṛiti* remains stable, though the surface is subject to change. This might be one way of looking at playing style on the *viṇā*, but it is difficult if not impossible to distinguish the "core" from the "surface," for this varies from musician to musician.¹⁶ In the course of her thesis, Catlin describes the role of various musicians in changing the "surface" of compositions.

The four studies mentioned above deal with the general concept of style (in relation to the musical product) in different ways. Subramanian's thesis juxtaposes *viṇā* and vocal styles, as well as Karaikkudi and Mysore styles. Reck's thesis examines style as internally defined by one man. Viswanathan looks at the pan-traditional structure of *ālāpana* style. Catlin uses the *kṛiti* as the unit in analyzing musical style. 'Style' has a different meaning in each of these contexts, and yet certain broad principles

¹⁵Here I am referring to the musical product aspect of style; Viswanathan does not deal with the social, economic or other aspects I consider, except with respect to the changing needs for teaching *rāga ālāpana*.

¹⁶The distinction between "surface" and "core" is questionable even in the context of the *kṛiti*.

and processes link each context together; I will draw on all these contexts in a discussion of the Karaikkudi style.

2. The Karaikkudi Style

The Karaikkudi style and styles in general are always changing. Because the purpose of this chapter is to establish a point of reference to discuss these changes, the first section of this chapter (2.1) will introduce the style and some of its members and the second two sections (2.2-2.3) will be a description of the Karaikkudi style as it appears to have been at the time of Sambasiva Iyer--although it will occasionally be necessary to draw on examples from present day practice. The next three sections (2.4-2.6) deal with specific issues in the Karaikkudi style, and the last section (2.7) is a brief survey of other prominent *viṇā* styles provided for the sake of contrast.

2.1 Members of the Karaikkudi style

K. S. Subramanian (1986, 226) has traced the names of those who belong to what is now known as the Karaikkudi style to what is believed to be the third generation of *viṇā* playing members of his family and estimates they lived in 1750.¹⁷ Subramanian's father, D.K. Narayana Iyer (who presumably got the information from his wife, Lakshmi Ammal, from her father, Subbarama Iyer, and from her uncle, Sambasiva Iyer) prepared a family history written from the point of view of his wife, Lakshmi Ammal, that confirms these names but provides no dates.¹⁸

1st generation: unknown

¹⁷I have found no records to confirm or contradict the dates Subramanian, in his genealogical chart, appears to have estimated by successively subtracting thirty years from the dates of each generation preceding Subbarama Iyer (1875-1936).

¹⁸I have provided a transliteration of the Tamil spellings for the names of the musicians preceding the Karaikkudi brothers (as they appear in Narayana Iyer's genealogy) since no standardized romanization of these names is found in the literature for these particular artists.

2nd generation: unknown

3rd generation: *malaiyappayyar* (c.1750)

4th generation: *veṅkaṭisvarayyar* (c. 1780)

5th generation: *cupparāmayyar* (c. 1810)¹⁹

6th generation: *cuppiramaṇiyayyar* (c.1840)

[who was also known, perhaps informally, by the shorter name *cuppayyavayyar*]

7th generation: Subbarama Iyer (1875-1936)

Sambasiva Iyer (1888-1958)

8th generation: Daughters of Subbarama Iyer who play *viṇā*:

1. Lakshmi Ammal (1918-1985)
2. Sankari Ammal (born c.1926)
3. Meenakshi Ammal (born c.1926)

Disciples of Subbarama Iyer

1. Lakshmi Ammal (vocal only)
2. Sankari Ammal
3. Meenakshi Ammal
4. Gomathy Sankara Iyer (study: 1928-30)²⁰

Disciples of Sambasiva Iyer

1. Ranganayaki Rajagopalan (b.1932) [study:1938-50]²¹
2. Raajeswari Padmanabhan (b.1939)[study:1945-55]

¹⁹That Subramanian lists *cupparāmayyar* as "Subbaraya" and notes that one "Subbaraya" was a court musician in Pudukkottah (*putukkottai*) raises the question of what is the correct name and whether "Subbaraya" or *cupparāmayyar* was mentioned as a *viṇā* player in "Pudukkottah" (*putukkottai*) in Subramanian's source--which he does not provide (1986, 15). Even if "Subbaraya" is an informal name for *cupparāmayyar*, or if Narayana Iyer has made an error in his genealogy, it is still necessary to link this particular family member to the man mentioned in Subramanian's source with evidence more substantial than a name.

²⁰A musicologist who trained G.N. Dandapani Iyer and R. Pitchumani Iyer, two *viṇā* artists who live in Madras (Subramanian 1986, 228)--neither of whom are considered Karaikkudi *viṇā* players. Although Gomathy Sankara studied with Subbarama Iyer, he is not, strictly speaking, considered his disciple.

²¹These dates, which Subramanian presumably obtained from Ranganayaki, probably refer to the period in which she took lessons on the *viṇā*, for her musical training began at the age of three with vocal lessons, and because Ranganayaki performed with Sambasiva Iyer until his death in 1958, it spanned over 20 years.

Other Students of Sambasiva Iyer²²

1. K.S. Subramanian (b.1944) adoptive son of Sambasiva Iyer [study:1957-58]
2. Tirugokarnam Ramachandra Iyer (b.1919) [study:1938-41]
3. Mysore T.N. Ramaswamy Sastri (1926-78) [study:1941-58 intermittently]
4. Devakottai Narayana Iyengar (1905-?) [study: 1922-25?]

9th generation:Children of Lakshmi Ammal who play *viṇā*

1. Raajeswari Padmanabhan
2. K.S. Subramanian
3. N. Chandramouli
4. Sasikala Suryanarayanan

Children of Sankari Ammal

1. Kamala
2. Vasantha
3. Jayalakshmi
4. Lakshmi

Children of Meenakshi Ammal

1. Rajalakshmi

Disciples of Lakshmi Ammal²³

1. S. Mallika (distant relative)
2. Sugantha Sridharan (granddaughter of Lakshmi Ammal's oldest sister, Subbalakshmi)
3. V. Shanti (granddaughter)

10th generation:

1. Sri Vidya (daughter of Raajeswari)
2. V. Shanti (daughter of Venkataraman, eldest son of Lakshmi Ammal)
3. Granddaughters of Sankari and Meenakshi

The lines of discipleship listed above provide historical reference for discussing the circumstances under which the Karaikkudi brothers became famous and several anecdotes reflecting their attitudes toward music.²⁴

²²Sambasiva Iyer distinguished between students and disciples, naming only Ranganayaki and Raajeswari to be disciples (Subramanian 1986, 228) because they studied from early age, because they studied with no one else before him, and because they were given the responsibility to carry on the tradition.

²³Subramanian (1986, 228) concludes his genealogy with his own generation.

²⁴Subramanian (1986, 15-28) other bibliographical entries under "Karaikkudi Brothers" provide many details that will not be repeated here.

Although their family ancestors had resided in and near the court cities of Sivaganga and Pudukkottai for generations, the Karaikkudi school of *viṇā* playing gets its name from the town in which the two brothers, Subbarama Iyer and Sambasiva Iyer, established themselves as renowned exponents of the *viṇā*. Born in Tirugokarnam, in 1899 the brothers were invited to live in Madurai after their influence in the princely courts of Pudukkottai (*putuk-kotṭai samastanam*) began to wane,²⁵ and later to Karaikkudi to live in a house donated by a wealthy *ceṭṭiyār* (a mercantile caste) (Subramanian 1986, 18; Sethuraman 1952, 55).

Subbarama, who died in 1936, was possibly the only *viṇā* player of his generation in Tamilnadu to play the *viṇā* in a vertical (*ūrdhva*) position. It is not known, however, whether his father (who was also his teacher) played the *viṇā* in a vertical position, and if so, why Sambasiva Iyer adopted the horizontal (*sampradāya*) posture. Subramanian suggests that if the vertical playing posture was not originally part of the family tradition, it may have been borrowed from Andhra *viṇā* players, or evolved from a tradition of *viṇā* playing in the temple in which the *ūrdhva* position is used (1986, 16). Regardless of their source, the complementary postures the two brothers assumed highlighted their musical roles. In a speech honoring Sambasiva Iyer at the music academy in 1952, Sambasiva Iyer's student and friend S. Sethuraman took the opportunity to reflect on these postures, comparing the *ūrdhva* position, somewhat noble or manly (*pauruṣa*), to the god Siva, and the *sampradāya* position, possessing the quality of gentle-

²⁵Sethuraman (1952, 55) does not explain why the brothers' influence decreased at this time, presumably because Sambasiva Iyer was present at this salutatory. Subramanian (1986, 18) describes this event in the context of the general decline in princely patronage.

ness or good nature (*sātvikam*) to the goddess *śrī śakti*; and combined, Sethuraman likens the brothers to *śakti* (1952, 55), the thrilling effect of which Rangaramanuja Ayyangar recalls:

Through hard work, they acquired perfect mastery over the Veena and dowered it with a tremendous volume so as to reach an audience of 2000 without a microphone. Their music was remarkable for its crispness. The light, swift fingering of the elder was in contrast to the deep, sonorous sweep of the younger. Their Tanam was a feast of sound that thrilled a vast audience into awe and inner glow. They were champions in rhythm and only leading Mridangam players could accompany them without faltering . . . (1972, 273-4).

Not only did the brothers adopt different playing postures but they also differed personally. For example, Subbarama was quite sociable--a skill which undoubtedly aided his managing a large family. Sambasiva Iyer, who was quite reserved and remained childless, was severe and capable of a biting wit (Subramanian 1986, 28; Bhuvarahan 1978, 13). This perception of Sambasiva Iyer, expressed by his students, occasional visitors, and younger members of the family differs from that of his *mṛidaṅgam* player, Muttu Iyer, who describes Sambasiva Iyer as a very sociable man (Muttu Iyer 1970's).

An experience of Lakshmi Ammal's husband D.K. Narayana Iyer illustrates a similarly severe attitude toward both eating and enjoying music. Sambasiva Iyer insisted that both of these activities be conducted in complete silence. Narayana Iyer, while dining with Sambasiva Iyer, recalls disturbing him with the sound of his mastication--the response to which, a piercing glance, Narayana Iyer could never forget. Sambasiva was equally particular about the food he ate, never failing to mention the shortcomings of the food he was served. His fastidious behavior toward both food and music suggests, perhaps, the equally important ritual role each plays in the life of a Brahmin such as Sambasiva Iyer, for whom food in general, the individual

function of each dish, and the processes of preparing food and of making music all emphasize "purity."

The brothers believed that musical understanding was contained in the ability to play music, not in the ability to express music in words.²⁶ As Sambasiva Iyer himself said, "*saṅgīta* is [found] neither in speaking, nor in writing, nor in debate. *saṅgīta* is an art of sound, [and] therefore should not be handled in any other manner."²⁷ Such attitudes, which are common to many performers in India and elsewhere, stem in part from and also may account for the nonverbal manner in which music is taught in India.

Although Sambasiva Iyer felt that words about music were inappropriate means to express musical understanding, he believed it essential to understand the words to the music, the *sāhitya*--which in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* are poetic expressions of *bhakti*, or intense loving devotion for god. This devotional message is highly valued even though the musical form of the *kṛiti*, the most common type of song in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta*, highlights musical elaboration through the use of *saṅgati*-s, or successively elaborated melodies to a line of text. Sambasiva Iyer's views on the importance of understanding these texts are recorded in a summary of his presidential address to the Music Academy:

Declaring that *sāhitya* without *bhakti* and *lakshana*^[28] was like a

²⁶The attitude that musical understanding comes primarily through performance seems to be common among performers of many cultures. Veena Dhanammal is said to have sarcastically commented, "Oh, so they *talk* music do they?" in reference to the founding of the Madras Music Academy (pers. com. Michael Nixon, 1988).

²⁷"*saṅkītam enpatu pēccilūm, eluttilūm, vivahāratilūm illai enputu en-nūtaiya kolkai. saṅkītam oru nāta vītyai, allatu vēru enta vitattilūm kīyālakkūṭātatu*" (Sambasiva Iyer 1953, 15)

²⁸Science or grammar of music (Sambamoorthy 1971, 2)

flower without smell and *saṅgīta* without *bhava*^[29] was mere empty sound, Sri Sambasiva Aiyar advised Vidvans and Students to understand the correct import of the songs before rendering them . . . Vidvan Sambasiva Aiyar said that lack of attention to *lakshana* had led to the creation of new types of *sahityas*. The traditional rendering of pieces had gradually disappeared and artists had come to sing various types of *sahityas* without any discrimination of time or place . . . Ignorance of the meaning might result in the rendering of a composition in a wrong place, which would be considered profane. (Sambasiva Iyer 1953, 10-12).

Although Sambasiva Iyer seems to imply in this passage that he knew the meaning of each and every word of the texts he would perform, his daughters Sankari and Meenakshi explain that he only possessed a general understanding of these texts, which were primarily in Telugu. By knowing words that had cognates with words in Tamil and in Sanskrit he could highlight specific words or phrases in the *saṅgati*-s he created, and by knowing the general mood of the piece he could avoid rendering a composition "in a wrong place." Songs with a sad text, for example, would be considered inauspicious for playing at a wedding.

A context in which the brothers used a composition for its text, *rāga*, and mood is described by S. Sethuraman (1952, 56-7). The Raja of Ramanathapuram, who had invited the brothers to perform at the palace, sat reading a newspaper while the Karaikkudi brothers were playing. In response to this act of rudeness, which was a sign of disrespect to the brothers as well as to the art, they played the *kṛiti rāma-bāṇa* in the *rāga sāvēri*. This *kṛiti*, in which Tyagaraja describes in detail the arrow the Hindu god, Rama, used to kill his demon foe, Ravana, itself serves as a metaphorical "arrow" aimed at the king (Subramanian 1986, n.20). The *rāga sāvēri*, generally associated with taunting or satirical texts (Sambamoorthy 1982d, 174), is an

²⁹"soul of expression in music" (Sambamoorthy 1952, 54)

ideal "bow" to shoot this "arrow." The King, catching this subtle message, dropped the newspaper and remained attentive throughout the rest of the concert.

This anecdote illustrates not only a concern for text and context, but also a rather defiant attitude toward the audience. Sambasiva Iyer felt that the artist's responsibility lay not in pleasing an audience, or his patron, but in serving the goddess through maintaining the purity of his art, and instructed his pupils in such values through indirect means. For example, every night he would ask his adopted son K. S. Subramanian to recite a particular parable in which a man buys a mule and takes it to town each day. While the man was walking alongside the mule, which was packed with goods to be sold at the market, some passers-by remarked, "look at that silly man, walking alongside his mule when he could be riding on it." The man, not to be made a fool of, mounted and began to ride the mule toward town; by and by, some other people passed by saying "oh the poor mule; it has to carry that heavy man in this awful heat." The man began to feel guilty, and as they approached a stream he thought a minute, got off the mule, and put the mule on his own back. While they were crossing the stream they both drowned. Only years later did Subramanian come to realize this parable was Sambasiva Iyer's subtle yet effective way of teaching him not to care about public opinion (Subramanian pers. com. Jan. 1988).

Despite Sambasiva Iyer's indifference to public opinion, he never performed alone while his brother was alive. Shortly after Subbarama Iyer died in 1936 the first of Sambasiva Iyer's two disciples, Ranganayaki, began training with him.

2.1.1 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan

Because Ranganayaki's relatives were close personal friends of Sambasiva Iyer she was often at his house while Sambasiva Iyer played or sang and sometimes Iyer would encourage Ranganayaki's attempts to imitate him. Observing this, her aunt persuaded Sambasiva Iyer to teach Ranganayaki. He began such lessons informally at first, teaching her to sing lessons like *sarali varisai* and asking her to repeat in *sargam* (solfege) melodies he would sing. He began informally because Ranganayaki was only three years old, and because, just as his father had taught him, Sambasiva Iyer wished to develop her *svarajñāna* (sense of pitch, see p. 37). Sambasiva Iyer began teaching Ranganayaki to play the *viṇā*, however, on Vijayādaśami day³⁰ (presumably of 1936, although Subramanian's date of 1938 seems to contradict this) with the *kṛiti*, "entavēḍukondu," first by *svara*-s and then with *sāhitya*.

From that day onward she learned the *viṇā*, starting with *sarali*, and continuing in the traditional order through *otta varisai* (sometimes classified as part of *sarali*), *akāra mīṭu* (playing *sarali* and *otta varisai*-s without plucks analogous to the vocal technique of *akāra*), *jaṇṭa varisai*, *alaṅkāram*, *gītam*, and *varṇam*. Before the age of seven she had learned these lessons and nine *kṛiti*-s taking approximately the following amount of time:

1 year: *sarali varisai*, *otta varisai*

1 year: *jaṇṭa varisai*, *alaṅkāram*

³⁰The night following a nine night festival called *nāvarātri* held in honor of the goddess. On the last day of this festival, the *sarasvati pūja* is performed in which the goddess of learning and music, Saraswati, is worshipped and all books and musical instruments in the house are blessed. Because it is considered auspicious for beginning any new undertaking, music lessons usually commence on the next day, Vijayādaśami day (Jagadisa Ayyar 1982, 135-45).

1½ years: *gītam* (see 2.2.2.1, "musical materials")
varṇam (*śaṅkarābharanam rāga*)
kṛiti-s: (in the following order)
vanajāsana, śrī, rūpaka
*pāhi śrī, ānandabhairavi*³¹
ennaḍudaya, balahamsa, rūpaka
eduṭānilicitē, śaṅkarābharanam, ādi
entāvēḍukondu, sarasvati maṇōhari, ādi
padaviṇī, sāḷagabhairavi, ādi
sarasīruhāsana, nāṭa, ādi
sarasasāmadāna, kāpi nārāyaṇi, ādi
śaṅkarinī, bēgaḍa, rūpaka

Sambasiva Iyer taught her these for the most part small and simple *kṛiti*-s and later many other compositions. Rather than sitting with her and playing, Sambasiva Iyer would ask Ranganayaki to play on the *viṇā* whatever he sang and correct her verbally or by motioning to her. Although he would occasionally sit with her to demonstrate techniques such as *tānam*, they usually played together only while performing, either in the *pūja* room or in concert.

From the very beginning, as Ranganayaki recalls it, she was forced to play on a full sized *viṇā* and was subjected to a rigorous routine; from four in the morning she would practice for several hours, and only then be permitted to have some coffee, take her bath, and eat. The rest of the day would continue in the same manner: she would play for several hours at a time and stop only to eat, perform *pūjā*, or do chores. If she made an error while practicing, she was severely reprimanded and forced to begin again. Ranganayaki said that she detested playing the instrument at this time, but that she had no choice. She recalls beginning to enjoy playing the *viṇā* only after she was well into her teens, married, and playing professionally.

³¹She has completely forgotten this piece. The only piece listed with this title and raga in the *Index of Songs in South Indian Music* is one by Syama Sastri. It is unlikely that this is the composition since it is longer and more complicated than the pieces that are taught initially.

In 1941 Sambasiva Iyer made his first major concert appearance since his brother's death, and Ranganayaki accompanied him (they gave a little known performance in Karaikkudi in 1940 [Srinivasan and Jayaraman, 1988-1989]). Kalki (1941) published an eloquent description of this long awaited concert which told of the public surprise on seeing Ranganayaki, the "little girl with the big *viṇā*." After astounding the audience in that performance Ranganayaki was to appear with her teacher in all of his performances.

2.1.2 Raajeswari Padmanabhan

Lakshmi Ammal, my teacher, was the third of the older Karaikkudi brother Subbarama Iyer's five daughters. She learned vocal music from her father but had to teach herself the *viṇā* as women in her family did not play the instrument, and her father refused to teach her, even though this constraint against female performance was gradually lifted as public attitudes began to change in the late 1920s.

In 1939, three years after the death of her father, Lakshmi Ammal gave birth to a daughter, Raajeswari. Raajeswari showed talent from an early age, easily reproducing the lessons her mother was teaching to other students. As a child in a musical household she was not subjected to the kind of rigor normally imposed on a student in the *gurukula* system. For example, she did not start out by learning exercises such as *sarālī*, but by learning short songs, and although her mother was teaching *viṇā* to many students outside the family, she did not make a special effort to teach Raajeswari.³² Raajeswari has fond memories of these days, in which she would learn folk

³²This method of teaching, which she herself experienced with her father, was used on all of Lakshmi Ammal's children except Sashi. She would even ask her children help her teach other students songs they themselves had not been taught.

songs and dances and playfully compose *pallavi*-s, one of which, a song to attract the attention of the eggplant vendor, she sang for me (Padmanabhan 1988).

In 1944, Sambasiva Iyer regularly visited his niece Lakshmi Ammal in the city of Madurai and watched her daughter Raajeswari pick up the family musical tradition, and eventually he requested that she be sent to his home in Pudukkottai for training. Raajeswari describes the reaction of her parents as one of both honor and reluctance; but, since out of respect for Iyer they could not deny his request, they complied.

Raajeswari learned under significantly different conditions from those of Ranganayaki's tutoring. By the time she began training, Raajeswari recalls, Sambasiva Iyer had begun to mellow a little bit as the grief over losing his brother had subsided enough to allow him to resume performing; and he no longer displayed the habit of severely scolding his pupils. Only at the age of five, when she came to Sambasiva Iyer, did she begin lessons on the *viṇā*, and although her mother had taught her such basic lessons as *saraḷi variṣai*, only with her uncle did she learn them systematically. Not only were conditions different, but Raajeswari also held an attitude toward music that was different from Ranganayaki's; for Raajeswari, music was something to be played with, something for personal expression and fun. She did not regard her uncle with fear and awe as did Ranganayaki, for her relationship with him was one of family love. As a result, it is not surprising to learn that when Raajeswari began lessons with Sambasiva Iyer she tended to follow his example less rigidly than had Ranganayaki. When she began learning compositions she would add her own touches, to which she claims Sambasiva Iyer would respond, "sabash" ("bravo"). She too would get up at 4

o'clock in the morning; but, she explains, he would only teach her when he was in the mood. Even if Sambasiva Iyer did not teach her on a particular day or at a particular time he would at least make her sing. After a year her family became lonely for her, and she returned to her mother for a year or so. After that she never returned home, making her first formal concert appearance (*araṅkērram*) at the age of ten.

2.2 The style represented by Sambasiva Iyer

2.2.1 Technique

In this section I will discuss only a selected few of the techniques found in the Karaikkudi style, for an extensive analysis of these techniques and others can be found in the dissertation by K. S. Subramanian (1986). All techniques of the Karaikkudi style require that the right hand index and middle fingers alternate in plucking the string, and that the index finger articulate *svara*-s (notes) which fall on odd divisions of the *akṣarakāla* (beat; i.e. the index finger is used for strong beats).

Five aspects of technique stand out in discussions of Karaikkudi Sambasiva Iyer's playing style: 1) *piṭippu* and *aluttam*, 2) spreading of two fingers, 3) *sphurita*, 4) vocal quality, and 5) instrumental quality specific to the *vīṇā*. Each of these aspects of technique is described below.

piṭippu or *aluttam*

Karaikkudi musicians use the terms *piṭippu* and *aluttam*³³ to refer to the firmness of the left hand grip, the intensity of the right hand pluck,

³³From what I gather the terms are more or less interchangeable. One disciple, Ramaswami Sastri, used the term *piṭippu* in an interview with David Reck (Ramaswamy Sastri 1970's); Sastri's disciple Shanta Krishnamurthy also describes this "depth" using the Tamil term *piṭippu*. Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Lakshmi Ammal, on the other hand, generally use the term *aluttam*. The fact that Sastri and his disciple prefer one term indicates that musical terminology is sometimes passed from master to disciple.

and to the resulting "depth" or "weight"³⁴ of the *gamaka*, or ornament produced on the *viṇā*. According to the *Tamil Lexicon* (University of Madras 1982), *piṭippu* means "grasping, holding, seizure, catching" and stems from the verb *piṭi*, to grasp or clutch.³⁵ *aluttam*, on the other hand, means in this context "emphasis, forcefulness" and derives from the verb *aluttu*, meaning to press down, to press hard, or impress (University of Madras 1982, 165). Lakshmi Ammal used to tell me "*alutti vāci*," or "play forcefully" (that is, to play by pressing hard on the strings with the fingers of the left hand while plucking firmly with the fingers of the right hand).

Examples one and two on tape one contrast two performances of the beginning to the composition *sarasiruhā* by a popular performer today, Chitti Babu, and by Sambasiva Iyer and Ranganayaki Rajagopalan in the late 1950s. The quality of playing called *piṭippu* and *aluttam* is not characteristic of Chitti Babu's playing style. Although this example is intended to demonstrate the sound of *piṭippu* and *aluttam* (in the version played by Sambasiva Iyer and Ranganayaki Rajagopalan), part of the difference between the two renditions also lies in the performers' choice of *gamaka* (integral ornament) and *saṅgati* (melodic variations on a line of text--usually of increasing complexity), and in the structure of the performances--these aspects are not considered here.

Two finger technique

In the Karaikkudi school, students are taught to keep the left hand

³⁴Depth and weight are two English words musicians have used to express this general concept.

³⁵This meaning should not be confused with the usage attached to *rāga*, "the name given to the more prominent sanchāras or *rāga* ranjaka combinations of a *rāga* and which bring out its svarūpa or identity" (Sambamoorthy 1973, 328).

index and middle fingers together in ascending passages and separate in descending passages: the purpose of this is to provide sufficient pressure on the frets in ascending passages and to provide smooth connections between *svara*-s in descending passages. One must distinguish, however, between this prescriptive rule, which performers express verbally, and actual practice, which may not fit the rule (at least in the performances of musicians I have witnessed).³⁶

sphurita, *pratyāhata*, and "sparkling *sphurita*"

In a demonstration at the Music Academy in Madras (*Journal of the Music Academy of Madras* 1953, 35) Sambasiva called attention to the *sphurita*³⁷ and *pratyāhata*³⁸ techniques in the Karaikkudi style. In the *sphurita*, the repetition of a particular *svara*³⁹ in ascending passages is emphasized by means of a "hammer-on" [i.e. the middle finger of the left hand sharply strikes or "hammers" the string--a technique common to guitar and many other

³⁶Subramanian (1986, 92) notes that Mysore Doraiswamy Iyengar and T. Brinda also use this technique. Michael Nixon (pers. com. June 1988) said that the Dhanammal school (as taught to him by Dhanammal's disciple Savitri Rajan) requires separation of fingers in ascent and descent.

³⁷Sanskrit term meaning "quivering, throbbing, trembling, palpitating, flashing" (Monier-Williams [1899]1979, 1271). These adjectives might be seen to apply to the quality of ornament produced when produced quickly on a series of notes. It applies even more closely to the effect produced by the "sparkling *sphurita*."

³⁸A Sanskrit term meaning "driven back, repelled, repulsed, rejected" (Monier-Williams [1899]1979, 677). Unlike the dictionary definition of *sphurita*, the definition of *pratyāhata* seems to relate to the occurrence of the technique in descending passages rather than to any specific qualitative feature of the sound.

³⁹In this case a discrete pitch. The term more generally applies to composite rendering of a musical note, and its characteristic ornament, or *gamaka* (which will encompass other pitches), which is permissible or mandatory in a given *rāga*. The exact pitch content and contour of a *svara* depends entirely upon context.

plucked string instruments] from the *svara* preceding it. For the sounding of the first *svara*, the left hand middle finger is placed just behind the fret corresponding to the pitch to be sounded, and the index finger of the right hand plucks the string. The *sphurita* occurs on the repetition of this pitch, in which the index finger of the left hand is first placed just behind the fret that precedes the fret of the pitch to be sounded; second, the right hand middle finger plucks the string; third, the left hand middle finger "hammers-on" the fret quickly enough to prevent the pitch a half-step lower from sounding. On example three of tape one, drawn from the first of a series of exercises called *jaṇṭa varīṣai*, the author demonstrates the *sphurita* technique in the *rāga māyamālavagauḷa*.

The *pratyāhata* is the descending version of the same *gamaka*. First, the left hand index finger is placed just behind the fret corresponding to the initial pitch; then the pitch is sounded. For the repeated *svara* the index finger of the left hand remains behind the fret on which the *svara* will be sounded; it is then quickly replaced in a "hammering" action performed by the middle finger as soon as the string is plucked. The right hand finger plucking is identical to that of the *sphurita*. Example four on tape one is a demonstration of the *pratyāhata* technique in the *rāga māyamālavagouḷa* drawn from *jaṇṭa varīṣai* and performed by the author.

"Sparkling *sphurita*" is a term coined by Subramanian (1986, 174) to describe a *gamaka* of five steps. The string can be plucked by either finger of the right hand; the left hand fingers proceed as follows (fret "x" represents the fret corresponding to the *svara* to be sounded):

1. The index and middle fingers rest on fret "x"
2. When the string is plucked the middle finger begins to cross fret "x" in the direction of fret "x + 1," but before the new

pitch actually sounds. . .

3. The middle finger is removed, leaving the index finger alone on fret "x" and . . .

4. The index finger is slid backwards across fret "x-1," but before the new pitch actually sounds . . .

5. The middle finger is "hammered" back onto fret "x"

Subramanian (1986, 175) notes that this technique "defines the position of any *svara* . . . with respect to its immediate upper and lower neighbors . . . by a slide, even though those immediate upper and lower neighbors may not be part of the *rāga* scale." *Emic*-ly this fulfills the same function as hammering to the next pitch of the *rāga* with the middle finger of the left hand and plucking with the same finger in order to sound the original *svara*, or, the same function as bending to the next pitch of the *rāga* and quickly returning to the original pitch. Example five on tape one is an ascending scale (taken from the *rāga māyamālāvagaṇḍā*) performed with a "sparkling *sphurita*" on each pitch. The final pitch is rendered with this *gamaka* four times in succession.

Vocal quality

The fourth technical feature which all members consider essential to the Karaikkudi style is vocal quality (i.e. the quality of sounding like human singing), the expression of which, in contrast to the other techniques described above, is particularly subjective, and the determination of which is complicated by the fact that almost all instrumentalists in *karnāṭaka saṅgita* claim to approximate the sound of the human voice.

To express what is considered vocal in the Karaikkudi style, performers render *gamaka*-s and overall forms slowly and clearly, pluck the strings in correspondence with syllables of text (to the extent possible), limit over-

all range to approximately 2½ octaves, and sing while playing.⁴⁰ Although it may seem ironic that the Karaikkudi style attempts to imitate vocal music through the use of slow tempos when vocal music includes vastly swifter comparative *gamaka*-s and scalar sweeps (*pirkkā* or *briga*)⁴¹ than does the Karaikkudi *viṇā* style, these techniques do not appear in the Karaikkudi style because they cannot be clearly executed on the *viṇā*.

Other schools of *viṇā* playing sometimes point to features of the Karaikkudi style they consider to contradict a vocal approach; these include "extra" plucks, stark phrase articulation, left hand plucking techniques, and limited string deflection.⁴² The range of opinions as to what constitutes the proper interpretation of vocal music on an instrument indicates that two aspects of style in south Indian music are a sense of what aspects are valued in vocal music, and a preference for particular vocal models--and as well, that vocal music occupies such a prominent position in present-day south Indian music that all instrumental music must in some way be measured against it.

⁴⁰Most vina players pluck where syllables occur and sing, albeit to different vocal models; tempo and interior details of execution are subject to wider variability between styles.

⁴¹*pirkkā* is a purely musical term, according to the *Tamil Lexicon* (University of Madras 1982, 2667) meaning "rising to a high pitch and then lowering." Sambamoorthy defines *birkā* or *briga* (1959, 65) as "Musical phrases of alluring patterns and variegated beauty sung or played at quick tempo at the concluding part of the *ālāpana* of a *rāga*." It is possible that the word is related to the Sanskrit *brīgala*, meaning "a fragment, piece, or morsel" (Monier-Williams 1979, 735) for the musical term refers not only to the speed and patterns of the technique, but also to the fragmented quality of the passages brought on by the use of discrete or nearly discrete pitches rather than slow *gamaka*-s.

⁴²Some players, such as S. Balachander, will deflect a string to reach many *svara*-s (as many *svara*-s as would fill the interval of a perfect fifth) without leaving a single fret; this is his way of sounding like the human voice.

Part of the resistance on the part of some *viṇā* players toward reproducing certain qualities of the voice follows from the desire to make the *viṇā*, as an instrument, sound like a *viṇā* and not like a different instrument. The former *mṛidaṅgam* player for the Karaikkudi brothers, Muthu Iyer, said Sambasiva Iyer made the *viṇā* sound like the human voice; but, he also said--and this is no contradiction--that Sambasiva Iyer made the *viṇā* sound like a *viṇā* (Muttu Iyer 1970's). According to him the modern *viṇā* playing styles sound like music of the *kōṭṭuvādyam* (*gōṭuvādyam*).⁴³

In the playing style of a given instrumentalist it is difficult to isolate what is "vocal" from what is "instrumental" not only because instrumentalists choose to emphasize different instrument-specific techniques, but also because they base their performances on different vocal models. For example, to some people the use of plucks which exceed the number of textual syllables represents emphasis on instrumental aspects. But such is not the case in the the Karaikkudi style, for vocal models in the Karaikkudi style are characterized by musical phrases that contain frequent articulations within passages of *akāra* (melismas sung on the vowel "ā" or other vowels). These phrases, sometimes called *tāna*-s (Rangaramanuja Ayyangar 1972, CLXii), are marked by glottal stops in vocal music and by plucks in *viṇā* music.

Vina specificity

As mentioned above, the Karaikkudi style is seen to take advantage of the unique and positive qualities of the *viṇā*; for example, techniques such as the "sparkling *sphurita*," while possible on other instruments and with the voice, are idiomatic to the *viṇā*. Similarly, the manner in which

⁴³An instrument that resembles the *viṇā* in shape, but has no frets. It is played with a plectrum and a wooden bar which is used as a slide similar to the way slide guitar is played.

sphurita and *pratyāhata* are used to articulate phrases, while having vocal analogues, is characteristic both of the instrument in a general sense, and to the Karaikkudi style specifically. Not only are specific techniques characteristic to the *vīṇā*, but also are entire genres such as *tānam*--the technique for which Sambasiva Iyer is said to have developed specially. In this regard, Gana Visharada Titte Krishna Iyengar writes,

Veena is our national musical instrument and when tana or Madhyama kala is played on the Veena by expert vainikas, the audience forget themselves in enjoyment of music. Matanga in his Brihad Desi speaks very highly of Veena. His lines are worth quoting: "A Veena is recommended in order to reach regions which are not attainable by vocal music." (Krishna Iyengar 1964, 86)

The use of the main and side strings for selectively punctuating melodic and rhythmic phrases is another *vīṇā* specific feature which is brought out in the Karaikkudi style. Although all *vīṇā* styles use these strings in way or another, the specific way they are used may differentiate one style from another. For example, in "*sarasasāmadāna*" the *vīṇā* technique called "*tribhinna*," which involves the simultaneous or successive plucking of three of the main strings from lower to upper (Sambamoorthy 1959, 172), is used to highlight important words of the text, and important structural points in the composition--and serves as evidence to some Indians that they too, have harmony (see chapter 3 pp. 192-93 for a discussion of the history of this term). Some "purists" will say it is evidence that even the Karaikkudi style has succumbed to incorporating gimmicks in imitation of Western music. The question of influence or borrowing, which will be taken up briefly in chapter three, is not of central importance when considering how these techniques, the aesthetic choice of which are a function of style, explore the innate technical possibilities of the *vīṇā*. What is important, however, is that members of the style point to the *vīṇā*-specific nature of

certain gestures as a feature of their style.

2.2.2 Training

Training can be discussed in terms of two components: the musical materials used, such as exercises and compositions and the manner in which these materials are taught. Each of these two components has aspects which are unique and aspects which are shared by *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* as a whole.

On December 27th, 1954, the fifth day of the Madras Music Conference, the "experts' committee" met to discuss the "teaching of music" and the "value of the 'gurukula' system." The summary of this meeting provided below is one of the few records that documents the statements of Sambasiva Iyer in regard to training.

Vidwan Sambasiva Aiyar said it was through perseverance and continued practice, some of the exercises extending over a whole year, that mastery could be achieved and such training should be undertaken even while one was yet young. Citing his own example, the Vidwan said that he was a Vainika for the eighth generation [according to Subramanian he was a seventh generation player] in his family and when he was practising exercises of *Sarali*, each for a year, his father would not permit him to think or even attempt anything higher until the first step was completely mastered.

Attention on *swarasthana*^[44] and its precise playing required that the mind should not be distracted by too early notions or ambitions about ragas or their knowledge and names. He thought that a training like this in accordance with old method on the Veena should extend over a period of 12 years; in a shorter period, he said this instrument could not be mastered. His elders first inculcated in him the complete *swaragnana*^[45] within his fifth year; then he was permitted to take to the instrument; and on the instrument, without any verbal explanation, they taught practically [,] by drawing his attention by mere signs to *sphurita*, *pratihasa*

⁴⁴The precise intonation of a pitch, literally the "*svara* place." The term is also used to refer to the fret on which a *svara* is placed on the *viṇā*. There are 12 *swarasthana*-s roughly corresponding to the 12 semitones of the western gamut.

⁴⁵literally "knowledge of the *svara*-s." Implies deep understanding and sense of intonation.

[*pratyāhata*] etc., as they went on playing. Thus, *Sarali*, *otta varisai*, *iratta varisai*, *alankara*, *gita*, etc.,^[46] were learnt. Kirtanas^[47] were taught only after this stage and following the same practice he had also brought up his two pupils.^[48]

Then he asked his pupil, Kumari Rajeswari, to demonstrate the method from *Sarali* onwards.

Kumari demonstrated the various stages, finishing with a *gita* in *Nata*, a *Bhairavi* varna and *Nata* raga and tana and the kirtana "Saraseeruhāsana." (Journal of the Music Academy of Madras 1957, 37-8)

2.2.2.1 Musical materials: Exercises and compositions used for initial musical training

Tapes two and three contain examples of beginning lessons and compositions, *sarali varisai*, *janṭa varisai* (called "*Sarali*, *ottu varisai*, and *iratta varisai*" in the above passage) and *alaṅkāra* performed by Ranganayaki Rajagopalan (a senior disciple of Karaikkudi Sambasiva Iyer) and others (recorded Jan. 1988), and *gita*-s including the *gitam* in the *rāga nāṭa* as performed by Raajeswari Padmanabhan (Tape three side B, example one, recorded Jan. 1988), the same person who demonstrated before the Music Academy 34 years earlier. *bhairavi varṇam* ("*viribhōṇi*") is performed on tape three side B example six by Ranganayaki and Raajeswari together in a recording made at the Music Academy in the early 1960's. *rāga ālāpana* and *tānam* in *nāṭa* is performed by Ranganayaki on tape four examples one and two (1985);

⁴⁶These are the names of the basic exercises and compositions.

⁴⁷The name of a kind of composition that is performed, as opposed to those that are used exclusively for learning or practice.

⁴⁸Here he is referring to Ranganayaki and Raajeswari. Although he had taught other students, he did not subject them to the kind of rigor mentioned in this passage. For this reason, he did not consider these other pupils his disciples (the pupils themselves, Ramaswami Sastry, Ramachandra Iyer, Devakkottai Narayana Iyengar, and others, however, considered themselves disciples!)

and finally, "sarasīruhā" is performed by Ranganayaki and Raajeswari in the Music Academy recording on tape four, example three.⁴⁹

The purpose of including these recordings is to provide an aural reference to the musical materials which Sambasiya Iyer considered to be fundamental. The appendix contains notations of the basic exercises *sarālī varīśai*, *jaṇṭa varīśai*, and *alaṅkāra* as practiced in the Karaikkudi school. The basic order and type of exercises was established by the so-called "father of Karnatic music," Purandaradasa [1484-1564 (Sambamoorthy 1985b, 32)]. The exercise marked with an asterisk is unique to the Karaikkudi style (tape two example seven). Its uniqueness is derived from the uneven number of *tāḷa* cycles (three) that must be completed before the pattern is completed in the first speed; all the other exercises require 1, 2 or 4 cycles of the *tāḷa*.

Members of the Karaikkudi school proudly claim that rendering all the exercises with *gamaka*-s is an exclusive characteristic of their school, although this is questionable (Meenakshi Ammal 1988). Most styles do teach the exercises in unadorned form as a way to warm up and to learn the *svara-sthāna*-s. In the Karaikkudi style, components of every *gamaka* used in playing compositions or in improvising can be found in the rendering of the initial exercises. To some extent, even the subtle differences between individual styles within the Karaikkudi style can be traced to the differences between renderings of initial exercises.

⁴⁹Subramanian (1986) provides a detailed analysis of the *varṇam*, "viribhōṇi," as rendered in the Karaikkudi and Mysore styles; Reck (1983) analyzes five performances of his teacher playing "sarasīruhā"; for this reason, these pieces will not be considered in detail here. The reader is advised to consult the studies by Subramanian and Reck, and to note the stylistic consistency between the recording of these two pieces provided for this study and those included in their studies.

The six *gīta*-s recorded on tape three are taught as part of initial training in the Karaikkudi style; the first one is composed by Purandaradas in honor of the Hindu god Ganesh. It is considered an auspicious piece with which to begin teaching *gīta*-s to all students of *karnāṭaka saṅgita*.

1. *śrī gaṇanāda, malahari rāga, rūpaka tāḷa*
2. *padmanābha, malahari rāga, tripuṭa tāḷa*
3. *ānalēkara, suddha sāvēri, rūpaka tāḷa*
4. *sakalasurada, gaṭa, rūpaka tāḷa*
5. *mīṇākṣi, śrī, tripuṭa*
6. *āreyaṇaka, nāṭa, rūpaka tāḷa*

Four *varṇa*-s are also commonly taught; it is not clear which *varṇa*-s were learned initially when the brothers themselves were undergoing training. The four listed below were taught to Ranganayaki as a child:

1. *viribhōṇi, bhairavi rāga, aṭa tāḷa*
2. *sārasākṣi, kalyāṇi rāga, aṭa tāḷa*
3. *sāmininne, śaṅkarābharana rāga, ādi tāḷa*
4. (name not available), *rāgamālika, aṭa tāḷa*

The first three pieces are unique to the style because they include characteristic *saṅgati*-s added by the brothers; the fourth is unique because it is a rare item. Perhaps Sambasiva Iyer stressed these compositions because he considered them of value in establishing a Karaikkudi approach to *viṇā* playing. Subbarama Iyer, however, felt it important to teach the *varṇam*, "*inta caukasēya*," *bilahari rāga, ādi tāḷa*, before any other *varṇam*; his daughter Lakshmi Ammal continued her father's practice of teaching *bilahari varṇam* before any other. At the time of Sambasiva Iyer either some changes had already occurred in the order and method of training or a fixed order for teaching was not considered equally important by both brothers.

2.2.2.2 Manner of teaching

The most important features of the Karaikkudi teaching method can be gleaned from Sambasiva Iyer's statement above (2.2.2). First the student is

exposed to music in the household, developing a sense of pitch and general feel for the music. At this stage the period of time required for learning varies from student to student. The first lessons are sets of basic exercises (*saraḷi variṣai*, *jaṇṭa variṣai* etc.) each of which requires approximately one year's training. According to one of the basic tenets of the Karaikkudi school, a new lesson should not be taught until the previous lesson can be executed perfectly.⁵⁰

As these lessons are taught, verbal communication is limited or entirely absent; this practice was an important aspect of the Karaikkudi method as represented by Sambasiva Iyer. The basic sentiments underlying his tendency to limit discussion about music seem to have been that one must learn to do or act before learning to think, that one must obey one's teacher without hesitation,⁵¹ and that music can only be "communicated" through music--that is, by playing it. If a student makes an error, the teacher signals the student to repeat the lesson; often the student must detect the error and correct it. During lessons with Lakshmi Ammal, I knew I played a passage correctly only when she stopped playing and allowed me to repeat it on my own.

Certain aspects of the Karaikkudi teaching method characteristic of Sambasiva Iyer's time but not expressed in his demonstration at the Music Academy are described by his disciples Raajeswari and Ranganayaki (Padma-

⁵⁰This is probably a feature of the "old method" in general. Today few teachers, even in the Karaikkudi school, adhere rigidly to this practice.

⁵¹Just as a devotee is supposed to abandon all thoughts of self and the rest of the world in order to experience divinity, the *śiṣya* must approach the *guru* without questions in order to learn. Recent literature in India has been critical of this aspect of traditional learning in India. See *The Imprisoned Mind: Guru-Shisya Tradition in Indian Culture*, by Akhileshwar Jha.

nabhan 1988; Rajagopalan 1988), and by his other relatives and friends. In earlier generations, all lessons were introduced vocally; once thoroughly understood, these lessons were transferred to the *viṇā*. Generally speaking, the master did not sit to play with the student. The student played while the master instructed vocally--that is, by singing rather than explaining. The vocal mode of instruction undoubtedly relates to the attitude that playing the *viṇā* should sound like singing. Now it is more common to find teachers instructing their students while sitting with the instrument. So, for example, Lakshmi Ammal, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, Raajeswari Padmanabhan and my other instructors all taught me using the *viṇā*--instructing me vocally only occasionally.

In the past as well as in some contexts today, only a small portion of a student's knowledge is gained through direct instruction. The rest comes from listening. When students practice compositions or improvisational forms they have heard, the teacher will often correct them. Eventually the student is allowed to perform with the teacher, in which context the student learns how to behave in front of an audience, how to choose items and order them for a concert, and how to achieve a balance between sections of improvisation and compositions.

To summarize, training in Karaikkudi style includes two aspects, the material taught and the teaching itself. The material taught is composed of exercises and compositions that are common to the entire *karṇāṭaka saṅgīta* tradition, and those that are unique to the Karaikkudi style in various ways. The teaching method itself can be divided into two types: direct instruction, which occurs primarily during initial training, and indirect

instruction, which begins when the disciple first hears music and continues throughout his or her life. The ability to continue to learn without a teacher is one of the most important skills a disciple must develop. The salient features of direct training in the Karaikkudi style are that teaching is accomplished nonverbally and that a new lesson is not taught until the previous lesson is perfected.

2.2.3 Compositions

During the lifetime of Sambasiva Iyer the Karaikkudi style was famous for certain compositions, of which the following (recorded on tape four) were considered by general consensus among members of the style to be the most characteristic and frequently played.⁵²

1. *sarasiruhāsana*, *nāṭa*, *ādi*, Puliyur Doraisamy Iyer
2. *śaṅkari nīvaṇi*, *bēgaḍa*, *rūpakam*, Subbaraya Sastri
3. *sarasasāmadāna*, *kāpi nārāyaṇi*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
4. *padavinī*, *sāḷaga bhairavi*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
5. *varanārada*, *vijayaśrī*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
6. *entavēḍukondu*, *sarasvatī manōhari*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
7. *ninnu jeppa*, *mandāri*, *ādi*, Patnam Subramanya Iyer
8. *manitaṅgu* (*kummi*), *rāgamālika*, *tiśra*, Chidambara Bharati⁵³

⁵²The appendix contains a complete list of compositions Ranganayaki Rajagopalan learned from Sambasiva Iyer, a list which can be seen as comprising Iyer's performing repertoire in the last 17 years of his life because Ranganayaki accompanied Iyer in most of his performances after 1941 and presumably knew all the compositions he played from that time until his death. For reasons that will be explored later in this paper, Sambasiva Iyer discontinued playing certain compositions commonly played by the brothers when they were together. The second list of compositions, which Subbarama Iyer's youngest daughter Meenakshi Ammal recalls learning from him, provides a point of departure for reconstructing the repertoire the brothers played during their performing career together (1898-1936 date of first concert provided by Bhuvanar 1988, 8).

⁵³A composition, based on a Tamil folk song/dance type, which has entered the "light classical" repertoire commonly found in the latter portion of classical music concerts. According to Lakshmi Ammal's daughter Sashi who performs the recorded example (Tape 4A example 7), the happy mood of this song makes it especially suitable for weddings. A few other non-classical numbers were common in Sambasiva Iyer's concerts, including "magudi" (a snake charmers song) and various "note"s (imitating the style of

Like the *varṇa*-s listed above, some of these compositions became associated with the Karaikkudi brothers because they were rarely performed by other artists,⁵⁴ and because the Karaikkudi brothers rendered them in a unique manner--primarily by adding or replacing *saṅgati*-s. While it is perhaps obvious that compositions may become associated with a particular artist through repeated performance, it is not quite as evident how individual innovations play a role in style delineation, and it is even less evident whether or not these innovations follow from general principles of innovation or occur in relatively consistent patterns.

2.2.4 Innovations

Four kinds of innovation are attributed to Sambasiva Iyer: innovations on the instrument itself, creation and modification of *saṅgati*-s, composition of *ciṭṭasvara*-s, and further development of the technique for *tānam* on the *viṇā*--analysis of this latter is beyond the scope of this study. Now let us consider each of the other innovations in detail.

2.2.4.1 Organological: Innovations on the *viṇā* itself

Since the time the Karaikkudi brothers were performing (if not before) members of the style have insisted their *viṇā*-s be manufactured by a particular family in Tanjore. Sambasiva Iyer's instrument was made by the craftsman Narayanasari, and those manufactured for members of the Karaikkudi school today, are made by his nephew (Narayanasari died in 1981). Sambasiva Iyer's *viṇā* was unusual due to the largeness of its overall size and the ratio between the size of the main resonator (*kuṭam*) and the neck. These

English tunes) which he composed.

⁵⁴With the exception of "*entavēḍukondu*" which was also made famous by Chembai Vaidyanatha bhagavatar.

features, which Iyer himself specified, helped to provide the tremendous volume for which his playing style was known.

Many *viṇā* players have experimented and continue to experiment with the construction of the instrument in order to enhance the sound, appearance, and utility relative to their aesthetic tastes. Sambasiva Iyer, no exception himself in this regard, is credited with introducing the sound hole, wound metal strings in the bass register,⁵⁵ and hinged cover for the peg box in order to facilitate changing strings and to store finger picks and oil. He fashioned his own finger picks by tying a *pañcama* string⁵⁶ to a silver frame. He also designed a tiny box in which he placed a metal plate fitted with a spring and perforated with small holes to allow him to lubricate his fingers with the precise amount of oil required for playing (Subramanian, pers. com. 1985). After he lost his teeth and could no longer chew betel nut, Sambasiva Iyer devised a betel smasher out of silver. His students recall his using this invention to pulverize betel nut in strict time with the *tāḷa* as they practiced.

Sambasiva Iyer's innovations on the instrument and his inventions demonstrate his overall dedication to music and the extent to which it dominated his life. In some ways his care for the instrument is comparable to the way a *pujāri* (priest) cares for the idol in a Hindu temple.⁵⁷ Both the *viṇā* and the idol are considered embodiments (rather than representa-

⁵⁵For the *mantiram* and *anumantiram* strings.

⁵⁶The second playing string on a *viṇā*, tuned to the fifth of the scale, or *pañcamam*.

⁵⁷See Ramanujachari and Raghavan (1981, 155-7) for a description of this form of *bhakti*, *arcana*, which includes "the dressing and decorating of the Lord." Sambasiva Iyer's innovations on the *viṇā* fall into the general category of ritual care for the deity, which is *Sarasvati* in this case.

tions) of divinity; consequently, the manner in which they are treated is a manifestation of religious behavior. All *karnāṭaka saṅgita* originates in devotion, however, individual musicians express this devotional aspect to different degrees and in different ways. The innovations described above are some of the ways Sambasiva Iyer expressed his religious devotion--which is inseparable from his love for music. His *bhakti* in the form of *arcana*, therefore, might be seen as one of the primary guiding principles behind his organological innovations.

2.2.4.2 *saṅgati-s*

Particular performers and certain styles in *karnāṭaka saṅgita* are credited with introducing new *saṅgati-s* (composed melodic variation on a line of text) into particular compositions; these *saṅgati-s* may, in time, find widespread acceptance. For example, the *saṅgati-s* introduced into the *kṛiti* "*vātāpi gaṇapatim*" (composed by Muthuswamy Dikshitar) by Mahavaidyanatha Iyer have become standard materials for the performance of this *kṛiti* (Sambamoorthy 1982b, 2). While analyzing all the Karaikkudi *saṅgati-s* is beyond the scope of this paper a few characteristic examples will illustrate one of many basic patterns of innovation found in the style.⁵⁸

Overall, Sambasiva Iyer's use of *saṅgati* reflects a deep concern for balance and precision. *saṅgati-s* are well balanced when they are limited to a number appropriate to the length of the composition to which they are attached (i.e. short compositions should not contain too many *saṅgati-s*), and when they adhere to a gradual, incremental pattern of development. A *saṅ-*

⁵⁸For analysis of different *saṅgati-s*, consult the master's thesis by Subramanian (for *saṅgati-s* in *śaṅkarābharanam varnam*) and his dissertation (for those in *viribhōṇi* and *śaṅkari nīvani*). Reck's dissertation contains an analysis of *saṅgati-s* in *sarasīruhā*.

gati is precise if it can be rendered clearly and consistently each time--this means both that the *saṅgati* must be simple enough and well enough defined to be understood, and that it can be performed accurately. This interdependent relationship between composition and performance is illustrated in my own experiences learning with Karaikkudi Lakshmi Ammal. For example, if Lakshmi Ammal was unable to execute a complex *saṅgati* with precision (because of an injured finger, for example), she used to play a simple version of a particular *saṅgati* rather than a complicated version. While playing within one's capabilities is valued in many cultures including western cultures, this attitude prevents Karaikkudi *vīṇā* players from performing acrobatic gimmicks or flashy scalar sweeps--in the performance of which other performers often make errors.

I will now briefly consider two sets of examples in which *saṅgati*-s introduced by the Karaikkudi Brothers exhibit a pattern of development idiomatic both to the instrument and to the style. The first set of examples consists of *saṅgati*-s added to "*entavēḍukondu*," a composition by Tyagaraja in the *rāga sarasvatī manōhari*. The second set of examples are the *saṅgati*-s added to "*kanugoṇṇini*," a composition by Tyagaraja in *bilahari rāga*, *ādi tāḷa*. Two versions of "*entavēḍukondu*" are found on Tape 4B: a rendition by the late Chembai Vaidyanatha Bhagavatar (a performer outside the Karaikkudi school who popularized a different version of the piece) which will be used for comparison, and a rendition by Ranganayaki Rajagopalan.⁵⁹

⁵⁹Performers inside and outside the Karaikkudi school say Ranganayaki's playing is a closer representation of Sambasiva Iyer's playing style than is the playing of any other living performer today. Although her playing sometimes differs in such details as choice of where to bend or pluck a string in a given context, the structure of her *saṅgati*-s remains the same as Iyer's; in "*entavēḍukondu*," according to the remarks of others who have heard his playing, her performance is identical to the way his was.

No known recording exists of Sambasiva Iyer playing this piece in its entirety, although a fragment of "entavēḍukondu" as played by him was broadcast on All India radio.

In the *anupallavi*, or second section of this composition which begins at 1'20" and is notated below in figure 1, Chembai develops *saṅgati*-s in a melismatic fashion around the syllable "ā" after the words "*cintadīrcuṭa kentamoḍirā*" (1'20"-2'15" labeled C₁D₁-C₂D₃ in the analytical index [abbr. "AI"]). In contrast, only Ranganayaki's first *saṅgati* (Figure 2) contains a melisma on the syllable "ā" (8'26"-8'50" labeled C₁E₁ in the AI). The second and third *saṅgati*-s differ from the first through the insertion of 'srg' (C₂: 8'50"-9'02") and 'dsrg' (C₃: 9'02"-9'08") between "*cintadīrcuṭa*" and "*kentamoḍirā*" and through the omission of the *akāra* (melismatic) passage.

In the second line of the *anupallavi* Ranganayaki develops two *saṅgati*-s on the syllable "ā" at the end of "*antarātmanā*" by a melisma on the *svara*-s '...m...d...s...d' in F₁ (C₃F₁: 9'08"-9'32") and '...mdsds...dmsd' in F₂ (C₃F₂: 9'32"-9'56"). In section F₃ of the third *saṅgati* the melisma on "ā" is replaced with the concluding words of the text, "*centarānunē*" (C₃F₃: 9'56"-10'14"). In contrast to Ranganayaki, Chembai sings only one *saṅgati* for the second line of text (C₃G₁: 2'26"-2'48").

The Karaikkudi *saṅgati*-s in "entavēḍukondu" are delineated not only through the insertions mentioned above, but also through incremental additions of the "sparkling *sphurita*" ({*ss*}) on the *svara ri*. For example, the syllable "rā" concludes section C₁ on *ri*, while the second *saṅgati* (C₂ and C₂') concludes with a single {*ss*} on *ri* and the third *saṅgati* (C₃ and C₃') concludes with two {*ss*} on *ri*.

While each of the *saṅgati*-s in Ranganayaki's performance described

above is characteristic of how sangati-s are structured in the Karaikkudi style, each is also idiomatic to the instrument--in some, because one of the *svara*-s is conveniently located on the *pañcama* string (in C_3 , the *dha* is played on the *pañcama* string; in sections F_1 and F_2 , *ma* is played on the *pañcama* string) and in others, because techniques like the "sparkling *sphurita*" are easy to play on fretted string instruments.

Figure 1

"entavēḍukondu," *sarasvatī manōhari*, ādi, Tyagaraja
anupallavi of performance by Chembai Vaidyanatha Bhagavatar.

C_1

[//] m . d . . s . . r . /
 cin ta dī rcu

/ g m . / g . r g m . g . // r
 ta ken ta mo . . dī rā

D_1

[// r] r g m . s . . . s d /
 a ya⁶⁰ .

/ . . np . . pg / . . mr . . r . // . g g s . .
 ya . ya . ya . ya

C_2

[//. g g s . .] m . d . . s . . r . /
 cin ta dī rcu

/ g m . / g . r g m . p mg . // r
 ta ken ta mo . . . dī . rā

D_2

[// r] m g g r s . . . s n /
 a

/ d np . . . pm / g m r . . . mg // g r s . . .

⁶⁰"ya" is a rearticulation of the syllable "a" in this *akāra* (melismatic) section.

C₂

[// g r s . . .] m . d . . s . . r . /
 cin ta dī rcu

/ g m . / g . r g m . p̣ mg . // r
 ta ken ta mo . . . di. rā

D₃

[// r] r g m g m s . . n d /
 a a .

/ n d n p . . m g / m g m r . . r g // m g m s . .
 a a

C₃

[// m g m s . .] m . d . . s . . r . /
 cin ta dī rcu

/ g m . / g . r g m . p̣ mg . // g . r g r .
 ta ken ta mo . . . di. rā . . .

G₁

[// g . r g r .] p . g s . r . . g . /
 an ta . rāt ma

/ g s s d / . . n p . . p m // g r s r g . [m . etc.]
 na . cen. ta rā nu . . . nē. .

Figure 2

anupallavi of *vinā* performance by Karaikkudi Ranganayaki Rajagopalan--text added in appropriate places.

bold = *svarasthāna*-s on which *svara*-s are played

> = pluck

{ss} = "sparkling *sphurita*" used to render *svara*-s below

R = *svarasthāna* for *ri* but played on the *pañcama*

(P) string

C₁

// m . d . . s . . r . /
 cin ta dī rcu
 > > > >
 M D S SR

/	g	m	.	/	g	.	r	g	m	.	g	.	//	r
	ta					ken			ta		mo	.	.		di			rā				
	>					>			>		>				>			>				
	RG					SG			G		R											

E₁

[//	r]	s	r	g	.	s	.	.	.	d	.	/					
							[ā]						
							>		>		>		>		>							
							SR		R		S				D							
/	n	.	p	.	.	m	g	.	/	m	.	r	.	.	s	r	//	g	.	s	.	.
	[ā]	
	>		>		>		>		>		>		>		>		>		>			
	D		P			M	G			G		R			S	R			R		S	

C₂

[//	g	.	s	.	.]	m	.	d	.	.	s	.	.	r	.	/
							cin		ta			dī			rcu		
							>		>		>		>		>		
							M		D			S			SR		

{ss}

/	g	.	s	r	g	.	m	.	/	g	.	r	g	m	.	g	.	//	r	gr	r	.	.
	ta					ken			ta		mo	.	.		di			rā					
	>		>			>			>		>				>			>					
	RG		S	R		G			SG		G		R										

{ss}

{ss}

C₂'

[//	r	gr	r	.	.]	s	rs	d	.	.	s	.	.	r	.	/
							cin		ta			dī			rcu		
							>		>		>		>		>		
							M		D			S			SR		

{ss}

/	g	.	s	r	g	.	m	.	/	g	.	r	g	m	.	g	.	//	r	gr	r	.	.
	ta					ken			ta		mo	.	.		di			rā					
	>		>			>			>		>				>			>					
	RG		S	R		G			SG		G		R										

{ss}

{ss}

C₃

[//	r	gr	r	.	.]	s	rs	d	.	.	s	.	.	r	.	/
							cin		ta			dī			rcu		
							>		>		>		>		>		
							M		D			S			SR		

{ss} {ss}

/ g . d <u>sr</u> g . m .	/ g . r g m . g . //	r <u>gr</u> r <u>gr</u> r .
ta ken	ta mo . . di	rā
> > > >	> > >	> > >
RG R SR G SG	G R	

(P)

{ss} {ss} {ss}

F₁

[// r <u>gr</u> r <u>gr</u> r .]	s .	r .	g <u>mg</u>	g .	r . /
	an	ta	rā	t	ma
	>	>	>	>	>
	S	R	G		R

/ s . r g <u>rs</u> . d . /	. . m . . . d . //	. . s . . d
nā		
>	>	>
S R RS D	N D	S D

(P)

C₃'

[// . . s . . d]	m .	d .	s .	. . r . /
	cin	ta	dī	rcu
	>	>	>	>
	M	D	S	SR

{ss} {ss}

/ g . d <u>sr</u> g . m .	/ g . r g m . g . //	r <u>gr</u> r <u>gr</u> r .
ta ken	ta mo . . di	rā
> > > >	> > >	> > >
RG R SR G SG	G R	

(P)

{ss} {ss} {ss}

F₂

[// r <u>gr</u> r <u>gr</u> r .]	s .	r .	g <u>mg</u>	g .	r . /
	an	ta	rā	t	ma
	>	>	>	>	>
	S	R	G		R

/ s . r g <u>rs</u> . d . /	. . m d s d s . //	. d m d s d
nā		
>	>	>
S R RS D	N D	S D

(P)

C₃'

[// . d m d s d]	m .	d .	s .	. . r . /
	cin	ta	dī	rcu
	>	>	>	>
	M	D	S	SR

{ss} {ss}

/ g . d <u>sr</u> g . m .	/ g . r g m . g . //	r <u>gr</u> r <u>gr</u> r .
ta ken	ta mo . . di	rā
> > > >	> > >	> > >
RG R SR G SG	G R	

(P)

F₃ {ss} {ss} {ss}

[// r <u>gr</u> r <u>gr</u> r .]	s .	r .	g <u>mg</u>	g .	r . /
	an	ta	rā	t	ma
	>	>	>	>	>
	S	R	G	R	

/ s . r g	<u>rs</u> . d s	/ d n . p . .	m g //	s r g m	p m
na	cen ta	ra	nu	nē	
> >	> >	>	>	>	>
S R	RS D D	P	MG	S R G	P M

The next example, taken from a Karaikkudi version of "*kanugōṭṭini*" (a Tyagaraja *kṛiti* in *bilahari rāga*, *ādi tāḷa*) contains an analogous progression of *saṅgati*-s which begins in the *anupallavi*⁶¹ after the first *drutam*⁶² of the *tāḷa*. The version played by Ranganayaki Rajagopalan in example 3 of tape 4 is structurally identical to that of Sambasiva Iyer and will be used as the basis of this brief description--without the use of a transcription, but with reference to the analytical index of taped examples in Appendix III.

In the second *saṅgati* (B₂), 'gpds' is inserted between the words "nama-lamu" and "nayampugā," and in the third (B₃), 'rgpds'. Like the analogous *svara*-s in "*entavēḍukondu*," *ri* and *ga* are played on the *pañcama* string. As further means of development, both the second and third *saṅgati*-s contain

⁶¹In both *kṛiti*-s the progression is repeated in the *caranam*, where the music from the *anupallavi* is used to sing new text.

⁶²A *drutam* is the "clap and wave" portion of the *tāḷa*. In *ādi tāḷa*, *drutam*-s occur on beats 5 and 7 and take 2 *aṣṭara*-s each.

svara-s that extend into the upper octave; whereas, the first *saṅgati* (B₁) reaches only *tāra*⁶³ *sa*. On the last two *saṅgati*-s of the last line of the *anupallavi* (C₂-C₃), the "sparkling *sphurita*" technique adorns the *tāra sa* (analogous to the use of {*ss*} on *ri* in "*entavēḍukondu*").

The excerpts from the two *kṛiti*-s discussed above serve to illustrate aspects of *saṅgati* development typical of the Karaikkudi style: incremental additions of discrete pitches which are easily accessible on the *pañcama* string, and successive elaborations of a single pitch using the "sparkling *sphurita*." The *saṅgati*-s in the two *kṛiti*-s represent not only processes of the same type, but also processes which have been extended by other members of the style--a subject that will be addressed in chapter 3.

"*kanuḡoṇṭini*" contains an example of another kind of innovation in the Karaikkudi style--the addition of composed *svara* passages, or *ciṭṭasvara*-s, to existing *kṛiti*-s.

2.2.4.3 *ciṭṭasvara*-s

The Karaikkudi school is known not only for composing *saṅgati*-s but also for creating *ciṭṭasvara*-s, some of which are now so common in the performance of certain *kṛiti*-s that other performers no longer know their source.⁶⁴ Although *saṅgati*-s and *ciṭṭasvara*-s were also composed by Subbarama Iyer, most of them have either been forgotten or mistakenly attributed to his younger brother, Sambasiva Iyer. The following compositions, contain Karaikkudi *ciṭṭasvara*-s; these *ciṭṭasvara*-s are recorded on tape 1B.

⁶³upper octave (starting on the twelfth fret of the *viṇā* on the *sāriṇi* string).

⁶⁴For example, the popular *viṇā* artist R. K. Suryanayana performs a *ciṭṭasvara* in the *kṛiti* "*rāmacandram bhāvayāmi*" which he believes to have been part of the original composition; in fact it was composed by Sambasiva Iyer--see list.

ādi tāla

1. *kanugoṇṭini, bilahari*, Tyagaraja
2. *yocana kamala lōcana, darbār*, Tyagaraja

rūpaka tāla

1. *alaittuvāpōṭi, kalyāṇi*, Ghanam Krishna Ayyar
2. *śrī madurāpuravāsini, śahāna*, (composer unkown)
3. *erundālpāradēvi, kāmbōji*, Maruvai Chidambara Bharati
4. *rāmacāndram bhāvayāmi, vāsanta*, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
5. *śōbhillu saptasvara, jaganmōhini*, Tyagaraja
6. *nāmorālakiñci, dhanyāsi*, Vina Kuppayar
7. *śrī varalakṣmi, śrī*, Muttuswamy Dikshitar

In the article "Chitta Swaras in Musical Compositions," S.R. Jayasita-lakshmi (1984) traces the history of *ciṭṭasvara*-s and describes them by the following structural characteristics:

1. *samakāla*: sung in tempo (and density) of *anupallavi* at end of *anupallavi*, and in *madhyamakāla* (lit.--medium speed; usually one syllable per *akṣarakāla*) at end of *caraṇam*.
2. *madhyamakāla ciṭṭasvara*-s
3. *ciṭṭasvara*-s which end with a *maḥam*, or "crown" (i.e. lively and extended concluding pattern of *svara*-s)
4. *srōtōvāha yati*: "phrases of progressively increasing magnitude"
5. *gōpucca yati*: "phrases of diminishing magnitude"
6. *svarālaṅkāra*: "same *svara* or same *svara* phrase recurs at the commencement of each *āvarta* [*āvarta*: cycle of *tāla*] or half *āvarta*."
7. *ciṭṭasvara*-s which give prominence to "jantasvara prayogas [phrases using repeated *svara*-s as in *janta varisai*], *datusvara gamakas* [*dātu svara*: "a note removed from another note by some steps" (Sambamoorthy 1952, 102)] or ancient *alankāra* [ornamental grouping] patterns."
8. *ciṭṭasvara*-s using *dīrgha svara*-s ("long note") at regular intervals for rhythmic effect.
9. *ciṭṭasvara*-s with some *āvarta*-s in *vilambit* (slow tempo) and some in *madhyamakāla*.

The Karaikkudi *ciṭṭasvara* to "*kanuḡoṇṭini*," which contains many of these characteristics, can be used to illustrate how members of the Karaikkudi style, in this case Sambasiva Iyer, produce new and interesting material within the broader tradition of *karṇāṭaka saṅgīta*. Although the structure of this *ciṭṭasvara* is not itself reflective of particularly 'Karaikkudi' stylistic features, the *ciṭṭasvara* itself is an emblem of the style when performed exclusively by musicians in the Karaikkudi style, because listeners become accustomed to hearing members of the Karaikkudi style perform it. The value placed upon or delight in composing *ciṭṭasvara*-s is also characteristic of the Karaikkudi style. That the opposite sentiment can also be a stylistic value, i.e. that a musician does not like to compose *ciṭṭasvara*-s or to sing those *ciṭṭasvara*-s that were not "originally intended," can be inferred from the statement, "some prominent composers like Papanasam Sivan do not appear to have been keen on composing chittasvaras," (Jayasitalakshmi 1984, 145).

In the notation below, each *āvarta* is divided into units enclosed in braces. I have created these units in order to elucidate the structure of the *ciṭṭasvara*--they may or may not correspond to every musicians conception of the composition while performing it. When the *ciṭṭasvara* is taught, if students cannot remember long strings of *svara*-s, they are taught short groups of *svara*-s which are then linked together. The units I have given in braces roughly correspond to the smallest of these "short groups of *svara*-s" which are taught to students. In this analysis, each unit is further subdivided with respect to accent (usually dynamic accent); larger level

structural accents are indicated by '>' and smaller ones by '^'.⁶⁵ Each *akṣara* comprises four *akṣarakāla*-s and is separated by a space; thus, for example, the last *svara* of the first brace, *sa*, is separated from 'dsrg' because it is the first *svara* of the fourth *akṣara*. Because the *sargam* notation below presents the *svara*-s as they would be sung and not the internal *gamaka*-s, it will occasionally become necessary to make these *gamaka*-s explicit within the descriptive text; for example, 'rs.' is often performed 'rrs'.

Figure 3: *cittasvara to kanuḡoṇṇini, bilahari rāga, ādi tāla, Tyagaraja*

```
// .... ..(gp dsrg s)(rs.) / (ndp)(d p.)(mg / rgs)(r s.)(nd) //
      >           >           >           >

// (s.)(r ..)(gs rgp)(r gpd)(g / pds)(p drsn / dp)(mg rsrg) //
      >   >   >   >   >           >   >   >

// (p.)(d ..)(nd pm.)(g rgpd / .)(pn.) (drs.) / (ndp.) (mgrg) //
      >   >           >           >           >           >

// (d.)(r ..)(gr ss.s) (gpds / .s)(rg pds. / s)(srg pds.) //
      >   >   >   >           >           >           >
                      (^)

//(ndpm gr)
>
```

Analysis

Broadly considered, this *cittasvara* displays principles of construction common to all of *karnāṭaka saṅgita* including diminution and augmentation of

⁶⁵This should not be confused with the notational system followed throughout the rest of this thesis in which plucks are indicated by '>'. In a *cittasvara* all *svara*-s are plucked.

rhythmic and melodic patterns (i.e. general characteristics of which Jayasitalakshmi's characteristics 4 and 5 are particular manifestations) and regularly recurring patterns of *kārvai*-s and *dirgha svara*-s (characteristic 8).

A more detailed notion of how this *ciṭṭasvara* functions musically can be gathered by analyzing the relationship between the *tāḷa* and *svara*-s in the *rāga*, and by identifying the means by which the *ciṭṭasvara* is propelled forward. Initially, *akṣarakāla*-s 7-13 of the first *āvarta* compose an ascending passage that begins on *ga*, a *graha* (initial) *svara* in the *rāga bilahari*, ends *tāra ga*, and comes to rest on *tāra sa*. *akṣarakāla*-s 14-16 '{ṛś.}', reiterate and accentuate *sa* by means of the *kārvai*,⁶⁶ 'ś.', and the emphatic *gamaka* from *ri*, 'ṛś'. *akṣarakāla*-s 17-19 '{ndp}', link the set of *svara*-s preceding it to its parallel in the upper tetrachord, '{dp.}', which accentuates *pa* with a *kārvai* and a *gamaka* from *dha*, 'ddp'. Parallel usages of *ri* and *dha* work nicely in this *ciṭṭasvara* because they are *chāya*⁶⁷ *svara*-s in *bilahari rāga* (Sambamoorthy 1973, 383) and because they occupy analogous positions in their respective tetrachords. Using the *vakra prayoga* (crooked phrase) 'rgs' which is also found in *akṣarakāla*-s 11-13, the next unit, '{mgrgs}', links the set of *svara*-s preceding it to a repetition of *akṣarakāla*-s 14-16 an octave lower. Finally *akṣarakāla*-s 31-32, '{nd}', are a rhythmic link to the first beat of the *tāḷa* and a melodic link to the tonic *sa* (in '{s..}' of the first three *akṣarakāla*-s of the second *āvarta*),

⁶⁶"elongation of *svara*-s, also of vowels in *sāhitya*" (Vidya Shankar 1983, 199)

⁶⁷*rāga-chāya* means "*rāga* characteristics" (Subramanian 1986, 271) or "semblance of a *rāga*" (Shankar 1983, 207); *chāya svara*-s in this context means *svara*-s that give these "characteristics" or this "semblance"

which, as the final pitch of "*kanugoṇṭini*," is not only an ideal concluding *svara*, but is also a *graha svara*, or an ideal *svara* for beginning phrases in *bilahari* (Dikshitar 1961-1983, 875). The rhythmic and melodic motion of these phrases, at this point simultaneously concluding and commencing, is urged forward by a 3 *akṣarakāla* *kārvai* on *ri* '{r..}' which parallels that preceding it on *sa*.

akṣarakāla-s 7-11 of the second *āvarta* contain the first of 3 ascending figures of 4 *svara*-s each, '{gsrgp}', '{rgpd}' and '{gpdś}', which are not only typical figures in *bilahari rāga*, but also "ancient *alankāra*-s" of the *ārōhi varṇa*⁶⁸ type--type 7 phrases according to the categories of Jayasitalakshmi's analysis. *akṣarakāla*-s 20-26, '{pdṛśndp}', reverse the motion of the *svara*-s from an ascending one to a descending one by using the parallel relationship of 'pd' to 'śi' in reverse: 'pd' 'ṛś'. In the last set of *svara*-s in the second *āvarta*, '{mgrsrg}', this descent ultimately leads to *sa* where the direction of motion is again reversed, reaching the *sama* with an unstable cadence on *pa*, '{p..}', analogous to that on *sa* at the beginning of the second *āvarta*. Like the second three *akṣarakāla*-s of the second *āvarta*, the second three of the third *āvarta* follow suit with the same *kārvai* on the parallel *chāya svara*, *dha* '{d..}' and prevent a sense of closure.

svara-s from the seventh *akṣarakāla* of second *āvarta* through the commencement of the third *āvarta* are given a compelling sense of forward drive through the use of accents. Major structural accents, '>', occur on *ga* of the seventh *akṣarakāla* and on every fourth *svara* ('p', 'd', 'ś', 'ś',

⁶⁸"artistic *svara*-group pattern in the ascending order of pitch" (Sambamoorthy 1952, 27)

'm') following it until the twenty seventh *akṣarakāla*. In *akṣarakāla*-s 7-19 these accents correspond to the highest pitch in an ascent group (like *pa* in {*gsrgp*}). However, the fourth *svara* of the next unit, *sa*, is an elision connecting the preceding end-accented ascending group of *svara*-s to a series of descending ones in which the first *svara* in each group is accented (*sa* and *ma* in 'śndp' 'mgrs'). The initial accents in these two groups, which contain duple subdivisions and begin after 2 *akṣarakāla*-s, are answered by the initial accents in the first and second units of 3 *akṣarakāla*-s each in the third *āvarta*. These rhythmic groupings combine with melodic ones to provide both momentary closure to the *sama* and provide continuity to the next set of patterns (or to repetition of the *āvarta* just played).

Like the phrases preceding it, *akṣarakāla* seven of the third *āvarta* through *akṣarakāla* six of the fourth *āvarta* contain interesting juxtapositions of rhythmic phrase groups. *akṣarakāla*-s 7-11 are a descending passage propelled by the *svara kaiṣika ni*, which signals descent when it appears in this form (*kaiṣika* or flat 7th) in this *rāga*. The initial accent, '^', on *ni* in 'ndp' is followed by a major structural accent, '>', on *ma*--both dynamic and agogic--in which the *kārvai* is played with a *gamaka* on the *viñā*, using the *svarasthāna* for *ga* ('m.' = 'gpm' [not notated]). Within *akṣarakāla*-s 7-11, '{ndpm.}', secondary accents form the pattern 3 + 2. The next six *akṣarakāla*-s balance the descending contour of the set of *svara*-s preceding it with an ascent that climaxes with a major structural accent and another two *akṣarakāla* *kārvai* on *dha*. By extending beyond the downbeat of the *drutam*, the *kārvai* creates tension between the effect of closure in the *tāla* and the effect of continuity in the *chāyā svara*, *dha*.

akṣarakāla-s 18-20, '{pn.}', building on the patterns at the end of the

previous two sets of *svara*-s ('pm.' and 'pd. '), sets up an expectation for 'ps.' which is diverted in *akṣarakāla*-s 21-24 through the appearance of 'dṛ' rather than *pa* in '{dṛś.}'. Like *akṣarakāla*-s 20-24 in the second *āvarta*, *akṣarakāla*-s 21-24 in the third *āvarta* redirect the motion of *svara*-s from an ascent to a descent; it is balanced by '{ndp.}' which like '{dṛś.}' is a typical *sancāra* (phrase or set of phrases) in *bilahari* (Sambamoorthy 1973, 383) and contains the pattern of primary and secondary stresses, '^->-'. The last four *akṣarakāla*-s of the third *āvarta* maintain the same basic stress pattern (without any primary stress points) and serve as a "turn around" phrase pivoting on *ri*.

The first six *akṣarakāla*-s of the fourth *āvarta*, like those at the beginning of the second and third, begins with the *kārvai*-s '>..>..' which contrast the duple patterns preceding them. Unlike the *kārvai*-s of the second and third *āvarta*-s, which followed the pattern, stable *svara* (*sa* or *pa*) + adjacent *chāya svara* (*ri* or *dha* respectively), the fourth *āvarta* contains two *chāya svara*-s separated by a fifth, '{d..}{ṛ..}', which extend into the *tāra sthāyi* (upper octave). This new configuration suggests both instability and forthcoming climax.

This climax is reached in a four phrase *srōtōvāha yati* in *akṣarakāla*-s 7-32 (such a climax can be seen as a *makuṭam*, or "crown"-ing climactic ending--characteristic 3). The stable motive in each phrase, 'ś.ś', climactic because it is the octave tonic, is approached from above '{grśś.ś}', in akks. (*akṣarakāla*-s) 7-12; from below, '{gpdś.ś}', in akks. 13-18; and from the *ri* below this '{rgpd ś.ś}', in akks. 19-25--here the *drutam* corresponds to the final *sa*. akks. 26-32, '{srgpdś.}', were it to follow the pattern suggested by the phrases preceding it, would culminate

with a repetition of *tāra sa* on the *sama*. But instead, the next cycle of *tāla* begins with an initially accented pattern descending from *kaiṣika ni* to *ri* which provides a smooth link to either a repetition of the whole *ciṭṭasvara*, a repetition of the fourth *āvarta* beginning on *akk.* seven, or a return to the *kṛiti* (depending on how the *ciṭṭasvara* is performed)--all of which begin with *ga*.

If Jayasitalakshmi's article presents the components of most *ciṭṭasvara-s* in *karnāṭaka saṅgita*, the *ciṭṭasvara* to "*kanugoṇṭini*" is unexceptional in basic structure--although interesting and exciting in its use of traditional gestures. In many ways, such manipulations of traditional gestures (as opposed to introducing nontraditional gestures which later become traditional or are rejected) are characteristic of Karaikkudi Sambasiva Iyer's melodic inventions.

The three kinds of innovations discussed in this section, organological, *saṅgati-s*, and *ciṭṭasvara-s* are indicative of the Karaikkudi style in several ways: first of all, in their specific nature, i.e. performers who use a *viṇā* with specific structural features and who take care of it through a specific process and who use particular *saṅgati-s* and *ciṭṭasvara-s* (all discussed above) demonstrate a link, if not membership, in the Karaikkudi style. This manner of association with style is problematic, for as we have seen, widespread public acceptance of individual innovations removes their value as unique stylistic markers. Secondly, these innovations indicate stylistic values such as the particular ways in which a devotional attitude in music can be expressed: preoccupation with detailed care of and invention of accessories for the *viṇā*, and the value of music in the abstract (*ciṭṭasvara-s*) and of new interpretations of existing texts (*saṅgati-s*) as

worthy additions to compositions of the past. Thirdly, the manifestation of these innovations suggests a particular relationship between precomposition and performance--that is, *ciṭṭasvara*-s and *saṅgati*-s are created, modified, and/or refined for performance so that they can be executed perfectly and are idiomatic to the instrument. Fourthly, to some extent a process of construction (especially prevalent in *saṅgati*-s) can be extracted that seems to be typical of the style--but because this process lies squarely within both *karṇāṭaka saṅgita* as a whole and among the logical possibilities of which the *viṇā* is capable, it is rather difficult if not impossible to pinpoint those features which are peculiar to the Karaikkudi style; instead I have isolated a few patterns which can be detected, albeit transformed, in the contributions of performers within the Karaikkudi style today.

2.3 Implicit and subtle markers of style

Even though some aspects of style are not explicit in such discussions of style as Sambasiva Iyer's speech, they are implicit in the behavior of musicians and in the subtle ways they talk about and react to music. While section 2.3, like section 2.2, contains a description of the Karaikkudi style as it may have been during Sambasiva Iyer's lifetime, it will become increasingly necessary during the course of this description to draw on experiences with musicians today in order to supplement sources written during the lives of Sambasiva Iyer and Subbarama Iyer and descriptions of their behavior and attitudes.

2.3.1 Body motion

People in the Karaikkudi style believe in restricting bodily motion while playing the *viṇā*. Both Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Lakshmi Ammal avoid excess motion by adopting a particular posture--a posture which

students are taught during their first lessons. For example, in my first *viṇā* lesson, Lakshmi Ammal taught me to put the *kuṭam* (body) on the ground next to my right thigh and the *kuṭukkai* (gourd) on my left thigh. While sitting, I was made to keep my right ankle under my left knee, and the *viṇā* frets facing neither directly up, nor outward but somewhere in between, with the instrument a "medium" distance away.⁶⁹ If the *viṇā* is tilted too far in one direction, or if it is not sitting securely against the body, it will shake when being played and will not give the proper sound (Ranganayaki pers. com. 1985).

The proscription against unnecessary movement extends beyond concerns of how the music itself sounds, and might be interpreted as a manifestation of the general feeling against drawing attention to oneself. This sentiment is related not only to the compelling societal pressure toward conformity, but also to the belief that, because music is considered "divine," attention to the individual represents a statement that he or she is greater than the art--and therefore greater than god.

Other examples illustrate less concern with musical sound than with appearance. On one occasion, while I was practicing a lesson at Lakshmi Ammal's house, I began to rock back and forth in time with the music--Lakshmi Ammal laughed at first, and then in a more serious tone scolded me, "no dancing!" Even a musician's face may conform to this notion of bodily stillness; when Ranganayaki performs, her face reveals neither happiness, nor sadness, nor anger--the only apparent motion being the gentle vibrating of her nose-rings and ear-rings set in motion by the intensity of her

⁶⁹This last description, which coincides with my own experience, is paraphrased from Lakshmi Ammal's son Subramanian (1986, 93).

playing. She probably developed this practice of stern facial expression from her *guru*, Sambasiva Iyer, who used to scold her if she smiled even while listening to music (Paul Butler pers. com. 1987).

This austerity of expression is not only characteristic of the Karaikkudi style in particular but also of other performers in Sambasiva Iyer's generation. The persistence of these values raises issues concerning the mechanisms that induce conservatism in one style or in one performer rather than in another, and concerning whether conservatism in one stylistic domain presupposes conservatism in another--issues that can be taken up as further aspects of the Karaikkudi style are explored.

2.3.2 Tempo

The tempo at which music is performed is often dependant on a musician's *pāṇi*. For example, we have seen that Sambasiva Iyer and Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, unlike performers in some other styles, render *gamaka*-s at a relatively slow speed to ensure clarity. In general, musicians such as K.S. Subramanian have told me that Iyer used to render compositions slower than do most artists today. The Karaikkudi brothers performed *varṇa*-s, which are now generally performed in 2-3 speeds, for the most part in a medium or slow tempo--with only selected portions performed at the second speed.⁷⁰

There are several possible reasons explaining why the brothers limited the speed of their playing, among which are the thickness and the tension of the strings, and the value placed on the clear rendering of *gamaka*-s. One might also explain the slow speed of performance historically, noting that the Karaikkudi style was a reaction to, or stood in contrast to, other

⁷⁰In *sāmininne*, a *varṇam* in *śaṅkarābharāṇam rāga*, only the *muktāyisvara* is played in the second speed. In the *carāṇam*, only the final two *carāṇasvara*-s are rendered in second speed.

styles that concentrated solely on speed, rhythmic intricacy, and display of muscle. As A. R. Bhuvanar explains in a pamphlet released for the birth centenary of Sambasiva Iyer:

In those far off days, the emphasis was placed on Ragam, Thanam and Pallavi. Playing "Shatkalam" [six speeds], was the aim of every Vina Vidvan. There was also the "Ghanam" [very fast style of *tānam* (Sambamoorthy 1959, 188)] style of Vina playing. . . proficiency on the instrument was judged by the ability to demonstrate intricate Pallavis in complex talas, rather than by the elevated type of playing that brought out "bhava" and "rasa."

This rugged type of playing, gradually yielded place to the style which lays much store on "bhava" and emotional stimulation and less on gymnastics, whether rhythmic or otherwise. Vidvan Sambasiva Aiyar was an authentic exponent of the new style with its stress on faithful rendering of the *kṛitis* of the Trinity, Tanam, and beautiful elaboration of Ragas. (Bhuvanar 1988, 8).

Although the Karaikkudi *viṇā* players of today have gradually begun to choose their own sometimes faster, sometimes slower speeds of playing, overall they maintain a moderate pace of rendition; this is true whether the unit be as small as the *gamaka* or as large as the composition, *rāga ālāpana*, or other forms. One should also note, however, that members of the Karaikkudi style play quite rapidly in comparison with such playing styles as that of T. Viswanathan--who himself points to tempo as a possible marker of style (pers. comm. 1988). Viswanathan's exposition of the *kṛiti* "*anurāgamulēni*," for example, is often much slower than that of Ranganayaki. While Viswanathan's tendency toward performing certain compositions in a relatively slow tempo cannot be traced to such practical limitations as string tension, it may, perhaps, be traced to his family's tradition of performing *pada*-s in a slow, drawn out, and extremely expressive manner to provide scope for the *bharatanāṭyam* dancer's *abhinaya* and to his family's tradition of performing compositions of Muthuswamy Dikshitar and Shyama Sastri, which are generally slow (Viswanathan pers. com. 1989). The

Karaikkudi school is known for its renditions of three *pada*-s, each of which, unlike the versions in Viswanathan's school, is rendered at a brisk tempo.

2.3.3 Interest in rhythm

Although the Karaikkudi brothers were not known for the speed of their playing, they were known for their interest in the exploration of rhythmic possibilities--Subbarama Iyer for his *laya* (i.e. his control over intricate rhythmic permutations) and his singing of *pallavi*-s with precision and depth, and Sambasiva Iyer, for his *ciṭṭasvara*-s and for his exposition of *tānam*. Among the complex rhythmic techniques for which the brothers were known, "*dvi-tāḷa-avadhāna*," (lit. "two-*tāḷa*-attentiveness") or the rendering of pieces in two *talas* simultaneously, is illustrated in a meeting of the "experts' committee" on 28 Dec. 1952, chaired by Sambasiva Iyer:

Vidvan [Tinnaiyam] Venkatarama Aiyar said that he had learnt the Avadhana from the illustrious Veena vidvans, the Karaikkudi Brothers and also from Tiruvayyar Subramanya Aiyar. According to the Dvi-tala Avadhana, two different *talas* are used when a piece is rendered, the right hand being used for one *tala* and the left for another . . . Vidvan Venkatarama Aiyar illustrated his Avadhana by rendering the varnam *Viribonī* in Bhairavi [raga] for which he used Khanda jati Ata *tala* (chatusra *nadaī*) on one hand and Chaturasra jati Tripata *tala* (misra *nadaī*) on the other . . . The president [Sambasiva Iyer] complimented the Vidvan for expounding the Avadhana clearly. (*Journal of the Music Academy of Madras* 1953, 33-4).

Because this passage seems to indicate that certain *vidvan*-s, such as the Karaikkudi brothers, were associated with particular rhythmic techniques, such as *dvi-tāḷa-avadhāna*, this technique, and others like it, can be taken as markers of style. In this passage Venkatarama Aiyar has legitimized himself as well as his ability to execute this technique by associating himself with the Karaikkudi style (and with Tiruvayyar Subramanya Aiyar) even though he was not a member of the style.

This "interest in rhythm" runs deep into the style, where even in the first set of exercises, *sarali varisai*, an extra lesson--unique to the style--combines the second lesson ('srsrsgm-srgmpdnś') with the fourth lesson ('srgmsrgmsrgmpdnś') to change the simple pattern of two *tāla* cycles per lesson to three cycles.

Figure 4: *sarali varisai* #5 (tape 2, ex. 7) 1st speed

```
// s r g m s r g m / s r s r / s r g m //
```

```
// s r g m p d n ś / ś n d p / ś n d p //
```

```
// ś n ś n ś n d p / ś n d p / m g r s //
```

Indications that aspects of rhythm are emphasized in the Karaikkudi style are found not only in the particular lessons taught, but also in the way they are taught--each with strict attention to the demarcation of the *tāla*. In the Karaikkudi style, and in other *vinā* styles, this is accomplished by stroking the three side strings with the little finger on every *ghāta*, or clapped beat of the *tāla*. In the Karaikkudi style the misplacement of these strokes is considered a serious error even if the melody stands in correct proportion to the *tāla* at every juncture. Some, but not all other *vinā* styles place emphasis on the use of side strings, and in short *tāla*-s, such as the *chāpu tāla*-s, the number of strokes is reduced so as not to interfere with the melody.⁷¹

⁷¹ In *miśra chāpu*, the strokes of the little finger divide the *tāla* into either one group of seven, or two groups of three and four--not into the way it is often counted 1 + 2 + 2 + 2. Similarly *khanda chāpu* is marked in either one group of five or two groups of two and three. Since the choice of how many strokes to use and where to use them in *chāpu tāla*-s seems to vary from performer to performer and from piece to piece (even within the style) it is not possible to ascertain whether the Karaikkudi brothers followed any particular rule in this regard.

Raajeswari Padmanabhan recalls learning her lessons in two speeds from her mother but not fully understanding *tāḷa* until she came to study with Sambasiva Iyer. With him she learned first to keep one speed in each hand for each *alaṅkāra*, and later to combine them keeping different *tāḷa*-s in each hand--for example *dhṛūva tāḷa* (14 beats divided 4 + 2 + 4 + 4) in one hand, and *tripuṭa tāḷa* (4 + 3) in the other. After mastering this technique she learned to double and quadruple the speed of these *tāḷa*-s, and later to keep them while singing *pallavi*-s (Padmanabhan 1988).

This account suggests that such proclivities as an interest in the intricacies of rhythm are inculcated from an early age. Even though the interest itself, of course, cannot be taught, tools can be provided and examples given that help students to develop their own creative possibilities.

Sambasiva Iyer, expressing his own "interest in rhythm" in rather limited ways, apparently felt that certain kinds of rhythmic play were suitable for the *vīṇā*, and certain kinds were not. The *mṛidaṅgam* player Karaikkudi Muttu Iyer, who used to play with Sambasiva Iyer, and Sambasiva Iyer's students Ramaswamy Sastri, Devakottai Narayana Iyengar, and Tirugokarnam Ramachandra Iyer, recalled that he never rendered *kalpana svāra*-s⁷² using *mṛidaṅgam jati*-s⁷³ (Muttu Iyer 1970's), but always in "*sarva laghu*." *sarva laghu* means calculating the *tāḷa* in small, steady subdivisions (*akṣara*-s or *akṣarakāla*-s) not in large units like *laghu*, *drutam* or *anu-*

⁷²Improvisation that usually occurs after the *caraṇam* of a composition or in a *pallavi* in which *svāra*-s are rendered in various patterns against the *tāḷa*.

⁷³Rhythmic combination explored in accompaniment and during solos by percussion instruments.

drutam; the effect of such divisions is one of spontaneity and continuity. Musicians using *mṛidaṅgam jati-s* think in terms of such large units as five, "tatim kina tom," six, "taka tari kiṭa," or seven *akṣarakāla-s*, "naka tatim kina tom"; strings of these units, when used by melody instruments or the voice, often give the impression of being precomposed (and often are). But Raajeswari (1988) mentions that spontaneous sounding *svara kalpana-s* are a "speciality" of the Karaikkudi style. This conservative practice, in which *sarva laghu kalpana svara-s* and not *mṛidaṅgam jati-s* are considered appropriate to the *viṇā* (and by extension, to the voice), and which is generally associated with musicians of Sambasiva Iyer's generation rather than with the Karaikkudi school in particular, is seldom adhered to today.

2.3.4 Techniques eschewed or rare

A playing style can be defined as much by what is carefully avoided as by what is strictly adhered to. For example, while Karaikkudi *viṇā* players almost never use vibrato on *svara-s* that do not require *gamaka-s*, other *viṇā* players such as Chitti Babu, his guru Emani Sankara Sastri, and R.K. Suryanarayanan often do--presumably for the purpose of prolonging the resonance of these *svara-s*. In addition, because these artists use strings of narrow gauge set at a moderate tension, techniques such as vibrato help to maintain the continuity they desire. And because these artists have adopted many Western techniques and tunes, it is probable that this technique too, has been borrowed from the West.

Although the use of vibrato is by no means typical in the Karaikkudi style, Ranganayaki appears to use it slightly on the *jīva svara* (*chāya svara*) *ma* in the *rāga*, *rītigauḷa*, producing a shimmering effect. This ornament, because it does not appear in descriptions of this *rāga* by Samba-

moorthy (1982c, 380) or Subba Rao ([1966] 1985, 40-1), may or may not be considered a *gamaka*; but because it is never used on *pa* or on *sa*, it does serve to differentiate certain *svara*-s, at least to some extent. The possible function of differentiation apparent in Ranganayaki's usage of this technique lies in sharp contrast to the apparent function of vibrato, as employed by the performers named above, to prolong or enhance the resonance of all "plain" notes.⁷⁴

Another technique, rare in Karaikkudi style but common in the Dhanam style (Nixon pers. com. 1988), is executed as follows: first, the left hand middle finger is placed just behind the fret corresponding to the pitch to be sounded, and the index finger is placed behind the fret that precedes it; second, the string is plucked with either the right hand index or middle finger; third, after the pitch sounds, the middle finger is removed while the index finger slides across the fret in front of it causing the *svara* to sound again, as if coming from below. This technique, distinct from yet related to the *sphurita* and "sparkling *sphurita*," is occasionally used in the *kṛiti sarasīruhā* as taught by Lakshmi Ammal and her students.⁷⁵ Because this technique sounds very similar to the "sparkling *sphurita*" in this context it is not possible to determine how Sambasiva Iyer played this passage solely on the basis of the recordings that exist (unfortunately I did not ask Ranganayaki about this while I was in India).

Ranganayaki uses the technique described above to articulate the

⁷⁴A parallel can be drawn in vocal music as well. G. N. Balasubramaniam and his currently performing imitators such as Balamurali Krishna have cultivated a Western vocal technique that incorporates vibrato as a distinct technique from *gamaka*.

⁷⁵Specifically, the technique occurs on the syllable "śa" in "*guṇaśālē*" in the second *saṅgati* of the *caranam* where these words appear.

penultimate *ri* in the first *saṅgati* of the *kṛiti* "ēṭāvunarā," but because she did not learn this *kṛiti* from Sambasiva Iyer but from Kaloori Krishnamurthy,⁷⁶ this usage cannot be taken as an indication that Sambasiva Iyer used this technique. One can observe that, although rarely used, the technique does form a part of the Karaikkudi *viṇā* style today.

A third technique, relatively rare in the Karaikkudi style but found in the Dhanammal style is performed by placing the left hand middle finger behind the fret corresponding to the *svara* to be sounded and the index finger either behind the fret immediately preceding or two frets preceding that of the desired *svara*. When the string is plucked the middle finger is lifted (with or without plucking the string slightly) and immediately "hammered" back on the fret. A version of this *gamaka* that Karaikkudi *viṇā* players use more frequently is performed by bending the string from the *svarasthāna* on which the index finger is placed in the above description (i.e. one or two frets preceding the *svarasthāna* of the *svara* around which the adornment is centered) to the *svara* desired, loosening the tension, and then sliding to the desired *svara*.

Finally, techniques of string deflection often serve as markers of style. Whereas Sambasiva Iyer did not deflect the strings of the *viṇā* more than four frets, or two Western whole steps (Subramanian 1986, 96), S. Balachander is a modern *viṇā* player whose attempts to make the instrument sound "vocal" have resulted in techniques that may involve bending bending strings beyond the interval of a perfect fourth. Although some extension of the bending technique has occurred in the Karaikkudi style (Subramanian 1986,

⁷⁶He has taught Ranganayaki "plain" versions of many compositions for which she has subsequently developed *saṅgati*-s.

165), bends in excess of two steps are rare.

This discussion, while suggesting that styles can be defined by the absence as well as by the presence of certain characteristics, also brings out the difficulty in trying to isolate techniques which are totally absent in the Karaikkudi style. Even so, the relative infrequency of and the limited contexts for these techniques seem to provide an elastic but definite stylistic boundary.

2.3.5 "note"-s ending on *madhyama*

Although Sambasiva Iyer did not compose *kṛiti*-s or other pieces with texts, he did compose pieces, popularly called "note"-s, which consisted entirely of *svara*-s and frequently ended on *ma*.⁷⁷ This unusual ending, for which there is no explanation in traditional Indian music theory (because "note"-s are not in *rāga*-s), may perhaps be interpreted as a "signature" or marker of the Karaikkudi style.

The "note" is a genre of wordless song based upon Western tunes, probably played by colonial brass bands and other ensembles, that seems to function as an icon representing all of Western music. In an interesting reversal of the colonial model of domination, "note"-s seem to prove to Indian musicians that they can successfully perform Western music, and that Western music is extraordinarily shallow in comparison with their own.

Sambasiva Iyer originally composed these tunes to amuse neighborhood children (Subramanian pers. com. 1988), but often performed them in concert. That Sambasiva Iyer was able to maintain a sense of purity in his classical music by relegating these popular, borrowed, Western tunes to a

⁷⁷Several versions of these "note"-s, recorded under informal circumstances, can be found on tape 6 side B.

separate category (see Kartomi 1981) suggests that perhaps even the manner in which musical material is borrowed and incorporated into one's own usage is a function of style: some styles may incorporate techniques, such as vibrato, into the way they play all genres; other styles may use Western tunes in a classical context (exposition of *rāga*, *svara kalpana* etc.); and still other styles, such as the Karaikkudi style, may play Western tunes only in a category specifically created for them. In this way, Sambasiva Iyer's general prohibition against mixing *pāṇi*-s is mirrored internally with a prohibition against mixing genres (or creating genres to avoid mixing classical with non-classical gestures).

Lakshmi Ammal taught me two of Sambasiva Iyer's "note"-s drawing attention to the final *ma* without explaining why it was important. The other Karaikkudi musicians whom I later questioned about this unusual ending had neither noticed this pattern, nor had they an explanation for it; and when I hesitantly suggested to Ranganayaki that ending the "note" with *ma* might in some way distinguish it as a Karaikkudi note, she first asked whether all other notes (such as the one made famous by Madurai Mani Iyer) ended on *ma*, and receiving a negative answer, smiled and said "*irukkalām*" ("it could be"). She also said that, although sometimes omitted from the performance of Sambasiva Iyer's notes, *ma* was an appropriate ending for all of them.

On one occasion at the end of a recording session (tape 6B ex 3b-c) Lakshmi Ammal did not end the "note" on *ma*, as she had taught me, but instead linked it to a brief exposition of *madhyamāvati rāga*--a *raga* traditionally used at the conclusion of performances which is believed counter the ill spiritual effect of musical errors that may have been committed. She probably omitted *ma* at the end of this "note" to avoid closure before

inserting a few phrases of *ālāpāna* in this auspicious *rāga*.

While the notion that this usage of *ma* could be a marker of the Karaikkudi style is based on admittedly slim evidence, it is at least accepted as a possibility by a prominent member of the style. If we too accept this possibility for a moment, we might ask to what extent Sambasiva Iyer consciously intended this function, and why he did not tell Ranganayaki. As his student, perhaps Ranganayaki was expected to figure things out for herself--his training method was nonverbal. Lakshmi Ammal was the only person who indicated to me that the ending, *ma*, was important in these notes--could Sambasiva Iyer have possibly made such an indication to her? At this point these questions must remain unanswered because before I began to, no member of the style thought pose them, and soon, I suspect they will provide their own answers.

2.3.6 Borrowing

As suggested above, the manner of incorporating borrowed material may vary from style to style. In addition, just as the phenomenon of syncretism depends on similar patterns between two different cultures, so too does borrowing among different styles in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* depend on compatibility within these systems. Sambasiva Iyer used to borrow *saṅgati*-s he liked, i.e. that were compatible with his stylistic values, but not necessarily the manner in which they were played, because while the former is common--any musical material which is grammatically correct is potentially useable in any style--the latter is relatively uncommon, for as we have seen, technique is often style-bound.

An example of such compatibility, in this case between Western and Indian string instruments, can be found in Sambasiva Iyer's use of wound

strings for the *mantiram* and *anumantiram* of the *viṇā* (the idea of winding strings might have come from the West). But unlike Western tunes, which were relegated to a separate category in Sambasiva Iyer's repertoire, wound strings--regardless of their source--contributed to Sambasiva Iyer's conception of an ideal sound for all music played on the *viṇā*. The same can be said about the sound hole he introduced to the south Indian *viṇā*, which had precedents in Western instruments like the guitar and in the *viṇā* used by the Parsis (Subramanian pers. com. 1988).

Musicians borrow or learn new materials, techniques, and technologies not only from such culturally and musically distant sources as the West, but also from musicians in their own culture. In the process of incorporating a new composition into the Karaikkudi style, for example, Sambasiva Iyer sometimes modified it to fit his stylistic aesthetics--that is, to *make* it compatible with the Karaikkudi style. But, although Sambasiva Iyer never performed a new composition before carefully developing or modifying the *saṅgati-s* to ensure they were both interesting and well-balanced, there is no record of how these compositions sounded when he learned them. The processes by which Ranganayaki modifies newly learned compositions may provide insight into those of Sambasiva Iyer, from whom, directly or indirectly, she learned not only particular pieces, but also *how to learn* new pieces. One such process, learning a composition from beginning to end with all the *saṅgati-s* intact and in the same order, making adjustments only for technique on the *viṇā*, is analogous to the way Sambasiva Iyer would borrow another performer's *saṅgati-s*. Another process involves learning the basic *saṅgati-s* of the composition, memorizing its text, but developing new *saṅgati-s* according to aesthetic demands of the style.

Some general issues arising from the question of borrowing are 1) what does the new material contain that is compatible with or desirable in the style? 2) how must this material be altered to conform to the new style? and 3) what does this material "mean" in its new context? In answer to the first question we find that in Iyer's time perhaps new and interesting musical gestures (*saṅgati*-s, compositions, etc.) and certain technical innovations were considered compatible with the Karaikkudi style, while new techniques, for example, were not. While the musical architecture, in *saṅgati*-s for example, might need alteration, all newly learned material was implicitly altered by the way Sambasiva Iyer would interpret it on the instrument. The question of "meaning" is context dependant--if a musician borrows a melody from another artist or from the West because of the prestige associated with it, one must consider it in a different light from that in which a melody borrowed for purely aesthetic reasons would be. While these contexts are not mutually exclusive, they do suggest different interpretations.

2.3.7 Relationship to audience

Accounts such as the following suggest Sambasiva Iyer did not alter his performance practices for the sake of the audience, "the moment the artist strives to 'please' he loses touch with the divinity within . . . they [the Karaikkudi brothers] did not believe in the function of music as entertainment," (Subramanian 1986, 22). In accordance with this sentiment, the brothers presumably would have avoided such practices as extensive visual (i.e. bodily motion) and verbal communication while playing, selecting easy-to-understand *rāga*-s solely for the sake of retaining interest, engaging in showmanship or virtuosic gimmicks, and limiting or extending the length of individual concert segments. This latter practice is illustrated in an

often retold anecdote. When Sambasiva Iyer began to perform on the radio, on at least one occasion he is said to have refused to condense his performance of *rāga ālāpana* to fit the allotted time slot, thus forcing the staff to truncate his performance (Kalki 1941).

This defiant attitude, while an important stylistic value, cannot and has not survived the demands of musical professionalism as the industry has grown. His two students Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Raajeswari Padmanabhan have made concessions to the public, and to the industry in general, but in different ways and to different extents.

2.3.8 Domains of individual expression

Sambasiva Iyer confined his creativity to the domains laid out in the traditional divisions: *kalpita saṅgīta* (composed music), which included his own *ciṭṭasvara*-s, "note"-s, adapted folk tunes, and *saṅgati*-s; and *mano-dharma saṅgīta* (improvised music) which includes *ālāpana*, *tānam*, *svara kalpana*, and *niraval*. His rigid adherence to this division suggests that segments of a performance have specific functions which should not be mixed-- i.e. *rāga* should not be played in the context of a composition, and *tānam* should not be played in the context of *ālāpana*. In this regard, Ranganayaki recalls that Sambasiva Iyer would never "set-up" improvisations before hand, nor would he spontaneously alter the structure of a composition while performing it.

Subbarama Iyer, who set to music texts taken from such Tamil classics as the *tiruvāccakam*, *tiruppukal*, and *tēvāram*, differed from his brother Sambasiva Iyer, who believed in composing music without texts (except for the *saṅgati*-s within an extant composition). Such differences in approach indicate the flexibility of values in the Karaikkudi style even in a period

that is considered rather conservative.

I consider the question of domains for individual expression because not only are the actual manifestations of creativity important for understanding what constitutes a style and how it changes, but so also are the categories and contexts in which these creative products are placed. Lakshmi Ammal, who used to compose *saṅgati*-s spontaneously or choose among different possibilities from performance to performance, presents a different model for such domains because although the act of creating *saṅgati*-s may in some ways conform to the practice of Sambasiva Iyer, the manner in which she performed these *saṅgati*-s--spontaneously--was wholly different.

2.4 śakti

This section concerns three ways in which *śakti*, the female energy principle, relates to the Karaikkudī school and to *viṇā* playing in general. The first is the change from a predominately male to a predominately female art, the second concerns the femininity associated with the instrument in mythology and iconography, and the third, Sambasiva Iyer's manner of worshipping the goddess.

2.4.1 Restrictions placed on women

As a result of the stigma attached to *dēvadāsi*-s,⁷⁸ high caste women were discouraged if not forbidden from learning music or dance--for that matter, from being educated at all--for *dēvadāsi*-s were associated with the knowledge of all arts which could be used to entertain Indian men as well as

⁷⁸"servants of god," or women who were dedicated to particular south Indian temples for the purpose of entertaining the deity with music and dance, were at one time considered *nityasumaṅgali*-s or "ever auspicious women." However, with the decline of princely patronage, the coming of the British, and other changes in Indian society the *dēvadāsi* figure became increasingly associated with prostitution. For a study of the role of *dēvadāsi*-s in south Indian society see Kersenboom-Story (1987).

to serve the temple. For this reason, no women in the Karaikkudi family were permitted to learn the *viṇā* until the late 1920s--at which time public (high caste) opinion was changing to one that encouraged high caste Indians, male or female, to excel in the arts.

Lakshmi Ammal, who learned vocal music from her father, Subbarama Iyer, applied what she learned to the *viṇā* and instructed herself until the age of fifteen--at which time she began to teach. Lakshmi Ammal's father, Subbarama Iyer, and uncle, Sambasiva Iyer, would not allow her to come to their concerts, and in general made it difficult for her to learn. The reason for this was partly because she was female and partly because of Subbarama Iyer's superstition concerning the premature death of his son. Just after his son had gotten married and was beginning to demonstrate great promise as a *viṇā* player he died. Subbarama feared that because his only son played well and died young his daughter Lakshmi would also die young if she learned to play well--so strong was the capricious power associated with the *viṇā* (Narayana Iyer [1986a]).

In the late 1920s public disapproval of high caste female performers was gradually giving way to acceptance of some performers--most notably to such dancers as Rukmini Devi and to *harikatha* exponent Sarasvati Bai (Rangaramanuja Ayyangar 1972, 264-66). Lakshmi was already married and had been giving lessons for some years when her father finally gave in, and began giving lessons to his two youngest daughters, Sankari and Meenakshi. They were still quite young when their father died, so they were unable to receive full training under him. Still, they are the only living disciples of the older brother.

Due to circumstances beyond the control of the brothers, the entire

tradition passed into the hands of women. Having no children of his own, Sambasiva Iyer adopted Lakshmi Ammal's son, Santhanam, to perform rites on his death day ceremony, renamed him Karaikkudi Sambasiva Subramanian,⁷⁹ and taught him for one year before dying in 1958. As a result, only two students, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Raajeswari Padmanabhan, received the full benefit of Sambasiva Iyer's tutelage.

Even if the male line had survived, the proportion of female disciples is likely to have increased due to a modernizing economy that, at least initially, required the men of a family to seek occupations more financially dependable than that of a professional musician. And while in earlier times husbands fulfilled certain religious duties and wives fulfilled others, the requirements of a modern business environment, especially in a city like Madras, has allowed men to stray from conduct that is considered "ritually pure." Because many Brahmin men now eat meat, drink alcohol, smoke, and spend large periods of time away from the home, women must bear the burden of maintaining and teaching traditional values at home.

A large body of literature discusses how women's roles have changed as a result of this shift. For example, whereas ritual status has played a substantial role in the development of caste, economics has played an important role in the creation of class--and according to Patricia Caplan's study of women's organization in Madras, "the creation of a culture specific to a particular class is largely the work of women" (1985, 20). The "particular class" that comprises most *viṇā* players is the middle or upper class

⁷⁹The author of the dissertation (1986) to which I have repeatedly referred.

for these are the groups that can generally afford *viṇā* lessons.⁸⁰ Because of the close correspondence between upper castes and upper classes, and because the *viṇā* is a symbol of Hindu "high culture," most *viṇā* players are also high caste Hindus. For example, the L'Armands found that 90% of all *viṇā* players in Madras between 1966 and 1967 were from high castes (1978, 124).

Some have interpreted the change of women's roles in an entirely negative light, focusing on what would be in the U.S. called a suburban housewife's mentality. But as Caplan retorts to a comment in a government of India report (1974, 85) that in wealthy families "Home making is raised to a fine art, and trifling details assume exaggerated importance,"

What the committee failed to see, however, is that such details are far from trifling; they are part of the vital task of the female householder whose role in domestic labour, child-rearing and socialization, marriage negotiations, extra-family relationships, ritual, and membership of voluntary associations is crucial not only in the maintenance of the structure of family and kinship, but also in the perpetuation, reproduction, and formation of life-styles or cultures associated with class. To define class according to males' occupations and incomes alone is to ignore the vast and complex process of culture formation, which is primarily carried out by women (Caplan 1985, 82-3).

These statements explain why women now constitute the majority of amateur musicians while men still dominate the professional sphere. By adopting music, women can affirm, retain, and communicate religious and cultural values in the home amidst changing economic and social conditions outside the home. In addition, women must demonstrate control over such traditional domains as cooking and music to increase their eligibility for marriage in the traditional arranged marriage system.

⁸⁰Payment for lessons is itself a modern phenomenon. Ranganayaki and Raajeswari never had to pay for lessons.

Woman who know music are desirable not only because they could entertain and provide income through giving lessons, but also because knowledge of music now represents culture, discipline, and morality. On a cosmological level, an unmarried (virgin) woman is seen to hold "capricious power; usually auspicious" (Reynolds 1980, 36)--this power, if not properly channeled, is believed to be capable of wreaking havoc, disease, misfortune, and of generally upsetting the cosmic balance of society. Because females are seen to possess power, or *śakti*, to different degrees and in different forms throughout their lives, men must "contain and control the *śakti* of the female in all phases of her life" (Daniel 1980, 66). Given these norms, it is not surprising to find that while a married woman with a living husband is considered totally auspicious, a widow, implicitly credited with causing the death of her husband, is considered utterly inauspicious. Parents can, in effect, control the *śakti* of their daughter by having her learn the *vīṇā*--a discipline that is not only considered divine, but also a safe outlet for "capricious power," for the learning of music requires self-discipline.

While these "power-restricting" and domestic aspects of learning the *vīṇā* may contribute to an explanation of the large number of amateur female musicians, it does not explain why the main proponents of the Karaikkudi school are women. Unlike many women, Ranganayaki and Raajeswari were not taught music for the purpose of controlling their *śakti* or for making them suitable marriage partners, but because they had talent, and were loved by their teachers. These simple explanations may also apply to many amateur female musicians who learned music for their own enjoyment--despite the cosmological explanations that dominate some studies of women in south Asia.

2.4.2 Iconography and mythology

The importance of the *viṇā* in Indian culture and its perceived value in worship is both based upon and expressed in, among other things, the connection between the *viṇā*, femininity and the goddess. Rather than review the many myths and specific sculptures that express this relationship in slightly different ways, I will discuss only three examples.

One myth credits the invention of the *viṇā* to the Hindu god, Siva, who became inspired by the sleeping figure of his consort Parvatī, arms draped across her breasts (Subramanian 1986, 83). This myth draws an implicit connection between the power of sound, *nāda*, which finds potential expression through the two resonators of the *viṇā*, and the life principle symbolized by the breasts of the goddess Parvatī.

The *viṇā* is also associated with male effeminacy. The sage Narada, who is said to have brought music to earth having learned it from the gods, is not only associated with the *viṇā* in classical mythology, but also in popular Tamil comic theatre, where he sometimes appears as a homosexual, carrying the *viṇā* and chanting "Narayana" (the name of his *iṣṭadēvatā*).

Iconographic depictions of the goddess of learning and music, Saraswati, never fail to include her playing a *viṇā*. All books and musical instruments, and especially the *viṇā*, are seen as embodiments of her. *pūjā* is performed for the instrument on certain days of the year (*viṇādayādaśamī* day and others) as if the instrument were the goddess.

These connections between the goddess, femininity and the *viṇā*, while only a fraction of the cosmology associated with the instrument, goes a long way to explain the modern Indian phenomenon in which the *viṇā* functions as an emblem of music, of culture, and of Hinduism independantly from the music

it actually produces--even though many people prefer to listen to vocal music, it seems to be fashionable to have a *viṇā* around the house, and a wife, daughter, or mother living there who plays it.

2.4.3 Sambasiva Iyer and worship of the goddess

The Karaikkudi brothers were *śrī vidya upāsaka*-s (worshippers of the goddess *śrī vidyā*, a form of Durga and an embodiment of knowledge), and they incorporated the *viṇā* into their daily worship. Raajeswari recalls, for example, practicing lessons on the *viṇā* one hundred and eight times each for each time Sambasiva Iyer would perform *śrī vidyā arcana*, and that in this context playing correctly was less important than playing the correct number of times. She also describes playing *kṛiti*-s in praise of the goddesses *ambāl* and *dēvi*, such as "*eḷuntaḷ paratēvi*" in *kāmbōji rāga* and "*nāmorāla-kiñci*" in *dhanyāsi*, after doing the evening *sandhyāvandana* (name for a particular *pūjā*)⁸¹ and after chanting such items as *lalita sahasranāman* (a thousand names of the goddess Lalita--another form of Durga) and *durgā sūkta* (verse in praise of the goddess Durga).

Subramanian too recalls, "He [Sambasiva Iyer] particularly liked me to play vina while he was doing his *pūjā*, which lasted for four hours." Ranganayaki recalls sitting quietly during the day while her master performed *pūjā*; in the evening Sambasiva Iyer would play such items as *durgā [sūkta]* and recite *śloka*-s which she would be asked to play on the instrument; then they would play compositions (probably ones like those played by Raajeswari in praise of the goddess). All accounts suggest, however, that Sambasiva

⁸¹Prayers performed by Brahmins three times a day at the junctures of morning, noon and evening. These junctures are sometimes personified as a goddess, *sandhyā*, who is seen as the consort of Siva, of the Sun, and of others (Monier-Williams, 1145). Subramanian describes this simply as "the daily worship of the sun" (1986, 34)

Iyer did not play the *viṇā* while doing *pūjā*--that is, while chanting the *mantra*-s, lighting the oil etc.--but afterward, as part of the general worship event.

Just as in Hindu mythology, where sages and demons alike practice asceticism to obtain *tapa*-s ("heat" or potential power) which can be used for harm or to do good, can be given away, or can be retained for spiritual advancement, so too is rigorous practice of the *viṇā* is seen to be a means of acquiring *śakti*. The famous Tamil journalist Kalki, who sat in amazement as the young Ranganayaki gave her first performance with Sambasiva Iyer in 1941, mused that Sambasiva Iyer must have shared with her the tremendous *śakti* he had acquired over his many years of practice (Kalki 1941).⁸² Because the *viṇā* usually requires several decades of training to obtain even moderate competence, Indians feel the need to account for child prodigies such as Ranganayaki who learned to play well in very few years. Such accounts usually claim that an artist has actually learned music for some number of lifetimes rather than years, or that the artist is or was an incarnation of, or blessed by a particular deity.

That Sambasiva Iyer practiced "as a ritual, till the very end of his life" (Subramanian 1986, 35) and that while doing *pūjā* Raajeswari was asked to repeat particular lessons a fixed number of times--regardless of mistakes made while playing--underscores how the discipline of practicing the *viṇā* (especially the initial exercises) was considered not only a means to an

⁸²ānāl inta pattu vayatu cīrumi eppaṭi 30 varuṣa catakam ceytirukka muḍiyūm ēnra viṣayantān enakku marmamāyiruntatu. piṛaku nānē oru camātānam kaṇṭu piṭittēn. munkālattellām riṣikaḷ taṅkalūṭaiyā tapasīl oru pakutiyaḷ piṛarukku koduttuviṭuvatai parrip paṭittirukkirōm. karnan tannuṭaiya punṇiyattaiyellām prāman vēsam pūṇṭu paramātmāvukku koṭuttu viṭavīllaiyā? atē pōl ētō oru caktiyaik koṇṭu kāraikkūṭi cakōtararkaḷ taṅkalūṭaiya ulaippukkuppin inta cīrumikku māṛriyirukka vēṇṭum.

end, but also as an end in itself--a process of becoming involved with the divine.

It is also interesting to note the many ways in which the goddess appears in Sambasiva Iyer's worship. While Iyer's actual routine of prayer is probably similar to that of other *śrī vidyā upāsaka*-s, his use of the *viṇā* in worship is rather uncommon (in comparison with the worship routine of a non-musician). The female or feminine aspects portrayed in the iconography and the mythology of the *viṇā* suggest that Sambasiva Iyer's assiduous use of the *viṇā* in worshipping the goddess may have some connection with the symbolism of the instrument.

2.5 Basic lessons as models for style

Many features of the Karaikkudi style may be extrapolated both from the basic lessons themselves and from the manner in which they are executed. As shown in 2.3.3, one such lesson reveals a predilection for rhythmic variation. To demonstrate how the manner of performing these exercises reflects on a smaller level the specific nature of the diversity found within the style in general, we will now consider several examples taken from *sarālī* and *jaṇṭa variṣai* and performed by Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Lakshmi Ammal on tape 2 (A:1&2, A:13&14, B:3&5, B:4&6).

People have trouble verbalizing, in a technical way, the subtle differences in what might be called "touch" (i.e. the effect of an individual musician's hand, grip, fingers, etc. upon the instrument) in the above pairs of examples, resorting instead to resort to poetic, non-musical language, for trying to describe the qualities of an individual musician's "touch" is like trying to describe the qualities of a particular color, without words for color, or to describe a taste for which one has had no previous expe-

rience. Despite its ineffable qualities, a musician's "touch" most strikingly identifies his or her individuality.

Although such terms as *piṭippu* and *aluttam* are relevant to a discussion of "touch," they are perhaps more suitable for describing the "touch" of the Karaikkudi style as a whole, than of its individual members. The two renditions of *saraḷi* presented on the example tape differ in such individual human factors as grip, speed and number of oscillations; size, strength, and placement of fingers; and, mood, degree of energy or fatigue, and age; and in such external physical factors as particular sound qualities of the instrument, diameter of strings, kind of fingerpicks; recording situation, room acoustics, and outside noise.

Despite these factors, certain differences in touch can be traced to individual approaches to *gamaka* and more specifically to the number and speed of internal oscillations that compose these *gamaka*-s. Essentially, Ranganayaki uses two firm, insistent oscillations, followed by a third smaller one acting as an "echapée," in contexts where Lakshmi Ammal uses two oscillations, followed by two very rapid oscillations which act as an "echapée." This pattern, while not found in every *gamaka* (not all *gamaka*-s require oscillation), is often found in the way the *gamaka*-s end and is illustrated in the *ga* of *māyamālāvagaṇa* *rāga*--the first *gamaka* a student encounters in the first lesson, *saraḷi variṣai*.

Although the recordings used in my examples illustrate these differences in *gamaka*, it may prove difficult to hear them since they are not used consistently. My own understanding of these details has come through hearing Lakshmi Ammal play them over and over again for a period of months for initial lessons and for a period of years for advanced lessons, and has been

confirmed only through my ability to reproduce them to her satisfaction. This minute level of interpretation is one of the features that separates her students from those of certain other members of the Karaikkudi style--such as Ranganayaki Rajagopalan.

Another feature that distinguishes internal style characteristics is the frequency of left hand plucks. For example, in the *avarōhana* (descending portion) of *saraḷi*, a gesture characteristic of Lakshmi Ammal's playing is a "double-oscillation echappée" (technique described above) on *ga* with the index finger, followed by a "pull-off," allowing *sa* to sound for a brief moment, and "hammer-on" sounding *ri* with the middle finger. In this *gamaka*, the double oscillation on the *svarasthāna* for *ga* is actually part of the *svara ri*. Ranganayaki generally begins this *gamaka* with a single oscillation from *ga* and uses no left hand finger pluck, but rather a descending slide (*jāru*) to *ri*.

The two examples of differences in internal playing style specified above can be generalized into two types: 1) difference in speed and number of oscillations in a given *gamaka* and 2) difference in frequency that left hand finger plucks are used as an expressive or ornamental device. Because these two kinds of differences do not affect the structure of the *svara*-s, they can be found in basic exercises such as *saraḷi varīṣai* and in more complex forms. Differences that involve a change in the structure of *svara*-s, such as the number of and type of *saṅgati*-s, while not found in lessons such as *saraḷi*, are found in such forms as *varṇa*-s--some of which the Karaikkudi style, unlike other styles, performs with *saṅgati*-s.

That the basic structure of *saraḷi* and *jaṇṭa varīṣai* and *alaṅkāra*-s remains constant for all performers in the Karaikkudi style should not be

surprising, given that it is also constant for most performers in the *kar-ṇāṭaka saṅgīta* tradition--except for the omission of, or addition of specific lessons, and for minor variations within certain of the more complicated exercises. Among compositions performed in the Karaikkudi style, the performance of *gīta*-s, of beginning pieces that contain few *saṅgati*-s, and of pieces that are rarely practiced (that is, pieces that have not been worked and reworked into new forms) reveal the most consistent structures across the style. Of the early lessons, the greatest amount of variability in content is found in the performance of *varṇa*-s because of their length and complexity, and because some of them can be performed with or without certain *saṅgati*-s.

2.6 Complementarity between the brothers

Sambasiva Iyer and his brother not only had different personalities and held their *viṇā*-s differently, but also played differently. Whereas Sambasiva Iyer was known for his *tānam* playing, and his "sonorous sweep," Subbarama was known for his *pallavi*⁸³ singing, including such aspects as *niraval* (melodic improvisation on a line of text), *kalpana svara* (melodic improvisation using *svara* names) and superb control over *laya* (tempo).

Because of poor health, Subbarama did not practice the *viṇā* as often as did Sambasiva Iyer, who practiced both as an end in itself, for the discipline, and for purposes of refining his *viṇā* technique. Although Subbarama Iyer would sing while doing chores in the house, he would only sit to play *viṇā* in the afternoon or evening or at a concert with his brother (Meenakshi

⁸³A musical form that relies heavily on the creativity of the musician and requires mastery of all aspects of the art; in it, a line of text, selected from another composition or from another source, is sung or played in successively elaborate ways both melodically and rhythmically.

Ammal 1988).

The differences between the brothers' habits of practice, specialties in performance, and personalities may have been intensified by hostilities that began to grow between them--hostilities due to "conflicts between other members of the family for whom they were responsible" (Subramanian 1986, 31) becoming so strong that towards the end of Subbarama's life, the brothers were not even on speaking terms. Whereas the brothers had once lived in two halves of the same house, Sambasiva Iyer's second wife insisted that a wall be erected to separate the two families. In another manifestation of hostility, Sambasiva Iyer began to decline to play concerts that his brother had arranged (Meenakshi Ammal 1988), possibly because as the head of a large family, Subbarama would give Sambasiva Iyer less than his share of the salary (Subramanian pers. com. 1988).

The combined contributions of the two brothers was said to produce an electrifying effect, like the union of *śiva* and *śakti* (see p.21). That each brother specialized in certain aspects of performing but together they were said to sound like one person playing the *viṇā*, suggests that for them, *tānam*, *kalpana svara*, *niraval svara*, and *pallavi* singing could not find full expression in one individual.

Consequently, as I have mentioned, Sambasiva Iyer found it difficult to perform alone after his brother died in 1936, and training Ranganayaki and Raajeswari--with whom he would later perform--may have been attempts to fill the gap left by his brother's death. But in some ways this gap could never be filled. For example, many compositions were omitted from his repertoire, possibly ones that reminded him of his brother (Subramanian pers. com. 1988)--a conjecture supported by the observation that many such com-

positions were in evocative *rāga*-s like *nilāmbari* and *varāli* and that these *rāga*-s, especially *nilāmbari*, were specialties of Subbarama Iyer's daughter Lakshmi Ammal, who learned them by listening to her father.

This brief summary emphasizing the differences between the brothers⁸⁴ calls into question whether and to what extent their own personal styles were derived from their father's (their *guru*), and the extent to which the contributions of each has been passed on to the generations following them. While Sambasiva Iyer's *saṅgati*-s, *ciṭṭasvara*-s, and technique for *tānam* are readily perceivable in the performances of Ranganayaki, Raajeswari and other students, aspects of performance associated with Subbarama Iyer, such as the rendering of *pallavi*-s, *niraval svara*, and *kalpana svara* are neither emphasized in modern-day performances of Karaikkudi *viṇā* players, nor, when they do appear, do they resemble those of Subbarama Iyer.⁸⁵

One can perhaps find a shade of Subbarama Iyer's personal approach in the singing and *viṇā* playing of his daughters and of their disciples, but because none of them studied with him to an advanced stage, his unique contributions, if their indeed were any, to the performance of *niraval*, *kalpana svara*, and *pallavi* singing are lost. This all suggests that one of the most significant changes in style since the time of the brothers has been the uneven transmission of it, and the consequent development of the half represented by Sambasiva Iyer in the playing of the two foremost, professional

⁸⁴"emphasized" because overall, it must be remembered that members of the style will say all Karaikkudi *viṇā* players represent "*orē pāṇi tān*" ("one style only") and that I emphasize these differences only to bring into relief what "one style" actually means.

⁸⁵Subramanian recalls discussions with the late Karaikkudi Muttu Iyer, the brothers' *mṛidaṅgam* player, in which Muttu Iyer demonstrated Subbarama Iyer's approach to *niraval* and how it was different from that of current performers (Subramanian pers. com. 1988)

exponents of the style, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Raajeswari Padmanabhan. It also suggests that, although most people associate the "pure" Karaikkudi style to be anything that approaches the playing of Karaikkudi Sambasiva Iyer--the legendary *viṇā* player of the style who still lives in recent memory--in fact, even at the time of the brothers there was a certain degree of diversity. And this diversity not only did not lessen the cohesiveness of their performances, but was the essence of it.

2.7 Other styles

2.7.1 Dhanammal style

The doctoral dissertation by Jon Higgins (1973), articles in *Sruti* magazine (Jan-feb 1984, 17-32; June-July 1986, 25-40), and R. Rangaramanuja Ayyangar (1972, 287-96)⁸⁶ among other works provide historical and descriptive material about the Dhanammal family, a review of which is beyond the scope of this work. However, several characteristic features of the Dhanam style are worthy of mention: As in the Karaikkudi style, they emphasize initial training, especially *gita*-s; unlike the Karaikkudi prescription of keeping fingers together ascending and apart descending the Dhanam school keeps both fingers separated ascending and descending (Nixon, pers. com. 1988); and unlike Karaikkudi *viṇā* players they use fingers, rather than plectra, to pluck the strings and refuse to play with *mṛidaṅgam* accompaniment; Dhanam also deemphasized rhythmic aspects of improvisation such as *svara kalpana*, which were considered more appropriate for men (Nixon pers.

⁸⁶*Sruti* magazine and Rangaramanuja Ayyangar's accounts must be treated with caution, for although *Sruti* draws on the expertise of well known artists in the music field, it caters to "popular" tastes, publishes gossip (literally), and does not check its facts before publishing them; Rangaramanuja Ayyangar is said to have exaggerated the amount of contact he really had with Dhanam.

com. 1988). The "sparkling *sphurita*" technique is not frequently found in the Dhanammal style nor is *aluttam* characteristic--her style being gentle and soft. Unlike in the Karaikkudi style, reiteration of a pitch is sometimes accomplished by sliding the index finger upward (ascending) from the previous fret. Catlin notes a tendency on Dhanam recordings to "blur metrical outlines" (1980, 222); perhaps this is partly a function of her age at the time of the recording--more than this, however, is the melody-orientedness of her playing, not so much a blurred metrical outline as a lack of emphasis on highly articulated phrases (as is characteristic of the Karaikkudi style).

Her raga *ālāpana*-s were said to be extremely concise. Her grandson T. Sankaran recalls her playing a few characteristic phrases of a *rāga* and then saying she did not know what else to play--not because she was not creative, but because she could give a rather complete picture of a *rāga* with a few gestures (Sankaran pers. com. 1988). She developed a way of coping with the time constraints imposed by the record industry by leaving the *rāga ālāpana* until after the composition, so that it, rather than the composition, would be cut short if time ran out.

Many renowned musicians and dancers are members of the Dhanammal family: the late T. Balasaraswati and T. Ranganathan, their brother T. Viswanathan, and cousins T. Mukta and T. Brinda among others. T. Brinda plays the *vīṇā*, but was not instructed in technique by Dhanammal. The only living *vīṇā* student of Dhanam is Savitri Rajan. Because their family style is essentially vocal (Viswanathan pers. com. 1988), it can comprise vocalists, instrumentalists, and *vīṇā* players, each with different techniques. While technique defines Dhanam's personal way of playing, but not the whole

style, the uniqueness of the Karaikkudi style depends heavily on technique. There are no mature artists in the Karaikkudi style who are primarily vocalists, or flutists (not yet at least);⁸⁷ there are, however, *mṛidaṅgam* players in the family who might be said to play in an analogous style.

2.7.2 Mysore school

The so-called Mysore school, one of the major schools of *viṇā* playing recognized today, claims Mysore Doraiswamy Iyengar, who traces his *paramparā* back to the legendary *viṇā* player Seshanna, as its foremost classical exponent.

K. S. Subramanian's doctoral dissertation (1986), a detailed comparison between the Karaikkudi style and that of Doraiswamy Iyengar, identifies Iyengar's occasional use of vibrato (a technique absent in the Karaikkudi style) as the most striking difference between the two styles (1986, 193). Other differences include Iyengar's use of slides in contexts where Subramanian uses string deflection, and Iyengar's choice of certain other techniques in contexts where Subramanian's use differs.

In an attempt to characterize the various styles, *Sruti* magazine's Radhika Raj Narayan wrote:

[Mysore Doraiswamy Iyengar] describes the Mysore style as basically an instrumental style, in which the melodic purity of the notes is sought to be retained. Therefore deep gamakas are not generally used. Shallow gamakas, playing the notes on the frets, a pleasing meetu, use of *tribhinna* [. . . and], use of *janta svaras* in phrases like *sa-ni-ni-dha-dha-pa-pa-ma* and *dhatu svaras* such as *ri-pa-ga-dha-ma-ni-pa-sa* are typical of this style. Left hand fingers are separated to facilitate fast passages . . . Many ragas such as Behag, Jhinjoti and Khamas played by *vainikas* of the Mysore School have a distinct North Indian touch, due to the proximity of Karnataka's northern districts to Maharashtra and the ensuing influence . . . (Narayan 1984, 18)

⁸⁷It will be interesting to observe how Raajeswari's son, who is learning to play the flute, comes to terms with his own musical heritage.

Doraiswamy corrects some of these statements in a later *Sruti* article:

There is a popular misconception that the Mysore style of veena playing is short of deep gamaka-s and is lacking in purity and repose. I can vouchsafe that this has not been so. Some inferior vainikas may have exploited the instrumental effects to a greater extent than was necessary or judicious, perhaps because they could not emulate the better attributes of the great vidwans, but we should not generalise from this that all vidwans of the Mysore school employed an imprudent overdose of instrumental technique in their music. (Shekar 1984-1985, 24).

Perhaps the characterization of the Mysore style as lacking "deep gamaka-s" was a misleading way of saying that *aluttam* is not stressed in the Mysore style. This latter description is supported by Subramanian's observation that Doraiswamy uses more slides than do Karaikkudi *viṇā* players. Bending the string rather than sliding tends to bring the quality of *aluttam* into relief.

Iyengar uses open air (condenser or dynamic) microphones rather than contact (transducer) microphones because he likes the way they bring out the timbre of the instrument. Ranganayaki and Raajeswari, to whom practicality seems to outweigh possible acoustic disadvantages, both use contact microphones. Perhaps the punchy quality of the Karaikkudi *viṇā* style reproduces more satisfactorily than does the somewhat subdued quality of the Mysore style. Not only does Iyengar prefer a different mode of amplification, his *viṇā* is also different, being made of rosewood rather than jackwood and having a slightly different shape than a Tanjore *viṇā* (the kind used by Karaikkudi players, and by most *viṇā* players in Tamilnadu). According to a student of his, he uses cylindrical frets rather than the somewhat square type found on many *viṇā*-s (Karaikkudi musicians use either type).

Other Mysore *viṇā* players include R.K. Suryanarayana and R.S. Keshavamurthy.

2.7.3 Andhra school

The Andhra style is said to be distinguished by its use of a variety of types of right hand finger plucks (*mīṭṭu*) (Narayan 1984, 19), and according to Subramanian (1986, 237), contains five divisions: Bobbili, Pithapuram, Vizianagaram, Kalahasti, and Vizakapatnam. One of the most famed of Andhra *vīṇā* players, the late Emani Shankara Sastri, was the guru of the popular *vīṇā* player Chitti Babu.

The most prominent exponent of the Vizianagaram division, Venkataramana Das (1866-1948), said to have practiced ten to twelve hours a day, including all the basic exercises in 4 speeds and in three octaves, is also known for producing a "rich tone" and for playing at extraordinary speeds with remarkable clarity (Sambamoorthy 1985, 52). His *vīṇā* was shorter than most, was held vertically, was fitted with a large gourd, and, like the Karaikkudi brothers' *vīṇā*-s, with thick strings tuned to a high tension.

His *vīṇā* was distinguished by a unique way of affixing the frets, by the proportion between the length of the neck and the diameter of the body, and by a floral design instead of a *yāḷi* on the headpiece (Sambamoorthy 1985, 55). He was known for deflecting the string up to "six higher notes" (interval of an augmented fourth), and for playing above the nut of the instrument.

Sangameswara Sastri (1873-1932),⁸⁸ another proponent of the Andhra school, was known for accompanying his powerful voice with the *vīṇā* (Sambamoorthy 1985, 60).⁸⁹ Like Venkataram Das he played the *vīṇā* in a vertical

⁸⁸These dates are provided by Sambamoorthy, Rangaramauja Ayyangar (1972, 273) gives (1874-1931).

⁸⁹The Karaikkudi school uses the voice as support for the instrument, not the other way around.

position and tuned the strings to a high tension--reaching a tonic pitch of 5 - 5½ (G or G#) because his *viṇā* was shorter than most. Like Sambasiva Iyer, Venkatarama Das, and some other *viṇā* players, he was known for a rigorous practice routine. Unlike some of these *vidvān*-s, who practiced from early in the morning, he was known to practice from 11pm to 3am in the morning and for "*veyi sadhakam* i.e., playing a thousand times at a stretch the scale in three octaves in the quickest tempo possible" (Sambamoorthy 1985, 62). He insisted that his students observe the same methods of practice. Like the Karaikkudi brothers he worshipped the goddess, performing *dēvi pūjā* on Fridays. The belief, shared by Sangameswara Sastri and Venkataram Das, that playing the instrument in the vertical position was masculine matches their rather aggressive approaches to practice and performance in general.

Emani Sankara Sastri, who died Dec. 1987, was the most recent proponent of the Andhra school. In a laudatory paragraph, Radhika Raj Narayan (1984) explains Sastri,

has merged the Tanjavur and Andhra styles and has further improved upon this merger. He uses a wide range of gamakas and meetus to achieve an extraordinary variety of textures and moods in his music. He is perhaps the only *vainika* to modulate the volume of the pluck to suit the music,^[90] . . . He uses all the fingers of his right hand to produce these various effects . . . *Mandhra sthayi* [lower octave] elaboration is interspersed with *madhya sthayi* [middle octave] phrase producing the effect of *sawal-jawab* or duet concert. He freely uses folk idioms to enrich the alapana. Tanam is replete with sound effects and is played in three speeds.

I found, in my own encounter with this *vidvān*, a man highly interested in change, who found to be boring and old fashioned any music that did not

⁹⁰This is an exaggeration, for others such as his student Chitti Babu and the Mysore *vidvān*, R.K. Suryanarayana, also change the volume of their plucking.

radically change. In this regard he was particularly critical of the Karaikkudi style. In the privacy of his own home he demonstrated his control over Western music by playing orchestral themes from Beethoven on his *viṇā*, which he insisted on plugging into a large amplifier "for richness." He did not seem to distinguish sharply between "classical" gestures and "gimmicks"--a distinction exploited by, but never satisfactorily defined by south Indian music critics.

P.K. Doraiswamy describes Sastri's approach to the age old question of "continuity" (musical, not historical continuity) on the *viṇā*:

His secret is to combine the plucking with the movement of the left-hand fingers in a peculiarly characteristic manner so as to drown the plucking sound in the *gamaka*-s without sacrificing crispness. In addition, he relies on subtle *sruti*-s and special effects like vibrato, staccato and other tonal effects to approach vocal effects closely. It has been said that while Balachander's technique brings out the masculine grandeur of some aspects of our music, Emani's technique emphasises basically feminine graces (Doraiswamy 1985, 16).

These descriptions suggest the Andhra style is not a single style, but a name given to a number of styles that happen to claim performers from Andhra Pradesh as its members. A similar misnomer, the Tanjore style, refers to a number of styles including the Karaikkudi style and the Dhanammal style.

2.7.4 Trivandrum school

M.A. Kalyanakrishna Bhagavatar (1913-1979), who was known for his singing as well as for his *viṇā* playing, and M.K. Kalyanakrishna Bhagavatar, who is known as "Talai Atti Kalyanakrishna Bhagavatar" because he nods his head up and down while playing (Raman and Sankaran 1986-1987, 77) are noteworthy *vaiṇika*-s of the Trivandrum tradition.

Although Desamangalam Subramania Iyer grew up in Kerala, the state in

which the city of Trivandrum is found, and taught the present day performers K.S. Narayanaswamy and K.P. Sivanandam (Raman and Sankaran 1986-1987, 79), these artists are said to represent the "Gayaki" division of the Tanjavur style in the article "Contemporary Styles of Veena Playing: A listener's guide" (Narayan 1984).⁹¹

About K. S. Narayanaswamy, Subramanian (1986, 213) writes:

A student of Sabhesa Iyer at Annamalai University and later became a teacher there. He has taught many students. Mr. Narayana Menon, the Director of Sangita Nataka Academy, New Delhi, and M.S. Subbalakshmi, the renowned vocalist of India are two of his students who are not vina players by profession. Another disciple of his, Venkataraman, is a professional vina player who is on the staff of All India Radio, Trivandrum. Pitchumani Iyer and G.N. Dandapani Iyer were vina students in Annamalai University when he was a teacher (conversation: Viswanathan).

2.7.5 Balachander

Listeners tend to have strong opinions about the approach of S. Balachander, who occupies a position all his own among modern *vīṇā* players. To attain his ideal of fluidity characteristic of the human voice, he is known to bend the strings beyond the interval of a fourth and to prolong the effect of each pluck through the use of contact microphones. Explaining this in an article contrasting Balachander's approach with that of Emani Sankara Sastri, P.K. Doraiswamy writes:

the logic behind Balachander's style may perhaps be explained by the following sequential argument:

1. frets are an obstacle to continuity and expressiveness at higher levels of musical attainment;
2. it is, therefore, necessary to evolve a technique of playing which reduces the player's dependence on frets;

⁹¹"Gāyaki" means singer. Gāyaki style means a style that attempts to capture the human voice--not a very useful appellation for reasons I have explained. In this article the Tanjavur style is said to comprise three distinct schools, the Gayaki style, Karaikkudi school, and the Dhanammal school.

3. it is, therefore, further necessary to produce as many notes as possible from a single swarasthana;
4. deflecting the string should, therefore, be developed as an art (if not a feat) in itself with suitable adjustments to the basic sruti and thickness of the string;
5. a plucked sound is audible only for six to seven seconds;
6. if a whole musical phrase is to be played with a single plucking, sound amplification is essential;
7. ordinary mikes are not sensitive enough for this purpose and a contact mike is, therefore an assential part of the whole 'deflection' technique . . . (Doraiswamy 1985, 16).

This critic further explains that people who consider the effect of plucking a virtue rather than a limitation do not appreciate Balachander's approach. Whereas Balachander's style, to P. K. Doraiswamy, is essentially "masculine," Emani Sankara Sastri's style is "feminine." Such characterizations of style into masculine and feminine, which is often independant of whether the player is a man or a woman, are not uncommon for as we have seen, some players from Andhra considered their technique to be "masculine" and, for example, people comment that Ranganayaki Rajagopalan plays like "gents."

These brief sketches of style, neither complete nor balanced in terms of content, are based on the limited knowledge of the author, and on the sparse material available in print--for the most part on *Sruti* magazine which is neither noted for its objectivity nor for checking its sources. Because of my own limited knowledge of these styles I have tried to make available descriptions written by Indians to provide at least some points of comparison with the Karaikkudi style, even though these points of comparison, strictly speaking, are between various peoples' descriptions and interpretations and not between the styles themselves.

Chapter two has been a general survey of the Karaikkudi style, examining its members and particular issues. For the most part this examination has centered around a fixed period of time, that in which the Karaikkudi brothers lived, and has assumed, for the sake of clarity, a greater degree of homogeneity than may have actually existed. Now it is necessary to examine the various changes that have been occurring in the style since Sambasiva Iyer died, while recognizing that the basis for assessing change outlined in chapter 2 is neither absolute nor complete.

3. Change and Development

This chapter is divided into two sections in which the first will address changes in aspects of style such as values, compositions, renditions, technique, and transmission and the second, such factors as changing economic, family, and technological conditions that may have encouraged style change.

3.1 Values

3.1.1 Religious

Since the death of Sambasiva Iyer in 1958, changes in the Karaikkudi style involving practices and values which can be broadly termed "religious" include the use of the *viṇā* in worship, the concern for understanding the meaning of songs, the contexts for playing, and the relationship between the performer and the audience.

Unlike Sambasiva Iyer, members of the Karaikkudi style today seldom include *viṇā* playing in their daily worship routine. While this change might be taken as an indication that modern performers feel that the connection between devotion and music is weaker than in earlier times, performers such as Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Meenakshi Ammal attribute this change to a lack of time. Although the chores and family responsibilities to which these women must attend probably occupy more time in their lives than did those of Sambasiva Iyer in his time, one cannot help but think that the women would find time for *viṇā* playing in daily worship if it were considered essential. Instead, however, Meenakshi Ammal, Sankari Ammal, Ranganayaki, and Raajeswari relate that they use the *viṇā* for worship only on special occasions such as *vijayādaśamī* day and *sarasvati pūjā*.

These women also name lack of time as a reason for being unable to

practice as much as Sambasiva Iyer, who practiced "as a ritual" in and of itself and for improving and maintaining technique. Now most Karaikkudi vīṇā players practice only while teaching.

Sambasiva Iyer gave life to these ritualistic aspects of performance by paying close attention to the meaning of the compositions he played--even if this understanding was general. Because neither Ranganayaki, Raajeswari, Meenakshi Ammal, nor Sankari Ammal knows Telugu or Sanskrit, they too do not fully understand the songs they perform and do not believe that a thorough, word for word understanding is essential to a successful performance, though they do believe, as Meenakshi explains, that one must play with *bhakti* (intense, loving devotion).

Although Lakshmi Ammal may not have understood these songs any more than did her sisters, she appears to have valued this knowledge and felt it necessary to explain the meaning to her students. Lakshmi Ammal's student S. Mallika, who studied in and now teaches at the Madurai Sathguru Sangeetha Vidyalayam, recalls that she would first teach the student such practical aspects as properly executing all the gestures of the style and pronouncing the words, and as the student advanced, the meaning of the text--now stressing such aspects as matching textual syllables with right hand finger plucks. Mallika, who has studied both Telugu and Sanskrit and like all other members of the style is a native Tamil speaker, believes understanding the meaning of the songs not only can improve one's playing but also can prevent one from playing compositions in inappropriate contexts, explaining that compositions such as "*ninnujepa*" and "*mokṣamu*," which evoke sadness and other nonfestive emotions, should not be played at weddings but that any piece is suitable for a *sabha* (music hall). That the meaning of a song is

irrelevant in a concert setting indicates a general change in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* as music has moved from contexts of princely patronage and private or public worship to ones of entertainment in the form of live concerts or recordings.

The attitudes of S. Mallika exemplify how institutional learning revitalizes such "old school" devotional values as understanding the text and observing the correct context for performance of compositions (*see also* 3.5.2 Changes in teaching of music: Time and institutions), and were conditioned, in part, by learning such things as *mṛidaṅgam*, theory, language, and general practice at the Vidyalayam.

Unlike Sambasiva Iyer, who did not "play down" to the audience because "the moment the artist strives to 'please' he loses touch with the divinity within" (Subramanian 1986, 22), some members of the Karaikkudi style now accommodate aspects of performance to public taste. Ranganayaki, for example, seems to cater to the public by playing popular compositions rather than those Sambasiva Iyer taught her which are considered "old fashioned," but she nevertheless, does not adopt flashy modes of performance to attract applause from the audience. Raajeswari--who unlike Ranganayaki is a popular artist, maintains eye contact with the audience, smiles in appropriate places, and has incorporated such popular techniques as harmonics into her playing--has values concerning performance which are different from those of her guru Sambasiva Iyer.

Ranganayaki and Raajeswari, again unlike Sambasiva Iyer, time the sections and kinds of compositions in a given performance in accordance with both the context, be it a wedding, *sabha* concert, or radio broadcast, and the audience. They have accepted these changes not because they lack reli-

gious sentiment, but because they entertain notions different from those of Sambasiva Iyer of what is offensive to the "divine"--both are devout in their personal lives and view the instrument as a manifestation of the goddess.

3.1.2 Talking about music, research and theory.

Sambasiva Iyer's attitude that music can be "explained" only through the music itself is not entirely shared by present-day Karaikkudi *viṇā* players. It is not surprising, for example, that K. S. Subramanian, who earned an undergraduate degree in chemistry, a master's degree in English, taught English literature in Madras, and eventually decided to pursue an academic career in music, likes to talk and write about music and feels his own scholarship and insight into *viṇā* style benefits the Karaikkudi style.

On the other hand, his mother Lakshmi Ammal, who was not concerned with new developments in music theory, spoke little about music, and when T. M. Tyagarajan announced that several generations of performers have been performing the *rāga bhairavi* incorrectly and proceeded to "correct" the *bhairavi varṇam* "*viribhōṇi*," one of the oldest and most traditional pieces in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta*, Lakshmi Ammal did not alter her performance of it.⁹² She used to refer to theory in cases where, for example, I played the incorrect *gamaka* on *dha* in the *rāga ābhōgi*, saying it sounded like *ni*--a *svara* absent in *ābhōgi*. But in most cases my mistakes were easier to correct by demonstrating than by talking, in which cases she would play the passage repeatedly until I imitated her correctly.

Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, who like her guru tends to be rather reserved,

⁹²The Music Academy of Madras and other musical institutions constantly entertain debates over "correct" practice in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta*.

may avoid speaking about music, in part, because she is not consciously aware of the rules that seem to guide her playing--one can know a style without being able to articulate its rules just as one can use a language without being able to explain its grammar (Gombrich 1968; Hayek 1963). For example, when I asked Ranganayaki where the *dha* of the *rāga nāṭa* is found in compositions or *prayōga*-s, she did not generalize, but demonstrated individual cases because she is not accustomed to think in terms of laws of usage.⁹³ Despite her general tendency to demonstrate rather than to describe, she does discuss music using such Tamil words as *aḷuttam* and English words as "clear," "loose," "perfect," each of which denote presence or absence of characteristics she sees as central to the Karaikkudi style.

Although Raajeswari Padmanabhan, who is more at ease with the English language than is Ranganayaki, seems to speak while teaching more than does Ranganayaki, she has cautioned me on several occasions that "practical research," research involving performing and listening, is more useful than academic research in which one writes about music (see quote, p.109-10).

Performers such as S. Mallika and Lakshmi Ammal's granddaughter V. Shanti, who seem to be interested in both performing and scholarship, will have to strike their own balance between "practical" and academic research depending on how these approaches suit themselves as individuals and as carriers of the Karaikkudi tradition.

In general, performers in the Karaikkudi tradition take different stances on the issue of discussing music depending on how the issue bears

⁹³One might ask whether such rules or regularities exist for the *rāga nāṭa*. Other musicians, such as my vocal teacher (not surprisingly a student of T. M. Tyagarajan), are able to generalize about these usages even if there are exceptions.

upon their own interests--not on how it relates to an abstract notion of what is right for the style. Subramanian, involved with academic scholarship from a young age, has departed from the family norm of performance emphasis, while Lakshmi Ammal, who had no exposure to academics, typified it.

3.1.3 Transmission

Because Sambasiva Iyer's slow, methodical manner of teaching is gradually losing viability as a result of the breakdown of the *gurukula* system, each member of the tradition is developing new ways to teach.

3.1.3.1 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan

Ranganayaki, who until recently taught at the Music Academy of Madras, generally taught students who not only learned other styles from other teachers (a practice her *guru* avoided) and had different levels of skill, but who also had different degrees of interest in music. Because she could not, for example, spend an entire year teaching *sarali varisai*, she accelerated the program, omitting the lesson with the unusual three cycle configuration⁹⁴ and spending a short time on the others.

Ranganayaki explains that, at home, she teaches according to the students' needs. For example, if a student wants to learn quickly, she will teach what she can in the time allotted--leaving the responsibility of grasping the material with the student. While teaching, she adheres for the most part to the traditional order and kinds of lessons without adding anything new, but sometimes omits some of the *gita-s* and *varṇa-s* her *guru* taught her. She often teaches popular and easy *varṇa-s* such as "*bagavāri*" in *hamsadhvani rāga* to beginners, and later, rather than teaching "*vana-*

⁹⁴Since the students in a music school almost never stick to a single style, perhaps she felt it unnecessary to include this special 'Karaikkudi' lesson.

jāsana" or other simple pieces with which she began learning, she teaches simple pieces which are currently in vogue such as "*sudhāmayi*" in *amṛita-varṣini rāga* (Rajagopalan 1988).

To generalize, when Ranganayaki teaches a beginner she tends to teach the material passed down to her and adjusts her expectations to the capabilities of the student. Later, because she feels the teaching materials themselves, i.e. *kṛiti*-s, are less important than their didactic function, she teaches easy-to-grasp songs. Once the student understands these pieces she teaches more difficult ones--Karaikkudi specialties or others.

3.1.3.2 Raajeswari Padmanabhan

Unlike Ranganayaki, Raajeswari sometimes uses different materials (such as those designed to strengthen the hand in particular ways) to teach even beginning students--a practice common among teachers of *karnāṭaka saṅgita* in general but uncommon among other members of the Karaikkudi style.

Although Raajeswari has developed specialized lessons, she does not veer from the order and types of lessons taught to her by her guru. Like Ranganayaki, Raajeswari will go through the lessons quickly when a student needs to learn quickly--always including at least some of the lessons that compose *sarālī varīṣai*, *jaṇṭa varīṣai*, *gītam*, and *varṇam*, and like Ranganayaki, leaves the student with responsibility of practicing these lessons.

Despite the existence of a large body of carefully designed, time tested exercises and compositions for teaching, all the teachers in the Karaikkudi style realize that certain things cannot be taught, but must be learned by the students' listening--as Raajeswari explains,

One cannot learn everything from a guru, some things have to be learned by listening. We must go to music concerts, analyze what and how things are being sung, and compare them. Instead of writing the comparisons down in a notebook it should be done

automatically--research by hearing and playing.⁹⁵

Whether imitating a particular lesson or attempting to play something heard at a concert, a student inevitably makes errors that need correction. To accomplish this correction, Raajeswari, and to a lesser extent Lakshmi Ammal, sometimes imitate a student's error in an exaggerated manner so the student can easily perceive and correct it, but most members of the Karaikkudi style have the student play a passage repeatedly until it is correct--without indicating what, specifically, is wrong.

3.1.3.3 Lakshmi Ammal

Lakshmi Ammal, except when teaching foreign students like myself who had little time in which to learn, adhered to the "old way" of teaching associated with her father and uncle. Unlike Ranganayaki and Raajeswari, who left the responsibility of learning with the student, Lakshmi Ammal made students practice until she was convinced they had learned a particular passage, and only then, proceed to the next. The effectiveness of this method is proved by a saying in Madurai, "if a song was learned from Lakshmi Māmi ("aunt" Lakshmi--an affectionate name) it cannot be forgotten," but because few students had the time or patience to learn in this way, they seldom learned such advanced techniques as *svara kalpana* and *niraval*, although some picked up a little bit of *rāgam* (*rāga ālāpana*) and *tānam*. Lakshmi Ammal felt this slow, precise method of training to be an essential part of the style.

⁹⁵"ellāttaiyum kurukiṭṭa collikkamudiyātu. cilatellām kēṭṭu pāṭam paṇṇanum kaccērikkupōkanum. avā ennapāṭurā enta 'type' eppaṭi irukku āp-paṭiyēllām pākkanum. atai 'compare' paṇṇanum. anta 'compare' paṇṇi atu eppaṭi irukku itū eppaṭi irukkunnu collittu 'notebook'lē elutāmalēyē nam-malē kātunālēyē 'research' paṇṇi irukkōm kātunālēyē 'research' paṇṇi vāciccu ataiyum 'research' paṇṇi irukkōm" (Padmanabhan 1988).

Lakshmi Ammal taught not only by the same method but also in the same order and using the same material as did her father. For example, she recalled her father's consistent practice of teaching the *varṇam* "*inta caukasēya*," in *bilahari rāga*, after completing the cycle of *gīta-s* traditionally used in the Karaikkudi school; because her father taught in this order, she would also teach "*inta caukasēya*" before any other *varṇam*. But her father only specified the first *varṇam* that should be taught. The second *varṇam* Lakshmi Ammal used to teach, "*intachalamu*," in *kāmbhōji rāga* set to *aṭa tāḷa* and composed by Pallavi Gopallayyar, was her own choice.⁹⁶ When her students were advanced enough to learn *kṛitī-s*, Lakshmi Ammal, like her father, taught "*vanajāsana*" in *śrī rāga*, and then other short *kṛitī-s* such as "*kṛipajūcuṭaku*," "*varanārada*," "*sārasasamamukha*," "*cinnanāḍēnā*," and "*sarasasāmadāna*."

Sometimes Lakshmi Ammal asked advanced students to teach to those less advanced, and in so doing, exposed the less advanced students to a variety of performance possibilities.⁹⁷ I found this practice to provide a useful model on which to base new interpretations, even though at times it was confusing and difficult to please one teacher with a version taught by another. Lakshmi Ammal provided similar multi-form model, from lesson to lesson, by varying the manner of playing a particular melodic or rhythmic unit. And although Lakshmi Ammal insisted the student reproduce her lessons exactly

⁹⁶As far as I know, this *varṇam* is not performed or taught by anyone in the present generation of musicians within or outside the Karaikkudi tradition--except for students of Lakshmi Ammal.

⁹⁷A similar process is described by Khatschi in reference to the teaching of a Dastgah in Persian music. A different portion of the Dastgah would be taught to a number of students, and it would be left to them to teach each other, thereby introducing variation through the extra step of oral transmission (1962, 33-4)

while learning, she encouraged her advanced students to be original and creative after these lessons were internalized and accomplished this by providing the diverse model discussed above, which consists of at least three layers:

1. Lakshmi Ammal's various ways of playing
2. The differences among students, who themselves teach
3. The different ways an individual student teacher might play

To sum up, Lakshmi Ammal retained her father's order, content, and method of teaching lessons, and unlike Ranganayaki, encouraged students to develop their own way of playing by providing a model that was itself diverse. Ranganayaki teaches compositions in a rather fixed form whether she herself teaches or asks her daughter to teach.

3.1.3.4 Revitalization

Lakshmi Ammal's sister Meenakshi Ammal, who in other situations might interpret the tradition rigidly, sometimes substitutes "note"-s for fundamental lessons such as *saraḷi variṣai* because some students neglect practicing *saraḷi*, finding it "boring." Meenakshi believes that by playing these "note"-s, the students will improve their fingering techniques while playing something they like to hear.

K. S. Subramanian, who after completing his doctoral work at Wesleyan University accepted a position at Madras University as an instructor, finds students' lack of commitment to practicing basic lessons to be a central problem in the Karaikkudi tradition today. Even advanced students of Ranganayaki and Raajeswari can rarely play *saraḷi variṣai*, *jaṇṭa variṣai*, *alaṅkāram* and *gītam* in three speeds. And when Subramanian asked Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and his sister Raajeswari whether any of their students were

advanced enough to carry on the Karaikkudi tradition, only Raajeswari was able to produce two students: her daughter Sri Vidya who had performed with her for several years, and Vijayalakshmi, a student at Kalakshetra.

After hearing this, Subramanian, who had been trying out new methods of teaching in the U.S., was convinced that the Karaikkudi style needed to be revitalized with a new approach. This new approach, which was the "old" approach applied in a modern way, took root in a small school called the "Karaikkudi School (*kāraikkudī pāṇi*)," dedicated to the thorough teaching of basic lessons--and in so doing, gave Ranganayaki and Raajeswari time to train advanced students. Subramanian, Sri Vidya, and Vijayalakshmi all teach in this school, which is located in Mandavalli near the houses of Raajeswari and Subramanian. The emphases on basic technical skills in this small institution ("The Karaikkudi School") and emphases on language learning in other music institutions (see p.105) are examples of how the shift in contexts for music learning from the home of the *guru* to the music school has actually revitalized the Karaikkudi style--and "old school" values in general (see also 3.5.2).

To summarize, changes and/or divergent approaches in transmission of the Karaikkudi style since Sambasiva Iyer's death include such aspects as 1) amount of time and degree of emphasis on fundamentals 2) specific content of early lessons 3) verbal versus non-verbal and theoretical versus "practical" teaching 4) acceptance of responsibility for making the student learn 5) teaching a diverse rather than a unitary model for compositions. Possible causes for these changes, which will receive further consideration later in this chapter (see 3.5), may include, 1) time restrictions--new expectations for education and professionalism placed on students and teachers, 2) chan-

ges in teaching method--perhaps no longer considered offensive to the divine, 3) rise of teaching institutions--imposing theoretical standards, but also cross fertilizing and revitalizing tradition, and 4) new attitudes toward music--inspired by and reflected in the society at large.

3.2 Repertoire

Changes and development in the Karaikkudi style are found both in what I will call "old" repertoire, taught by previous generations of Karaikkudi *viṇā* players, and in repertoire that has entered the Karaikkudi tradition in the last generation or two. Members of the Karaikkudi style today choose and perform repertoire, in different ways, to suit their own aesthetic and economic needs. Section 3.2 is an examination of the various ways repertoire is used and of the characteristic patterns of usage among performers.

3.2.1 "Old" repertoire

Musicians approach their "old" repertoire in three ways: regarding it as fixed; developing, changing or otherwise using it in a new way (3.2.1.1); or by ceasing to perform or teach it (3.2.1.2). The preference for one or the other of these approaches may characterize individuals in a style. For example, while Ranganayaki might omit a piece her guru taught her which is out of vogue, she will almost never change it--either in hers or in others' perceptions of change.⁹⁸ Raajeswari, on the other hand, not only omits certain compositions and continues playing others relatively unchanged, but also "develops" (her word) "old" repertoire for modern performances.

Although two renditions are generally considered to be the "same" when they contain the same structure of *svara*-s, Viswanathan and Subramanian note that even the rendition of *svara*-s, i.e. through *gamaka*-s, gives individual

⁹⁸That is, she may vary the manner of performance within an accepted range.

meaning to both a *rāga* and to a performance by a particular artist:

Although svaras constitute the basic unit of musical meaning within the vocabulary of *ālāpāna*, they derive their color and individual character from the ornamentation (gamaka) characteristic of each *rāga*. *Gamaka* performs an integral, rather than decorative function in Indian music. (Viswanathan 1977, 31).

. . . the appropriateness of any particular ornamentation [*gamaka*] is strictly governed by the individual tradition. One kind of ornamentation could be irrelevant in a particular context to a particular style, even to the extent of a traditional artist considering another exponent of the same tradition to be untraditional in his approach, although from a different level both are traditional. **The kinds of preferences in a particular style are what create a tradition within the tradition.** (Subramanian 1986, 159).

Karaikkudi *viṇā* players usually consider renditions the "same" that contain the same *svara*-s--but as Subramanian explains above, this consideration assumes a stylistically consistent choice of *gamaka* within each *svara*. The distinction between difference in *svara* content and difference in *gamaka* within a *svara* suggests that approaches to performing "old" repertoire need to be analyzed at several levels.

3.2.1.1 "*padavinī*": An example of stability and change

Tape # 5 contains eight versions of "*padavinī*" (*sāḷaga-bhairavi rāga*, *ādi tāḷa*), a composition for which the Karaikkudi brothers were famous⁹⁹ and which is part of the current performing repertoires of both Ranganayaki and Raajeswari.¹⁰⁰

The cassette contains examples by seven different performers at

⁹⁹See Shekar (1984-1985, 20) for an anecdote about the performance of this song for the Maharaja of Mysore--Mysore Doraiswamy Iyengar describes the Karaikkudi brothers making a powerful impression on the Maharaja with this song, which he asked a palace musician to notate because nobody in his court knew it.

¹⁰⁰Recent examples are found on Ranganayaki's commercial cassette (Sangeetha GMSC 6097) and in an All India Radio program, 10 Sept. 1985 performed by Raajeswari Padmanabhan and her daughter, Sri Vidya [ex. 6].

different times, of which the first is a recording of Ranganayaki and Raajeswari playing together at the Madras Music Academy in the early 1960's, and which, because the date of this performance is near that of Sambasiva Iyer's death, is probably performed the way Iyer taught it to them. The second example, played by Ranganayaki alone in 1984, was recorded in Ranganayaki's house for the purpose of learning. The third and fourth examples, performed by Subaramma Iyer's daughters Sankari and Meenakshi respectively, were recorded in the late 1970's by K.S. Subramanian for the purposes of comparison. Example five, played by Sugantha Sridharan (a great-granddaughter of Subbarama Iyer), was also recorded for the purpose of learning. Examples six and seven are played by Raajeswari and Sri Vidya--the first on a radio program in 1985, and the second, at their home in 1988. The last example, sung by Semmangudi Srinivasa Iyer on the record "The Doyen of Carnatic Music Dr. Semmangudi Srinivasa Iyer, (vocal)" [BGRP 1015 1016], is an example outside the Karaikkudi tradition provided for general comparison, but not for analysis.

In this analysis I will use Figure 1, a transcription of the piece as sung by Ranganayaki Rajagopalan (tape not provided), as a "basic text" from which to compare the versions.

Figure 1: *padavinī*

tāla: ādī

rāga: sālāgabhairavi

ārōhaṇa: s r₂ m₁ p d₂ ś [C D F G C']

avarōhaṇa: ś n₂ d₂ p m₁ g₂ r₂ s [C' Bb A G F Eb D C]¹⁰¹

pallavi

1. // . . . s r m p p . /
pa da vinī sa

/m.pm m r g . r . / n d d p p m m g //
dbha kti yu ka lgu
 2. // r m g g r s r m p . r m p . . . p . /
tē pa davinī sa

/m.pm m r g . r . / n d d p p m m g //
dbha kti yu ka lgu
 3. // r m g g r s r m p m g r s . s r m p /
tē pa davinī sa

/ d s r m g g r s / n d p d m p m g //
dbha kti yu ka lgu tē
- end: // r m g g r s r m p . r m p /
pa davinī

/ / //

anupallavi

1. // . . d d d . s . . . s . r . . . /
cadi vi vē da sã

/ r . m g g . g . / g r s s s . . . //
strō pa ni sa ttu la
2. // . . p d s . p . d s . p . p d s r /
ca dī vi vē da sã

¹⁰¹(Subba Rao [1966] 1985, 51).

/ r . m g g . g . / g r srg r ss. s. //
 strō pa ni ṣa ttula
 3. // . . . s . n d . p . m . p d p d s /
 sa ttatē li ya lē
 / . . n d . p m . / p d p m p m m g r . // r mggr
 ni di pa da vā¹⁰²
 end. // back to 3rd sangati of pallavi and end //

caranam

1. // . . n . p . m p m m r g . r . s . /
 tyā ga rā ja nu tu
 / . . p d s . . . / n d p m g . r . //
 dou śrī rā mu ni
 2. // . . n . p . m p m m r g . r . s . /
 tyā ga rā ja nu tu
 / . . rmpd s . . . / n d p m g . rgrg //
 dou śrī rā mu ni
 // s r m p d s n d m m p m m r g . r . s . /
 tyā ga rā ja nu tu
 / . . rmpd s . . . / n d p m g . r . //
 dou śrī rā mu ni
 3. // . . . s r m p . d . s . r . p m /
 ttva mu tē li ya ni
 / g r s . n d p . / m p d m p m g // r mggr
 do ka pa da vā¹⁰³
 end. // return to 3rd line of pallavi and end //

¹⁰²Ranganayaki sings "vya" instead of "va" here. It is possible that she remembered it incorrectly, that she learned it that way, or that it appeared as "vya" in her book.

¹⁰³Ranganayaki sings the syllable "ya" instead of "va."

Variants:broad analysis

Broadly speaking, the first five variants adhere closely to the notated version--diverging primarily in phrases connecting the end of one *saṅgati* with the beginning of the next. Although the five versions contain slight differences such as the placement of plucks which do not correspond to syllables of text,¹⁰⁴ Karaikkudi viṇā players would consider them the same because their *saṅgati*-s are composed, for the most part, of the same *svara*-s, and because the order and number of their *saṅgati*-s are the same.

The sixth and seventh versions differ from the preceding five in the final repetition of the last *saṅgati* of both the *anupallavi* and the *caraṇam*, which not only contains different *svara*-s, but is also played differently, in that it is not repeated.¹⁰⁵ Raajeswari considers this *kṛiti* to be an example of how she has developed the Karaikkudi style.

Variants: examples 1-5

Although the variations among examples one through five are trivial on one level, they exemplify characteristic differences among the artists on another. The analysis that follows identifies patterns of variation and, in situations where the artists are likely to have based their versions on a single version, suggests possible processes that have brought about these variants.

Examples one and two, which correspond exactly to the model, indicate

¹⁰⁴As in *varṇa*-s, extra plucks are dictated by the structure of *tāna* phrases, which are themselves subject to variation.

¹⁰⁵The rule of repeating *saṅgati*-s exactly is sometimes broken at the end of sections, as it is here. Although some performers introduce variations from *saṅgati* to *saṅgati*, this is rare in the Karaikkudi style (some of the recorded examples contain *saṅgati*-s which are not repeated because I asked performers to play each *saṅgati* once).

that Ranganayaki's conception of "*padavinī*" as sung in December of 1985 corresponds to her *vīṇā* rendition of 1984 and to the early 1960's version performed by Ranganayaki and Raajeswari together, that Ranganayaki's versions have maintained the same *svara* structure over a period of nearly 25 years,¹⁰⁶ and that Raajeswari used to play a version identical to the notated model.

Sankari Ammal

The third example, performed by Sankari Ammal, is played much more slowly than the others.¹⁰⁷ The brothers, too, may have played "*padavinī*" at this tempo, for Subramanian claims that Karaikkudi *vīṇā* players have gradually increased the tempo of performance over the years (pers. com. 1988).

Unlike Ranganayaki and Raajeswari, Sankari plucks again to articulate 'mggr' which links repetitions of or changes between *saṅgati*-s (av2,3,end: akk2-3)--this is a relatively minor although consistent difference.

In the third *saṅgati* of the *pallavi*, the consonant "d" from "*sad*" and the syllable "*bha*" from "*bhakti*" (intense, loving devotion for god), which is rendered with a single pluck on *tāra ri* followed by a deflection to *tāra ma* and *ga* and a pluck on the second *ga* for the syllable "*kti*" in the first two examples, is rendered in example 3 by one pluck on *tāra ri* for the "d" of "*sad*" and one pluck on *tāra ma* for the "*bha*" of "*bhakti*"¹⁰⁸ Although this *ma*, like in other versions, is rendered from the *ri svarasthāna*, it

¹⁰⁶It is also relatively stable with regard to the production of *gamaka*, but this analysis will not deal with the variations of *gamaka* within performances of the same performers.

¹⁰⁷Although the speed may be attributable to recording problems of which I am not aware (the recording was made by Subramanian).

¹⁰⁸It is possible that "*dbha*" still occurs on *ri* and the pluck on *ma* is just an extra pluck, or visa-versa.

produces an effect characteristic of the playing of the three sisters Lakshmi, Sankari, and Meenakshi. I will call this *gamaka* "sustained from above," which is produced, in this case, by sustaining the *ma* a little bit and then producing a quickly oscillating *gamaka* on *ga* (all on the *ri svarasthāna*) but may appear in other analogous contexts. In this piece, the "sustained from above" approach lends emphasis and richness to the performance of the word "*bhakti*."

In the *anupallavi*, Sankari plays "*ya*" [av3akk11-12] of "*tēliyalēn[u]*" with the *svara ma* using a quick shake on the *ga svarasthāna*, producing an effect of lightness and quickness that contrasts with the slowness and depth of the analogous *gamaka* in the first two examples, in which *ma* was rendered with a descending slide coupled with a string deflection starting on the *pa svarasthāna* and ending on the *svarasthāna* for *ga*. This choice of a quickly oscillating, short *gamaka* as opposed to a slow, drawn out *gamaka* exemplifies another pattern of performance characteristic of the three sisters' playing.

On the other hand, Sankari's choice of *gamaka*-s at the end of the third *saṅgati* of the *anupallavi* (av3akk25-28: 'p.dp m.pm'), combination "hammer-on" and "pull-off"-s instead of "sparkling *sphurita*"-s of Ranganayaki's performance in example two, represents an interpretation of these *svara*-s that does not necessarily differentiate musicians' individual styles--three ways of rendering these *svara*-s, "hammer-on" "pull-off"-s, "sparkling *sphurita*"-s, and string deflections (found in this context in examples 1 and 4), might be used interchangeably by a particular artist.

Sankari's rendition of the *caraṇam*, which begins with a longer *kārvai* than the other versions and a one rather than two *akṣarakāla* long rendering of the first *ni*, differs from examples one and two by using *ri* on the syl-

lable "ni" of the second *saṅgati* [av2akk27-28] before repeating it instead of the stronger 'rgrg' found in versions of Ranganayaki and Raajeswari ('rgrg' is a smoother link to the ascending passage beginning on *sa* which follows it). A similar omission occurs in the first rendering of the third *saṅgati* [av3akk34-35], in which *ri* rather than "mggr" serves as a link to a repetition of the third *saṅgati*.

I suspect the omission of these subtle linking passages, again insignificant from an overall structural level, is a result of the limited period Sankari was able to learn with her father. Other explanations may be that Sambasiva Iyer introduced these details after the death of his brother, that Sankari forgot these details in this performance, or that for some reason, fully conscious of these performance possibilities, she decided to play in this particular fashion.

Meenakshi Ammal

In the *pallavi* of the fourth example, Meenakshi Ammal, like her sister Sankari, highlights the syllable "bha" of "bhakti" with a *gamaka* that is "sustained from above" and adds an extra pluck for 'mggr'.

In the second *saṅgati* of the *anupallavi*, Meenakshi plays the syllable "da" of the word "vēda" on *tāra sa*, whereas in all other examples "da" is rendered with a descending slide beginning on *tāra sa* and ending on *pa*--an ornament that is conceived of as *pa*. Since some performers delay the effect of this slide more than others, Meenakshi's version might be seen as so delayed as to omit *pa* entirely.

In the second half of the same *saṅgati*, rather than playing the elaborate rate 'grsrgrss.s.' (performed in the higher octave) on "*ṣattula*" [av2akk25-32] Meenakshi Ammal elaborates after the syllable "*strō*" [av2akk19-20] and

leaves "*ṣattula*" as 'grsss...' [as in avlakk25-32]. This elaboration consists of a quick "hammer-on" from *tāra sa* to *tāra ri* and a string deflection from the *ri svarasthāna* to the *svara-s* 'mgr'--all taking place within the space of two *akṣarakāla-s*.

Meenakshi condenses the *caraṇam*--possibly for reasons of recording conditions of which I am not aware--by omitting a repetition of the first *saṅgati* and skipping to 'srmpdsndpmpmrg.r.'. The second half of the third *saṅgati* [av3akk17-25] is rendered differently from the model by substituting a musically similar section of the *anupallavi* [av3akk25-32]:

/ ḡ ṛ ṣ . n d p m / p̄ d p̄ m̄ p m m g r . //

In addition to the musical similarity between this section and the section notated in figure 1, there is a similarity in texts: both the *anupallavi* and the *caraṇam* end with the word "*padavā*"--a question form of the word in the title "*padavi*" meaning "high status in life" or "good fortune" and "way, road, path or course" (Brown 1987). Substituting one section for another is a common type of variation which I will call "conservation of *saṅgati-s*"; and although Meenakshi might have forgotten the other way of playing the third *saṅgati* of the *caraṇam*, one cannot assume so.

Sugantha

In the fifth example, Sugantha plays variants that combine those found in performances of Sankari and Meenakshi Ammal. This coincidence may have come about because Sugantha's teacher Lakshmi Ammal, and Lakshmi Ammal's sisters Sankari and Meenakshi, all learned this song from Subbarama Iyer and because Sankari and Meenakshi used to visit Lakshmi Ammal's house and Sugantha's family in Karaikkudi, where Sugantha would hear them and their

students play "padavinī."

The first example of the combined variants occurs in the second half of the second *saṅgati* in the *anupallavi*, where, like Meenakshi, Sugantha elaborates after the syllable "strō" [av2akk19-20] with the *svara*-s 'sr̥m̐gr̐' and like Sankari (as well as Ranganayaki and Raajeswari) she elaborates the syllable "ṣa" of "ṣattula" with 'gr̥sr̥gr̥r̥ss.s.'.

Like Sankari, Sugantha renders *ma* on the syllable "ya" [av3akk11-12] in "tēliyalēn[u]" with a quick shake. Unlike any of the previous versions, Sugantha adds a *saṅgati* to the last line of the *anupallavi* in which she renders the syllable "vā" as it appears in the *caranam* [av3akk27-33] 'pdm pmgr.' This variation is another example of "conservation of *saṅgati*-s."

Summary: examples 1-5

The first five examples, considered the same because their *svara* structures are almost the same, adhere closely to the transcription of the version sung by Ranganayaki and suggest that this version is probably very close if not identical to that taught to Ranganayaki, Raajeswari, Sankari, Meenakshi, and Lakshmi Ammal. Only Sugantha's version combined variations found in other versions--a result, perhaps, of the fact that she was exposed to more versions of this song as she was growing up than the other four artists might have been.

Although most of the variations occurred in interpretation of particular *svara*-s through the use of *gamaka*-s, one of these variations (Meenakshi's performance of *pa* as *sa*) changed the *svara*--i.e. the adornment of the *svara* took priority over the *svara* itself. This phenomenon may be an example of how the structure of a piece changes over time, while the style of playing it changes little.

Transition and/or connecting passages are often interchangeable. Connecting phrases of one to five *svara*-s in length, for example, are the locus for minor variants among the five examples. The variations found in the last half of the final *saṅgati*-s in both the *anupallavi* and the *caraṇam* (these represent connecting phrases on a relatively broader scale) are other examples of "conservative" variations.

Examples 6-7: analysis

The last two examples follow the transcribed model almost exactly, except for the significant changes at the end of the *anupallavi* and the *caraṇam*.

Although the second *saṅgati* of the *pallavi* is played only once in example six, it is probably a casual rather than purposeful omission because the *saṅgati* is repeated in example seven. In both the sixth and the seventh examples, the third *saṅgati* of the *anupallavi* is played as it is in the *caraṇam*--just as Suganthā played her fourth *saṅgati*:

/ . . n d . p m . / p d m p m g r . //

ni di pa da vā

These differences, which are of the same order as those between the first five examples, are of little structural significance in comparison with the fast passage Raajeswari has added linking the end of the *anupallavi* to the first line of the *pallavi*:

/ . . . s . n d . p . m . p d s r /

sa ttatē li ya lē

/ g r s n d p m . / p d s r m g r s n d p s n d p //

ni di pa da vā

// m g r s n . [s r m p]
[pa davinī]

The seventh example, which is played slower, contains an extra *svara*, *dha*, in this passage ('mgrsṇḍ' not 'mgrsṇ.'). The variations found in examples six and seven (in comparison with the vocal model) are of greater significance than those in examples one through five because they contain a unique combination of *svara*-s, which is neither found elsewhere in the composition as rendered by Karaikkudi musicians, nor as rendered by other artists such as Semmangudi Srinivas Iyer (example 8). She has purposefully added this passage to improve the song, adding a bit of new life to an "old" song.

Although containing new material, the variation occurs at points of juncture in the composition--just as did the larger variations ("conservation of *saṅgati*" type) in examples one through five. Consistent with this connecting function, the passage is repeated at the end of the *caraṇam*. Although this passage is omitted in the *caraṇam* of example seven, it was recorded in the artists' house without rehearsal, and after one of them started to play this brisk passage but the other did not, it was finally omitted. Raajeswari then finished the piece alone. This informal rendition seems to indicate that although the piece has taken on a new stable form in the performers minds as evidenced by their public performance of the piece, the old version underlies the new version and may sometimes resurface. In this particular example, almost the entire piece was played as Raajeswari had played it in the early 1960's except for the end of the *anupallavi* and *caraṇam*. This rather well defined instance of developing "old" repertoire, in which a specific section is changed but not the *gestalt* of the piece, is only one of several possibilities for such development.

Into the *kṛiti* "ēlanīdayarādu" in *aṭhāna rāga*, *ādi tāḷa*, for example,

Raajeswari has introduced systemic changes such as new internal rhythmic relationships as well as the order and structure of *saṅgati*-s which are unlike the compartmentalized changes (new *saṅgati*-s) she introduced into "*padavinī*." Although analysis of the piece recorded on tape 5B is beyond the scope of this paper, it provides an aural reference to these systemic changes through renditions by Ranganayaki Rajagopalan,¹⁰⁹ Sashikala Suryanarayana (daughter of Lakshmi Ammal), and Sugantha Sridharan--which are relatively similar; and a rendition by Raajeswari Padmanabhan, which illustrates change. Unlike "*padavinī*," which Raajeswari volunteered as an example of how she has developed repertoire, "*ēlanidayarādu*," was identified by Ranganayaki as an example of a *kṛiti* Raajeswari has changed significantly from the way Sambasiva Iyer taught it.

That two kinds of changes, compartmentalized and systemic (although not all changes fit as neatly into these categories as my examples suggest), occur in Raajeswari's development of "old" repertoire raises the question of why one piece (performed by any artist) might be preserved to a greater extent than another. My tentative answer to this question is that pieces considered central to the Karaikkudi brothers' repertoire (i.e. well liked and often performed by the brothers, and strongly associated with the brothers in the minds of their listeners), such as "*padavinī*," are less subject to change than others.

This answer suggests yet another question: why was "*padavinī*" central to the brothers' repertoire? One might assume an answer to this question is that the brothers simply liked the music to the song and people associated "*padavinī*" with the Karaikkudi brothers because they performed it often, and

¹⁰⁹I asked Ranganayaki not to repeat *saṅgati*-s on this recording.

because both the song and the *rāga* were rare.

But beyond that, the brothers may also have liked the song for its textual content. In the *pallavi*, which explains that "*padavi*" is attainable only through *bhakti* (recall the slight emphasis on this word in the renditions of Meenakshi and Sankari), there seems to be a pun on the word "*padavi*," which means both "high status in life" or "good fortune," and "way" or "path," producing two possible interpretations: one gains "status and good fortune in life" only through loving devotion for the Lord, and, the only true "path" to the Lord is through loving devotion.

The rhetorical question contained in the *anupallavi*--"is *padavi* attainable by mere study of the *vēda*-s, *śāstra*-s, and *upaniṣad*-s?"--implies that one cannot attain *padavi* unless one understands the essence of these works, which is not available in the books themselves but in personal devotion. This text reveals an attitude strikingly similar to Sambasiva Iyer's attitude that music (an important form of *bhakti*) cannot be learned from books, should not be debated, and need not be discussed in words. The brothers may have appreciated this song because it echoed their own values.

3.2.1.2 Dropping repertoire

Because most of the pieces Sambasiva Iyer taught to Ranganayaki and Raajeswari are considered "old fashioned" by audiences and performers today, they have been dropped from their performing repertoire. But because pieces continually come into and go out of fashion in *karnāṭaka saṅgita*, these pieces may resurface in new forms--in which case it will be useful to know who performed these pieces and how they were performed. In anticipation of this need, Appendix II contains a list of all the songs taught to Ranganayaki by Sambasiva Iyer, a partial list of those taught to Raajeswari,

and a partial but nearly complete list of songs taught to Meenakshi Ammal by Subbarama Iyer. Recordings of some of these compositions are available for study in the archives of the University of Illinois, Urbana, Il.

Because nonprofessional performers need not concern themselves with the popularity of the pieces they play, their choice of compositions to practice and play depends on personal factors such as favorite *rāga*-s. For example, Lakshmi Ammal, who stopped performing after her son died in the 1950's, continued to play and teach "old" repertoire. Her sister Meenakshi Ammal, who prefers to live her life according to the ways of "that age" ("*anta kālam*"), has favorites that are seldom found in modern day performances. Unlike Lakshmi and Meenakshi, Ranganayaki and Raajeswari, who spend most of their time teaching and performing, do not have time to play for their own enjoyment and have no reason to continue practicing repertoire that the public is not interested in hearing.

Still, some pieces which are not in vogue, such as "*padavinī*" continue to be played, probably because they are considered central to the style.

3.2.2 New repertoire

Musicians eventually need, and want to learn pieces from sources other than their *guru*-s; for professionals this may involve replacing old repertoire with new repertoire to suit the demands of modern audiences.

Unlike as in days past, when certain compositions were considered the "property," as it were, of particular *pāṇi*-s, any performer in a *pāṇi* today can play any composition. People may have only had a single opportunity to hear such artists as the Karaikkudi brothers before radio and/or convenient transportation made access to their music possible. When people did get a chance to hear the brothers, they would have expected to hear compositions

for which the brothers were famous, such as "*sarasīruhā*" "*śaṅkarinī*" and "*padavinī*." Now, because people can turn on their tape recorders and hear whatever they want, they demand greater variety. And because music is available not only from a greater number of live sources than before but also from recorded sources, musicians have many more opportunities to add popular numbers to their repertoire than were available in the past.

3.2.2.1 Composing

Performers have two logical choices for adding new repertoire--composing it themselves or learning songs that already exist.

Unlike her *guru* Sambasiva Iyer, who confined himself to composing music that lacked text (except *saṅgati*-s), Raajeswari has composed songs with texts in Tamil and Sanskrit including *varṇa*-s in *bahudāri rāga*, *naḷinakānti rāga*, and *amṛitavarṣini rāga*, a *kṛiti* in *karta rāga*, a *rāgamālika* in Tamil for the Kalakshetra at the request of Rukmini Devi, and was in the process of composing a *tillāna* in January of 1988. But her interest in composing was not totally without precedent, for her grandfather Subbarama Iyer used to set to music such texts as *tirupukal*, *tēvāram*, and *tiruvāccakam*.

Ranganayaki, although able to compose new songs, chooses not to, and taking her *guru* Sambasiva Iyer's restriction on composing one step further, does not compose *ciṭṭasvara*-s or "note"-s either. Like Sambasiva Iyer, she believes the role of the musician is to interpret the great compositions of the past, and not to compose new ones.

Although the attitude a performer expresses toward composing tends to reflect the *pāṇi* to which he or she belongs, a single attitude need not be shared by all members of the *pāṇi*. The sentiments of Ranganayaki and Raajeswari can be seen as extensions of the those of their teachers. For

example, Raajeswari may have been interested in composing later in life, because she was encouraged to compose little songs while still learning with her mother (see pp.27-28); and because she must have heard songs such as "mācil vīnaiyum," in *yadukulakāmbhōji rāga*, *tripuṭa tāla* which were set to music by her grandfather Subbarama Iyer.¹¹⁰ If the composing practiced by Subbarama Iyer and Sambasiva Iyer are seen as progressive--that is, as tendencies toward composing rather than restrictions on composing, Raajeswari's practice can be seen as an extension of her predecessors'. On the other hand, Ranganayaki bases her attitude on that of Sambasiva Iyer, which she perceives as a restrictive one, and her composing nothing new except for *saṅgati*-s in compositions is but an extension of it.

3.2.2.2 Learning new songs

This section concerns the role of style in learning new pieces, addressing such issues as how a new piece is absorbed into a new style and the transformation, if any, it undergoes in the process. Ranganayaki learns new pieces by either leaving them entirely intact (maintaining their *pāṭh-āntara*), save for the unique manner in which she transforms singing into playing, or by enriching them with new *saṅgati*-s.

3.2.2.2.1 Maintaining *pāṭhāntara*

Ranganayaki does not modify the structure of songs learned from such musicians as T. M. Tyagarajan, Maharajapuram Santhanam, and Kandadevi Narayana (disciple of Ariyakudi Ramanuja Iyengar) for she respects their manner of performing.¹¹¹ She rarely learns new songs from these musicians

¹¹⁰Lakshmi Ammal played this song, a favorite of hers and her father's, for Narayana Iyer when he came to see her before their marriage was arranged.

¹¹¹She says they have a "*nalla vali*"--lit. a "good way" or "good style."

directly, sometimes learns songs off a cassette tape, and sometimes through one of her daughters.¹¹² In all cases she memorizes the words and melody of the song before attempting to play it on the *viṇā*.

Tape 6 contains examples of songs Ranganayaki has learned and attempted to reproduce exactly, the first of which, *caraṇampava*, is a song whose text is composed by Narayana Thirthar, and whose music is composed by T. M. Tyagarajan. Ranganayaki learned this song from her daughter Jayanti, who learned it from her vocal teacher, T. M. Tyagarajan. I learned the song from Kamala Ramamurthy, another disciple of T. M. Tyagarajan and the source for the svvara notation given in figure 2.

Figure 2: *caraṇampava karuṇāmmayi*

Poet: Narayana Thirthar
Composer of music: T. M. Tyagarajan
Language: Sanskrit
Raga: Hamsavinōtini
Tala: Rūpakam

Textual Source: Sambamoorthy (1986, 23-4), transcribed from the Tamil.

Source of Musical Notation: Kamala Ramamurthy (1985).

Note: Text is transliterated from Tamil script, and will not accurately represent the Sanskrit pronunciation. A Sanskrit source was not available at the time of the present project.

ārōhaṇa: s r₂ g₃ m₁ d₂ n₃ ś [C D E F A B C']
avarōhaṇa: ś n₃ d₂ m₁ g₃ r₂ s [C' B A F E D C]¹¹³

pallavi

1. // d m g r m m // g r mggr s s // n s r . s r //
ca ra ṇa m pava karu ṇā m mayi kuru tī ṇa ta

// g . m . . . //
yā lō

¹¹²One daughter studied with Kandadevi Narayana, and another, with T. M. Tyagarajan. She has learned from Maharajapuram Santhanam only through cassettes.

¹¹³(Subba Rao [1964] 1982, 118)

2. // d m g r m m // gm rg mmgr s s // s sr grsr g m //
 ca ra nam pava ka ru nam mayi kuru ti nata
 // d . nns. srgm //
 yā lō
3. // d m dns. nd m. // gm rg mmgr s sn // dnsr gmrgr mdn. //
 ca ra nam pava ka ru nam mayi kuru ti nata
 // s nd nmdg mrgm //
 yā lō
- end // d m dnrdn d m // g r mggr s s // n s r . s r //
 ca ra nam pava ka ru nam mayi kuru ti nata
 // g . m . . . //
 yā lō

anupallavi

1. // . nn .d m d d // d n dn s s s //
 karu nā rasa varu nā laya
2. // . nn .d m d d // d n dn s sn r // .s [nn .d m d d]
 karu nā rasa varu nā la ya [karu nā rasa]
3. // [.] nn .d m d d // d n dn s rsrg // .r [nn .d m d d]
 karu nā rasa varu nā laya [karu nā rasa]
4. // .r sn .d . sndm // d n dn s s s //
 karu nā rasa varu nā laya
 // . dn .s.n r s // n n dn d mgmd //
 kari rā jakru pā lō
5. // . sn .d . mgrs // rgmd mdns dnsr //
 karu nā rasa varu nā laya
 // . gm gr . sn d // grsn dmgr srgm // d [sn .d . mgrs]
 kari ra ja kru pā lō [karu nā rasa]
- end // d m dn rss. .ndm // g r mggr s s //
 ca ra nam pava ka ru nam mayi
 // n s r . s r // g . m . . . //
 kuru ti nata yā lō

caranam

1. // . mm .m . d m // . gg .g.r m g // . rr .r.s g r //
 atu nā kalu viti nā mayi suti yā sura

// s n s r g . //

pari tam

2. // . mm . m . nd m // . gg . g . dm g // . rr . r . mg r //

atu nā ka lu viti nā ma yi suti yā su ra

// s̄ndn srgm dn s //

pari tam

3. // . mm . m . s̄ndm // . gg . g . ndmg //

atu nā ka lu viti nā mayi

// . rr . r . dmgr // s̄ndn srgm dnrd // s [mm . m . s̄ndm]

suti yā sura pari tam [atu nā ka lu]

4. // . nn . d m d d // d n dn s s s //

matu sū taṇa matu sū taṇa

5. // . nn . d m d d // d n dn s sn r // . s [nn . d m d d]

matu sū taṇa matu sū taṇa [matu sū taṇa]

6. // [.] nn . d m d d // d n dn s rsrg // . r [nn . d m d d]

matu sū taṇa matu sū taṇa [matu sū taṇa]

7. // . r . sn . d . s̄ndm // d n dn s s s //

matu sū taṇa matu sū taṇa

// . dn . s . n r s // n n dn d mgmd //

hara mā maka tu ri tam

8. // . sn . d . mgrs // rgmd mdns dnsr //

matu sū taṇa matu sū taṇa

// . gm gr . sn d // grsn dmgr srgm // d [sn . d . mgrs]

hara mā ma ka tu ri tam [matu sū taṇa]

end // d m dn rss . ndm // g r mggr s s //

cara ṇam pava karu ṇam mayi

// n s r . s r // g . m . . . //

kuru tī nata yā lō

The structure of the *svara*-s in examples one, a recording of T. M. Tyagarajan singing "*caranampava*" in Madurai, 1982, and two, a recording from All India Radio of Ranganayaki in 1985, is identical, and Ranganayaki's right hand finger plucks correspond either to textual syllables or to phrase articulations in the performance by T. M. Tyagarajan; for these reasons, T.

M. Tyagarajan considers her rendition "correct" (K. Ramamurthy pers. com. 1985).

The third example on tape 6 is a vocal rendition of "*dinamanivamsa*" in *harikāmbhōji rāga*, *ādi tāla*, sung by Maharajapuram Santhanam, and example four, a *viṇā* rendition by Ranganayaki Rajagopalan. The notation for this song, which Ranganayaki learned from a cassette recording of Maharajapuram Santhanam, is not provided. These examples illustrate that, despite the cultural emphasis on teacher-student relationships in India, even such conservative musicians as Ranganayaki Rajagopalan sometimes learn new repertoire from tape recordings.

In learning new repertoire, Ranganayaki's choice of which musician's version of a song to learn is dependant on her values as a member of the Karaikkudi style. For example, when Ranganayaki decides to learn a song as T. M. Tyagarajan sings it, she is making a stylistic choice, deciding to leave the order and content of *saṅgati*-s unchanged--just as she would treat a composition she learned from Sambasiva Iyer.

Style also bears on the learning of new compositions in a technical sense, for Ranganayaki's performance of "*caranampava*" is subject to her "touch," her fingering, her *aluttam*, and all the other technical aspects of the Karaikkudi style. Because this comes automatically to her, Ranganayaki does not see this as change. However, when rendering long, brisk vocal passages she inevitably shortens or simplifies them for the instrument.

Unlike the rather passive way membership in the Karaikkudi style affects Ranganayaki's interpretation of songs she considers to be complete and interesting, membership in the Karaikkudi style plays an active role in providing Ranganayaki with a set of technical and aesthetic tools to develop

new *saṅgati*-s for songs she considers to be plain and uninteresting.

3.2.2.2.2 Developing *saṅgati*-s

Kaloori Krishnamurthy has taught Ranganayaki many *kṛiti*-s in a rather plain, unadorned form. Ranganayaki has modified these songs in accordance with her aesthetic standards by altering and/or adding *saṅgati*-s. Tape six example five contains a representative example of one such piece: "ēṭāvunarā," a *kṛiti* in *kalyāṇī rāga*, *ādi tāla*. Raajeswari performs "ēṭāvunarā" in example six, and claims to have learned the composition from Sambasiva Iyer. Ranganayaki doubts this is the case, however, for in the twenty years she knew Sambasiva Iyer, she never heard him play "ēṭāvunarā." Whether Raajeswari learned the song from Sambasiva Iyer or from someone else, a comparison of hers and Ranganayaki's versions illustrates differences of interpretation, such as choice of which parts of *saṅgati*-s to develop-- although without the models on which the versions of Ranganayaki and Raajeswari were based one cannot assess the contributions of the individual musicians.

Figure three is an outline which approximates the motion of *svara*-s in the first six *saṅgati*-s of the *pallavi* as performed by Ranganayaki Rajagopalan.

Figure 3: Basic motion in *saṅgati*-s of *pallavi* of "ēṭāvunarā"

[*svara*-s in parentheses refer to *svara*-s reached in *gamaka*-s or variations which are not part of the basic *svara* structure]

sangati 1: // g -- p -- s / sṇ -- r -- s / r -- r //

sangati 2: // g -- p(d) -- s / sṇ -- (g)r / g(r) -- gr //(ṇ-r)

sangati 3: // g -- p(d) -- s / p / p -- g -- pm //(g-r)

sangati 4: // g -- p(d) -- s / d(n) -- p / p -- ns -- pm //(g-r)

sangati 5: //g -- p(d)[n]¹¹⁴ -- s / s / n -- d -- pm //(g-r)

sangati 6: //g -- pn -- s / p -- grs -- p / m -- g -- m //

The range and tessitura of each *laghu* and of each *drutam* increases incrementally in each successive *saṅgati*--of which there were only three or four in the version Ranganayaki learned originally. Raajeswari's first *saṅgati*, which reaches *ga* at the end of the *āvarta*, is structurally equivalent to the second *saṅgati* of Ranganayaki's performance. Raajeswari, by ascending to *ni* as soon as the second *saṅgati*, develops *saṅgati*-s in the middle of the first *laghu* sooner and more substantially than does Ranganayaki. Ranganayaki ascends only as far as *pa* (*da*) in the middle of the first *laghu* throughout the first four *saṅgati*-s, and as far as *ni* in the repetition of the fifth *saṅgati*.

Summary

Karaikkudi *vīṇā* players have preserved and changed "old" compositions and learned new songs since Sambasiva Iyer died, and in the process, made decisions about innovation according to their own interpretations of the Karaikkudi style. Ranganayaki, for example, believed it necessary to preserve the way her *guru* performed compositions--if she was to play them at all--while Raajeswari preserved his manner of playing to different extents. For both artists, whether they changed compositions and the extent to which they changed them seem to depend on such factors as the popularity of the compositions today and their importance in the repertoire of the Karaikkudi brothers.

Both artists introduce new compositions into their performing reper-

¹¹⁴second time

toire; Ranganayaki, for example, does so by learning from cassette tapes and from musicians; Raajeswari does so from these sources and by composing them herself. Ranganayaki alters the structure of compositions that do not meet her aesthetic standards--standards based upon her training as a musician in the Karaikkudi school. The *kṛiti* "ēṭāvunarā" illustrates, not surprisingly, that two artists who belong to the same style need not develop *saṅgati*-s in exactly the same way; and, that Ranganayaki does not believe in composing and Raajeswari does, illustrates a style can accomodate conflicting values which may follow from different interpretations of the same source--in this case, the attitude of Sambasiva Iyer.

3.3 Rendition

Important to understanding changes in the Karaikkudi style since the death of Sambasiva Iyer, is understanding not only the material played (3.2) but also how it is played--a discussion of which will be the subject of 3.3. While some aspects of performance were addressed in discussing "*padavinī*" (see pp.115-27), this section is given to a more thorough analysis of the ways composed music (*kalpita saṅgita*) and improvised music (*manodharma saṅgita*) can be developed in performance. This section is also given to identifying the differences among the kinds of innovations and musical gestures typical of Lakshmi Ammal (and those associated with her), Raajeswari, and Ranganayaki.

3.3.1 *kalpita saṅgita*

Individual musicians can, to various extents, alter compositions by either replacing one musical unit with another or by inserting new musical units into a composition. Such musical units, for the purposes of analysis, will be discussed in terms of the classifications, *gamaka*, *prayōga* (musical

phrase), and *saṅgati*, even though the actual "units" may not correspond perfectly to these divisions.

3.3.1.1 Variation by replacement of *gamaka*

A particular performer or group of performers may characteristically choose certain kinds of *gamaka*-s when rendering a particular *svara* or group of *svara*-s, even though this choice may have little impact on the structure of the overall composition in which it occurs. Not all *gamaka*-s can be viewed in this way, however, as is illustrated in the three interchangeable ways the end of the third *saṅgati* in "*padavinī*" were performed (av3akk25-28: 'p.dp m.pm' [see p.121]).

A similar example of interchangeability is found in comparing two separate recordings of Ranganayaki Rajagopalan playing "*sarasīruhā*," (tape 7, exs. 1-2) in which the *drutam* section B_1'' of the third *saṅgati* in example 2 (2' 55") differs from that in example one (B_1 : 55") by the use of two string deflections from *ma* to *pa* ('mpmp') rather than a "sparkling *sphurita*" on *ma* (comprising the *svara*-s 'mpm') followed by a "hammer-on" to *pa*. Such differences, which are based solely in technique, almost never either differentiate *saṅgati*-s or performances by different musicians.

Sometimes one performer uses *gamaka*-s which contain *svara*-s only slightly different from those of another performer (or of the same performer in another instance). For example, B_1 in the first *saṅgati* of the first performance (12") is replaced by B_1'' in the second (1' 50"), which instead of containing the double deflection described above ('mpmp'), comprises only a single deflection ('mp'), and adds a step to the gradually increasing complexity of each *saṅgati* in the second performance. Contributing to *saṅgati* architecture seems to be one of the characteristic functions served by in-

which are not only more mappable onto the *svara* model, but are also better suited to the overall architecture of the three *saṅgati*-s which occur at the beginning of this *varṇam*:

Figure 6: Lakshmi Ammal's rendition of the 1st *saṅgati* of "sāmininnē" as reflected in lessons and performances circa 1985:

/ s . . . n s pddn p .
> > > >
s n s pd .p

pa in *akṣarakāla* nine is approached from *tāra sa*, rendered by deflecting the string from the *dha svarasthāna*.

This version, unlike that in figure four, can be mapped directly onto figure five: other than identical *svara*-s, 'pd' is a *gamaka* for *dha* and 'dn', for *ni*; and provides a logical progression for the *saṅgati*-s that follow it, each of which begin with one *akṣara* of *sa*, and contain developments in the second *akṣara*. In versions that incorporate figure four, the first *svara* in the second *akṣara* of each *saṅgati* falls in the series, *pa*, *ma*, *ma*; Lakshmi Ammal's innovations change this to the progression, *ni*, *pa*, *ma* by using figure six as the first *saṅgati* and figure four as the second.

While in some contexts, as above, performers use progressively complex *gamaka*-s to develop particular sections of successive *saṅgati*-s, sometimes performers develop *saṅgati*-s by using (but not necessarily borrowing) *gamaka*-s found in analogous *saṅgati*-s of other compositions. An example of one such *gamaka* is found in renditions of the compositions "nāmorālakiñci," in *dhanyāsi rāga*, *ādi tāla* (tape 7, exs. 5-6), and "ēmiḷḷēsitē," in *tōḍi rāga*, *miśra chāpu tāla* (exs. 7-8). These *rāga*-s are classified under the eighth *mēlakarta* (system of classification based on permutations of 7 note scales), *hanumatōḍi*, and have the following ascending and descending scales

(*ārōhana* and *avarōhana*):

dhanyāsi:

ascent: C Eb F G Bb C' descent: C' Bb Ab G F Eb Db C

tōḍi:

ascent: C Db Eb F G Bb C' descent: C' Bb Ab G F Eb Db C

Because *rāga*-s are defined not by notes, but by *svara*-s with characteristic *gamaka*-s and by phrases and combinations of phrases, comparing the "scales" of the two *rāga*-s reveals not their subtle differences but their structural similarities. These similarities provide ideal contexts for the parallel types of variation described below.

The brief excerpt from Ranganayaki's rendition of "*nāmorālakiñci*" (ex. 5) contains the *svara* combination '*p̄mpmg*' which is performed by plucking the string while the left hand middle finger is on *pa*, sounding *ma* with a "pull-off" (a pluck with the left hand middle finger executed when removing it from *pa*, leaving the left hand index finger on the *ma svarasthāna*), and sounding *pa* once again with a "hammer-on"; Ranganayaki ends the combination, sounding the *svara ga*, by plucking while the left hand index finger descends from just behind the *ma svarasthāna* to the *ri svarasthāna* (second fret of the *viṇā*) in a deep deflection of the string.

Ranganayaki's rendition of this *svara* combination can be seen as an embellished version of that performed by Meenakshi Ammal in example 6, which does not employ the "hammer-on" and "pull-off" *gamaka*-s, sounding only the *svara*-s '*pmgg*'.

Ranganayaki prefers the simpler of these two ways of performing '*pmgg*' when it occurs in her rendition of "*ēmijēsītē*" (ex. 7), whereas Meenakshi's niece, Sugantha Sridharan, performs this passage '*p̄mpmg*' in the manner de-

scribed above in her rendition of "ēmiḷēsitē" (ex. 8).

These examples illustrate how a particular kind of variation can occur in two different compositions and in two different *rāga*-s. Although Ranganayaki consistently uses the more complex version for "nāmorālakiñci" and the simpler one for "ēmiḷēsitē," there is no objective reason why a performer should play these compositions the same way each time or use these *gamaka*-s in one composition and not in another. Lakshmi Ammal's students Sugantha Sridharan and Sashikala Suryanarayana use the complicated version of the *svara* combination in their renditions of both compositions. This preference for complicated, busy variations and variations that involve left hand finger plucks reflects a general trend among Lakshmi Ammal and her students that contrasts with Ranganayaki's preference for simplicity.

A further example of this trend toward active and complicated renditions is illustrated by Lakshmi Ammal's daughter Sashikala Suryanarayana--a performer who plays more ornately than any of Lakshmi Ammal's students. In the *anupallavi* to "entavēḍuko" (ex. 17) Sashikala's rendition of the *sangati* sections marked B₁ and C₁ consistently differ from those of Ranganayaki, Raajeswari and Sugantha. This difference in rendition lies in the use of a *gamaka* which touches the *svara*-s 'mgmpmg' instead of 'gmg' on the syllables "oḍi" in the word "moḍirā" (see basic notation, pp. 50-53) and is indicated in the analytical index by parentheses and a prime symbol, i.e. (B₁)' or (C₁)'. Note that Sashikala's variation resembles the variation in the third *sangati* of Chembai Vaidyanatha Bhagavathar's rendition (Tape 4B 2'04").

Not only do general performance trends, such as toward complicated, busy textures, tend to differentiate Lakshmi Ammal and her students from

Ranganayaki, but the use of particular *gamaka*-s in particular contexts also do. One such context is the first *ga* occurring in the *kṛiti* "*sarasīruhā*," an example of which is performed by Lakshmi Ammal's student, S. Mallika, on tape 7 (ex. 3). Unlike Ranganayaki (and Sambasiva Iyer on his recordings), who performs this *ga* as 'mg' on the *ga*₃ ('E') *svarasthāna* by relaxing the string from its position, initially deflected to *ma* ('F'), Mallika performs *ga* as 'mrmr' on the *ri*₃ *svarasthāna* ('D#') oscillating between *ri*₃ and *ma* ('D#' and 'F'). Reck notes that this phrase, which he writes out in a more explicit form as (m) R (m) R m P, "although a *viśeṣa prayōga* is one of the strongest characteristic phrases of *nāṭa* as played by the Karaikkudi style" (1983, 241). If this phrase does possess a strong "Karaikkudi" character, as Reck's observation seems to imply, perhaps Lakshmi Ammal's and her students' use of this form ('mrmrmp') rather than the form played by Ranganayaki and by Sambasiva Iyer ('mgmp') acts as a marker of style.

This deep *gamaka*, 'mrmr', which is found consistently in Lakshmi Ammal's rendering of the phrase 'gmp', might also be interpreted as implying the *svara*-s 'rmp' and provides another example of how successive embellishments of a *svara* may ultimately obscure the *svara* on which the embellishment is based.¹¹⁷

Lakshmi Ammal's branch of the Karaikkudi style is characterized not only by this "deep *gamaka*" on *ga*, by a preference for busy, complicated *gamaka*-s, and for *gamaka*-s that involve left hand finger plucks, but also for *gamaka*-s of the "sustained from above type" noted in her sisters' renditions of "*padavinī*" (see p.121). Comparing Ranganayaki's (tape 8, ex. 3)

¹¹⁷The first example of such change is found in Meenakshi's rendition of "*padavinī*," in which the embellishment usually given to *pa* sounds like *sa*.

And finally, this *ciṭṭasvara* illustrates the characteristic manner in which Lakshmi Ammal and her students use more oscillations than does Ranganayaki in their rendition of *gamaka-s*. In the third *āvarta* of section B Lakshmi Ammal uses three successive oscillations between *dha* and *ni* on the *dha svarasthāna* where Ranganayaki only uses one to render the *svara-s* 'dndd.':

(av2)	(av3)		(av4)
3	1	2	3
ṣ̣ ṣ̣ ṣ̣ ṣ̣ / . n	(d n d d .)	(m g r s)	(s / n d m g r s)
> >	> >	>	> > >

Summary

Minute differences between renditions of composed music played by different performers, by the same performer over a period of time (diachronic change), or, potentially, by a performer at any given time (synchronic variation) are often brought about by differences in *gamaka-s* used for particular *svara-s* or for groups of *svara-s*, and may occur in perceivable patterns. Lakshmi Ammal and her students, for example, tend to choose *gamaka-s* that:

1. "sustain from above"
2. use left hand finger plucks
3. displace "metrical" accent
4. use many oscillations
5. are complex
6. contribute to incremental development of *sangati-s*

Ranganayaki tends to choose *gamaka-s* that lack all but the last of the above characteristics; Ranganayaki's *gamaka-s*:

1. are rarely "sustained from above"
2. contain few left hand plucks
3. and oscillations correspond to *akṣara* accents
4. contain few oscillations
5. are clear, slow and simple

These characteristic patterns of rendition sometimes enable one to predict from whom a student in the Karaikkudi school has learned, even though students like myself, who learned from both Ranganayaki and Lakshmi Ammal, tend to play with characteristics of both performers.

Although the choice of some *gamaka*-s appear to depend on the individual style of a performer, the choice of other *gamaka*-s, such as either "sparkling *sphurita*," "hammer-on" and "pull-off," or string deflection, depend less on individual style than on technical ability and convenience.

Just as individual branches of the Karaikkudi style can be described by their choices of *gamaka*, so too can they be described by their choices of *prayōga*.

3.3.1.2 Variation by replacement of *prayōga*

Performers' variations of compositions may differ in their constituent *prayōga*-s, or musical phrases, which are in this case larger than *gamaka*-s and smaller than *saṅgati*-s, and which may be introduced, for example, to contribute to the overall architecture of *saṅgati*-s (see also 3.3.1.1), to compete with or conform to popular and written versions, or to agree with musical theory. Each of these motivations will be considered in this section.

S. Mallika (tape 7, ex. 3) renders the *pallavi* of "*sarasīruhā*," *nāṭa rāga*, with *saṅgati*-s that contain different *prayōga*-s from those found in early recordings of Ranganayaki, Raajeswari, and Sambasiva Iyer, and from those found in Ranganayaki's current performances. These *prayōga*-s, which incrementally increase the range and tessitura of the *saṅgati*-s in which they are embedded, occur in the first *drutam* section of the *tāla* in the third and fourth *saṅgati*-s of Mallika's performance and are indicated by B₂

and B₃ in the analytical index (ex.3). In the earlier, less-adorned version of the piece performed by Ranganayaki and Raajeswari in the early 1960's (ex. 1), the analogous *prayōga*-s remain almost unchanged in each *saṅgati* (B₁ and B₁')

Figure 7: *prayōga*-s from *saṅgati*-s in *pallavi* of "*sarasīruhā*"

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{B}_1 \text{ and B}_1': \quad \frac{\text{6}}{\text{m.np.pm}} \frac{\text{6}}{\text{m.gmpmpm}} / \text{r.s. s.s.} // \\
 \text{B}_2: \quad \frac{\text{6}}{\text{srsn.pm}} \frac{\text{6}}{\text{m.gmpmpm}} / \text{r.s. s.s.} // \\
 \text{B}_3: \quad \frac{\text{6}}{\text{gmpnsrsn.pm}} \frac{\text{6}}{\text{m.gmpmpm}} / \text{r.s. s.s.} //
 \end{array}$$

Mallika's *saṅgati*-s contain the internal progression of *prayōga*-s $\frac{\text{6}}{\text{m.np.pm}}$, $\frac{\text{6}}{\text{srsn.pm}}$, $\frac{\text{6}}{\text{gmpnsrsn.pm}}$; whereas the analogous set of *saṅgati*-s in example one contain only $\frac{\text{6}}{\text{m.np.pm}}$. Mallika's teacher Lakshmi Ammal used to play B₂, of which B₃ is but an extension, and other performers play *saṅgati*-s with similar *prayōga*-s.

Unlike Mallika's *saṅgati*-s, which are based on incremental differences in *prayōga*-s, one of the *prayōga*-s that distinguishes the *saṅgati*-s of Raajeswari's current performances of *sarasīruhā* (ex. 4) from those of her early performances (ex. 1), is not incrementally related to the *prayōga* she used to play and might be based upon a popular version of the song. This *prayōga*, 'pmgmp', occurs in the eleventh *akṣarakāla* of the fourth *saṅgati* in her performance on example four, and differs from 'mg. mp', the *prayōga* used

been inspired to change this song by sources outside the Karaikkudi school.

Not only might performers alter *prayōga*-s to conform with popular and/or written versions, but also might they alter *prayōga*-s considered theoretically incorrect to conform with theory,¹¹⁹ an example of which, performed by Sashikala Suryanarayana on tape 8 (ex. 1), is the *kṛitī* "rāma-bāṇa," in *sāvēri rāga*. Example 2, which I perform as taught by Lakshmi Ammal, conflicts with the *rāga lakṣaṇa* (characteristics of a *rāga*) of *sāvēri*, which includes skipping *ga* and *ni* in the *ārōhaṇa*, (Dikshitar 1961-1983, 229) by including the *prayōga* 'p̄ḍṇsrgsr̄ṇḍ' in the second *saṅgati*:

<i>akṣara</i> -s:	1	2	3	4
<i>saṅgati</i> 1A.	//s... r̄sr̄sgr s... p.s. s̄ṇḍ. ḍ.rs srsr srsr/			
<i>saṅgati</i> 2A.	//s... r̄sr̄sgr s... p̄ḍṇsrg rs̄ṇḍ ḍ.rs srsr srsr/			

Because this *prayōga* is not commonly accepted in *sāvēri*, Lakshmi Ammal's students play similar *saṅgati*-s which omit the *ni*, such as 'ḍsrgsr̄ṇḍ' performed by Sashi in example 1:

<i>saṅgati</i> 1A.	//s... r̄sr̄sgr s... p.s. s̄ṇḍ. ḍ.rs srsr srsr/
<i>saṅgati</i> 2A.	//s... r̄sr̄sgr s... ḍsrg rs̄ṇḍ ḍ.rs srsr srsr/

Finding beauty a more compelling reason for including this *prayōga* than theory a deterrent, Lakshmi Ammal, who knew the *ārōhaṇa* of *sāvēri rāga* omits *ni*, continued to play this *prayōga*--which she may have learned from her father. I have not been able to determine how it was performed by either brother because Sambasiva Iyer was no longer playing "rāmabāṇa" when he began teaching Ranganayaki. One may find continuity with past, however, in

¹¹⁹Sometimes changes come about in conflict with theory. One such change in the last few generations is the rendering of *ābhēri* with *chaturti dhaivata* instead of *suddha dha* (Subba Rao [1956] 1980-[1966] 1985, 2).

Lakshmi Ammal's insistence on using this "forbidden" *prayōga*, which seems to echo the Karaikkudi brothers' belief that one can not truly understand music through books, but only through performance.

Summary

Performances of the same compositions by different performers in the same style, in this case the Karaikkudi style, may differ not only in *gamaka*-s (3.3.1.1) but also by the choice of different *prayōga*-s. Sometimes this choice represents a process of diachronic change, for artists such as Raajeswari who would have learned a rather fixed form of "*sarasīruhā*" from Sambasiva Iyer, and now perform it in a new, somewhat stable form. For others, such as Mallika, this choice represents one of many possibilities presented to her by her *guru*, Lakshmi Ammal, in addition to her own creativity.

Like choices of *gamaka*, choices of *prayōga*-s may effect the speed and degree to which each successive *saṅgati* increases in complexity. Or, an artist such as Raajeswari might choose to play popular *prayōga*-s because, as a teacher at a major music school, Kalakshetra, she would be asked to teach such *prayōga*-s to her students. And finally, as more and more performers begin to accept a unitary theoretical model, performers may try to protect their legitimacy as educated musicians by altering *prayōga*-s that do not conform to this model.

3.3.1.3 Variations by replacement of *saṅgati*

Ranganayaki and Raajeswari had, by 1987, gone their separate ways--having neither played together nor really spoken to each other for over twenty years. Consequently, when K. S. Subramanian invited them to participate in a television program that year, the situation was potentially awk-

ward for both artists. Subramanian hoped to persuade Ranganayaki and Raajeswari to join forces to perform "*sarasīruhā*," a song for which the Karaikkudi brothers were famous and which Ranganayaki and Raajeswari had played together hundreds of times when they were children.

Playing together in unison for the first time in many years is usually possible among *viṇā* players in the Karaikkudi school, as well as among those in other schools, who had learned a "basic" version of a piece. For this reason it was particularly unusual that these artists, who could not find a meeting ground, had to perform separately: Raajeswari with her daughter Sri Vidya, and Ranganayaki with her daughter Jayanti. Ranganayaki performed the composition, just as she performs all "old" compositions, almost precisely as it appears on old tapes of Sambasiva Iyer, Ranganayaki, Raajeswari, and other Karaikkudi *viṇā* players of the 1950's. Unlike Ranganayaki, Raajeswari changed not only *gamaka*-s and *prayōga*-s (see above, 3.3.1.2) but also *saṅgati*-s she had been taught by Sambasiva Iyer.

Examples in 3.3.1.2 showed differences between *prayōga*-s used in "*sarasīruhā*"; when enough *prayōga*-s are changed, entire *saṅgati*-s take on a different character, and because Ranganayaki felt that Raajeswari had changed these *saṅgati*-s entirely, they could not play together. Figure 8 is a transcription of one such *saṅgati*, the first on tape 7 example 4 played by Raajeswari (A_1D_1) at 5'20":

Figure 8: Raajeswari's *saṅgati* from "*sarasīruhā*"

A_1	D_1
//...p. m.p. ..mg mp.. / ..p. mggpm / sr... sṇsr //gm[p.m.p. etc.]	
> > > > >	> > > > >

The section of this *saṅgati* which differs from that of the parallel *saṅgati* performed by Ranganayaki ($A_1'B_1$) is indicated by the letter "D" in

the analytical index. The letter "B," modified by prime signs and subscripts, is used to indicate parallel sections of all other performances, including those of Ranganayaki (exs. 1 & 2), which contain variations of a smaller scale:

Figure 9: "B" section of Ranganayaki's and Raajeswari's performance in the 1960s (Tape 7 ex. 1)

$$B_1: \frac{\text{p} \dots \text{pm}}{6} \frac{\text{m.gmpmpm}}{\text{r.s. s.s.}} // \dots [\text{p. m.p. etc.}]$$

The first *akṣara* of figure 9 is developed in all performances by Karaikkudi *viṇā* players (see figure 7 for one such example), but the second *akṣara* is varied in limited ways (see 3.3.1.1). The second *akṣara* may remain relatively fixed because the particular manner in which the *svara*-s are rendered makes the Karaikkudi rendition of "*sarasīruhā*" unique. This uniqueness is partially derived from the combined use of the "sparkling *sphurita*" and the "hammer-on" and "pull-off" techniques.

Although *akl* in figure 9 takes several forms in renditions of other Karaikkudi *viṇā* players, Raajeswari's rendition of this portion of each *saṅgati* (*akl* of section "D" in her performance, ex. 4), is unlike that of any other performer in the Karaikkudi school (except her daughter, and others who base their renditions on hers). Raajeswari's rendition of *akṣarakāla*-s 13-18 ('*sṇsr gm*') are also unique among Karaikkudi *viṇā* players.¹²⁰ These *akṣarakāla*-s serve the function of linking the end of one *saṅgati* with the beginning of the next.

Perhaps Ranganayaki would have found these changes less substantial if

¹²⁰This section is also similar to that in Rangaramanuja Ayyangar's notation (1987, 107).

introduced into a *kṛiti* other than "*sarasīruhā*," which was Sambasiva Iyer's favorite composition. Although I suggested Raajeswari's performance of "*padavinī*" was more like that of Sambasiva Iyer than her performance of "*ēlanīdayarādu*" because the Karaikkudi brothers were famous for "*padavinī*," "*sarasīruhā*" may have been altered substantially because it is performed by other artists, unlike "*padavinī*," which is rare. To compete with other performers Raajeswari may have found it necessary to create a modern version which not only incorporates gestures from other performers and from her own tradition but also reflects her own imagination.

3.3.1.4 Variation by adding new *saṅgati*-s

viṇā players in the Karaikkudi school, and performers in general, alter repertoire not only by substituting one *gamaka*, *prayōga*, or *saṅgati* for another within a composition but also by adding or inserting new *saṅgati*-s or items such as *ciṭṭasvara*-s into existing compositions. This section will concern several sources for and functions of *saṅgati*-s and patterns by which new *saṅgati*-s are introduced into old compositions.

Lakshmi Ammal used to teach three *saṅgati*-s for passages generally performed with only two in the Karaikkudi style--an aspect of the "multi-form" model discussed on pp. 110-11. Five versions of one such passage, the first line of the *pallavi* in the *varṇam*, *viribhōṇi*, *bhairavi rāga*, *ādi tāla*, are found in examples 9-13 on tape 8. Each example contains two *saṅgati*-s which differ in their first *laghu* section, marked "A" in the analytical index; in all, three different *saṅgati*-s are represented among all five examples: section A₁ being on all examples, 9-13, A₂, on examples 9,10,12 and A₃, on examples 11,13. All three *saṅgati*-s begin 'n.s.r.' and are followed by '..gsr.' in A₁, by '(p)-ṣ.ṛṅmpḍnsr' [(p)-s indicates a descend-

ing slide from *pa* to *sa*] in *A₂* and by '..pḍṇsrgmp' in *A₃*.

That Meenakshi Ammal plays *A₁* and *A₃*, Sankari plays *A₁* and *A₂*, and Lakshmi Ammal used to teach all three possibilities suggests their father Subbarama Iyer might also have taught or performed them, and although Lakshmi Ammal and her students taught these three *saṅgati*-s, they would only use two in performance--presumably for the purpose of balance. Information is not available as to if and when a third *saṅgati* was introduced to the tradition; *varṇa*-s outside the Karaikkudi tradition are usually performed without *saṅgati*-s.

Lakshmi Ammal used to teach three *saṅgati*-s for the first line of both the *pallavi* and *anupallavi* (which will not be discussed) of the *patam*, "*alaittuvāpōṭi*," *kalyāṇi rāga*, *rūpaka tāḷa*--one of which makes use of a *gamaka* found in a *saṅgati* of a *varṇam* in *kalyāṇi* and another of which illustrates a displacement of metric accent characteristic of Lakshmi Ammal's individual style. Example 23 (28'47") tape 8 contains my performance of "*alaittuvāpōṭi*" as taught by Lakshmi Ammal in 1985 and contains three *saṅgati*-s; example 21 (22'20") performed by Ranganayaki and example 22 (25'34") performed by Sashi each contain two *saṅgati*-s in the *pallavi* and in the *anupallavi*.

The first *saṅgati* of the *pallavi* in all three performances consists of four *āvarta*-s. Each performance conforms to a *svara* structure which is nearly identical:

<i>A₁</i> : //r..s ..sn dpp.//	<i>B₁</i> : //pmg. g.r. r.s.//
<i>C₁</i> : //sns. r.s. g.r.//	<i>D₁</i> : //m.g. gmp. pdn.//

The second *saṅgati*, as taught by Lakshmi Ammal, differs from the first in sections A and B:

$$A_1': \quad // \overline{\text{srgr.g}} \quad \overline{\text{rss.sn}} \text{ dpp.} //$$
$$B_1' : // \overline{\overline{6}} \text{ mpdpmg } \text{g.r. r.s.} //$$

B₁' differs from B₁ by an elaborate *gamaka* replacing 'pm'--a variation which is also found in the second *saṅgati* of the first line of "*vanajākṣi*," a *varṇam* in *kalyāṇi rāga*, *aṭa tāḷa*, which, like "*viribhōṇi*" and "*samininnē*," is rendered with *saṅgati-s* in the Karaikkudi style. This elaborate *gamaka* is executed by placing the left hand index finger just behind the *ma* ("F#") *svarasthāna* and, after plucking the string with a right hand finger, quickly deflecting the string to the *svara* above, (producing the typical *ma* of *kalyāṇi*); then, the left hand middle finger, after striking the string on the *pa svarasthāna*, executes a "sparkling *sphurita*," together producing the *svara* combination 'mpdp'; this is followed by a descending slide combined with a bend on the *ma svarasthāna*, and another descending slide to that of *ga*.

Lakshmi Ammal's version of the last *saṅgati* can best be understood in terms of her general tendency to create tension between dynamic and metric accents. This tension can be perceived by comparing her *saṅgati* (B₃ as performed by Sashi and by the author on tape 8) with B₂, the analogous *saṅgati* performed by Ranganayaki:¹²¹

$$B_2: \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & 6 & \\ & & & \hline // & \overline{\text{mpdnrsn}} & \text{dpmg.r} & & \text{r.s.} // \\ & > & > & > \end{array}$$
$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & 6 & & 6 & 6 \\ B_3: & \frac{}{g. sn. d} & & \frac{}{pmg. g.} & \frac{}{r. r. s.} \\ & > & > & > & > \end{array}$$

¹²¹Unlike other transcriptions, here '>' indicates dynamic accents, but not necessarily plucks.

Whereas Ranganayaki (B₂), by accenting the first beat of three and four *svara* groups (4 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 4), emphasizes the beginning and middle of each *akṣara*, Lakshmi Ammal's version (as played by Sashi and the author, B₃) avoids aligning dynamic, phrase defining accents with the metrical accent implied by the division of *akṣara*-s by dividing the section into five *svara* and four *svara* phrase groups (5 + 5 + 4 + 4). Ranganayaki leaves the last *akṣara* of B₂ identical to that of B₁, embellishes the first two *akṣara*-s with a fast ascending and descending *brikka* passage, and ends the second *akṣara* with the *svara*-s 'g.r', in a different rhythmic configuration from that of the first *saṅgati*. In Lakshmi Ammal's version, the *svara*-s for entire first *saṅgati* are rendered in *tiśra naṭai* (triplets) and condensed into the last two *akṣara*-s, while the first *akṣara* comprises an ascending slide from *ga* to *tāra sa*, a "pull-off" to *nī*, and a right hand finger pluck on *dha* which initiates descending phrases 'dpmg.' 'g.r.' 'r.s.'--a rare example of successfully inserting--not replacing--a *prayōga*, 'g.sn.d', into a *saṅgati*.

I have shown that new *saṅgati*-s may be based upon or draw from the same source as *saṅgati*-s in other compositions and/or may follow from an artist's general approach to performing. New *saṅgati*-s may also extend principles already implied by other *saṅgati*-s within the composition to which they are added. Examples of this principle of extension can be found in two compositions previously examined, "*entavēḍuko*" and "*kanugoṇṭini*." In both the *anupallavi* and analogous portion of the *caraṇam* of both compositions, a *srōtō-vāha yati* is built by the successive interpolation of *svara*-s in the first *drutam* section of each *saṅgati*. I have noted earlier (pp.49,54) that these interpolations are well suited to the *vīṇā* because of the convenient loca-

tion of the pitches on the *pañcama* string. Because Sugantha Sridharan sang "*kanugoṇṭini*" without these interpolations, however, one may conjecture that such interpolations may not be well suited for vocal renditions (recording 1985, not provided).

Extensions of this *yati* idea (incremental interpolations of *svara*-s) are found in performances of Lakshmi Ammal's students, such as her son, N. Chandramouli (tape 7 ex.19), daughter Sashi (ex. 17, 20), and niece Sugantha (ex.16). For example, while both Ranganayaki (tape 7 ex. 14) and Raajeswari (ex. 15) interpolate 'srg' and 'dsrg' between the words "*cintadīrcuṭa*" and "*kentamoḍirā*" in sections indicated by C_1 and C_1' in the analytical index, Sugantha (ex. 16 [taken from the *caranam*]) and Sashi (ex. 17) extend the interpolation idea by inserting 'pdsrg' (C_1)--but by incorporating these changes into the other *saṅgati*-s, not by adding new *saṅgati*-s.

As one might expect, just as the same principle of *saṅgati* construction is found in both "*entavēḍuko*" and "*kanugoṇṭini*," so too is the same principle of extension found in both *kṛiti*-s. For example, in the anupallavi of "*kanugoṇṭini*," whereas Ranganayaki (ex. 18) interpolates only 'gpdś' (B_3)¹²² after the first *drutam* between the words "*inakula mandu*" and "*impugānu-buṭṭi*," N. Chandramouli (ex. 19) inserts 'gpdś' (B_3) and 'rgpdś' (B_4); and Sashi (ex. 20), who inserts an additional 'pdś' (B_2), develops the *srōtōvāha yati* fully:

- interpolations: 1. 0
 2. pdś
 3. gpdś
 4. rgpdś

It should not be inferred from these recorded examples of "*entavēḍuko*"

¹²²However on her commercial recording (tape 4B ex. 3), she also interpolates 'rgpdś'.

and "*kanuḡoṇṭini*" that young performers who learned from Lakshmi Ammal always play these compositions more elaborately than such performers as Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, for sometimes Sashi plays less elaborate and Ranganayaki more elaborate versions; but generally, younger performers, especially disciples of Lakshmi Ammal, extend principles of elaboration and prefer complicated busy textures.

The idea of expanding the two *kṛiti*-s by successively inserting *svara*-s after the first *drutam* of the *anupallavi* might have been introduced by the Karaikkudi brothers themselves, or by their predecessors, for not only musical but also, conceivably, for textual reasons, as Sambasiva Iyer, for one, was given to pondering the meaning of the songs he played.

In "*entavēḍuko*," Chembai Vaidyanatha Bhagvathar developed *saṅgati*-s by singing successively elaborated melismas on the syllable "ā" at the end of "*cintadīrcuṭa kentamoḍirā*"--a phrase meaning "why do you hesitate to relieve my sorrow"¹²³. The Karaikkudi version contains a melisma on the vowel "ā" in the first *saṅgati* only¹²⁴ and successive interpolations of *svara*-s between "*cintadīrcuṭa*" (to relieve my sorrow) and "*kentamoḍirā*" (why do you hesitate). These interpolations of *svara*-s might be considered musical analogues of "hesitation."

In the *caraṇam* the division occurs after "*sattamātramā*" (a name for *rāma*) and before "*cāla nammitini*" ([I] believe very much). Here there seems to be no textual reason for a musical interpolation. If one were able to

¹²³That is, the sorrow and loneliness of the devotee (Tyagaraja) in the absence of his god.

¹²⁴In Raajeswari's version, however, the second *saṅgati* also contains the melisma on the vowel "ā". In this recording I requested her to play each *saṅgati* only once.

establish that the brothers chose to insert *svara*-s in the *anupallavi* in accordance with the meaning of the text, one could claim they included these interpolations in the parallel portion of the *caraṇam* for purely musical reasons.

In "*kanugoṇṭini*," where the interpolations take place between the words "*inakula mandu*" (of the lineage of the sun god), and "*impugānu buṭṭi*" ([he was] born nobly), there is no particular reason why the words should be separated, and in the *caraṇam*, where the break occurs within the word "*sugriva*" (name of the king of the monkey race) between the syllables "*sugri*" and "*va*" the interruption seems unjustifiable. The break would make sense, however, had it occurred after "*sugriva*"; the text of the *caraṇam* up to the name "*sugriva*" had named heroes of the Ramayana who worshipped and served Lord Rama: "his devoted brothers Bharata, Lakshmana, and Satraghuna; Hanuman, kneeling at his feet, and the courageous Sugriva." "*pramukhulu*" (all these great people), the word after "*sugriva*," would logically come after a small pause following the list of "great people."

In short, no persuasive case can be made for elaborating the *saṅgati*-s in the *anupallavi* and in the *caraṇam* of "*entavēḍuko*" and of "*kanugoṇṭini*" according to concern for text, even though Sambasiva Iyer claimed that understanding the words was important. Instead, it is likely that whoever introduced these changes found not only that they were ideal for the *vīṇā*, but also that both *kṛiti*-s are well suited to accommodate this kind of *saṅgati* development because they have such musical features as overall structure, contour, and *tāla* in common.

The "extension of an idea" principle found in the addition of *saṅgati*-s to "*entavēḍuko*" and to "*kanugoṇṭini*" also contributed to their incremental

complexity. In other compositions, such as "viribhōṇi" and "alaittuvāpōṭi," new *saṅgati*-s were introduced by Lakshmi Ammal or by others in teaching, of which only only a few were actuated in each performance. Aspects of *saṅgati*-s found in some compositions performed by certain musicians resemble *saṅgati*-s found in other compositions; such relationships have been demonstrated on a minute level between such compositions as "alaittuvāpōṭi" and "vanajākṣi" and as "ēmiḷṣitē" and "nāmorālakiñci." Now we will look at another such *saṅgati*, which in this case has been actively appropriated from the *anupallavi* of one composition, the Karaikkudi rendition of *śaṅkarābharaṇam varṇam*, "sāmininnē," and added to the *anupallavi* (which is also in *śaṅkarābharaṇam*) of another composition, the *nāvarāgamālikā* ("nine *rāga*") *varṇam*, "valacivacci."

Example 11 (tape 7) is Lakshmi Ammal's rendition of the *anupallavi* to "sāmininnē." Sections C₁, C₁' and B₁' of "sāmininnē" are the Karaikkudi variations she has also added to the *varṇam* "valacivacci." The basic *svara*-s for "sāmininnē" are given by Panchapakesha Iyer (1987, 1):

//s.dd pmdp .mgm pgmr / gmpd dpmp / dnsn s.[r g]¹²⁵//

But Lakshmi Ammal performs two *saṅgati*-s:

1st *saṅgati*

A₁ // s.sd p.m.d pmmg.p mg.pmgmr. /

B₁ / gmpp dpsmp¹²⁶ /

C₁ / pdnsn sndpmgrs // back to A₁

¹²⁵[r g] leads into the next line of text.

¹²⁶'smp.', a variant of 'gmp.', is approached from the open *sa* string instead of from the *ga svarasthāna*.

A_2 // $\overline{\overline{\overline{s s s n d}}}$ $\overline{\overline{\overline{p m p s n}}}$ $\overline{\overline{\overline{d p p m m g m p}}}$ $\overline{\overline{\overline{m g . p m m g r}}}$

B₁' /gmpdn sndpgmp/

C₁' /p̄d̄ns̄.p̄ s̄nd̄p̄m̄gr̄s̄//

```
// s.p. pmgr g.m. p... / gmpd dpmp / dnsn s... //
```

D₁ // s.p. $\frac{3}{\text{pgpmgr}}$ g.gm mp.. /

B₀ / gmpp dpmp /

$$C_0 \quad / \quad \overline{pdnsn} \quad \dot{s} \dots //$$

saṅgati-s such as these, for which the Karaikkudi style is famous, serve an emblematic function in the style, and when added to other compositions, make them in effect "Karaikkudi" compositions--an opinion Lakshmi Ammal intimated on one occasion, when a neighbor expressed surprise on hearing her add *saṅgati-s* to "*valacivacci*." Other examples of such emblematic functions may perhaps be found in Lakshmi Ammal's use of the *viśeṣa prayōga* 'mrmrmp' in "*sarasīruhā*" (p. 144) and the elaborate *gamaka* from the Karaik-

kudi version of "vanajākṣi" in "alaittuvāpōṭi" (p. 156).

Many of the new *saṅgati*-s examined seem to have been based on either models inside or outside the tradition, or on basic principles of development, characteristic of either an artist or the *saṅgati*-s inside a composition. *saṅgati*-s to the *kṛiti* "eduṭānilacitē" which do not seem to have been played in earlier times, are now being played by such artists as Raajeswari Padmanabhan (ex.29 and 30), K. S. Subramanian (ex. 29) Sugantha (ex. 31) and sung by Shanti, Sugantha, and Lakshmi Ammal (ex. 27), and may have been based on a general *saṅgati* idea exploited by other musicians such as Chembai Vaidyanatha Bhagvathar (ex. 33) and V. Ramachandran (ex. 34). I suggest this *saṅgati*-idea has come into the Karaikkudi tradition recently because no such *saṅgati* is found on recordings of Ranganayaki (tape 8, ex. 25) Veda-valli Srinivasan [daughter of Devakottai Narayana Iyengar](ex. 32), Sankari Ammal (ex. 28) or old recordings of Ranganayaki and Raajeswari with Sambasiva Iyer (ex. 24). This "idea" can be described as a descending series of cascading *svara*-s and is found at the end of the *pallavi* of "eduṭānilacitē" (sections "F" and "G") in examples 27, 28 and 29:

6
D: //srgr.g rss..n dn.. s..n

E: srgm pdns rsnd pmdp/

F₄: /grs. s... mgrs ndgr/
 . ..

G₃: /sndp rsnd pmgm pgmr/

This cascading sequence of six *svara*-s each seems to be a particular version of a general idea that Chembai interprets in five *svara*-long sequences,

—
D: //srmgm rss. n... srgm

E: pdns rgmg rsnd pmdp/
 F: /grs. gmpd/
 G: /ngrs ndrs ndpn dpmg//

and V. Ramachandran interprets:

D: //m.g. r.s. d.n. s...
 E: srgm pdns rsnd pmdp/
 F: /grs. grsn dprs/
 G: /ndpm sndp mgpm gm.r//

which is similar to the Karaikkudi version in terms of melody, but bears a relationship to the *tāla* that is different from that of the Karaikkudi version. Rangaramanuja Ayyangar (1976, 279) gives still another version, with the sequences beginning on *tāra ga* and containing 5 *svara*-s each.

Although we know neither how Sambasiva Iyer played "*eduṭānilacitē*" with his brother, nor how his brother played it alone, we can be relatively certain Sambasiva Iyer did not use this *saṅgati* idea in his performances after 1940, because Ranganayaki does not perform or teach it and because the 1950's recording of Sambasiva Iyer, Ranganayaki, and Raajeswari does not contain it. One might infer from these observations that a basic idea for a *saṅgati*, of unknown origin, has circulated among musicians of different styles and that the acceptance of this *saṅgati* idea into various schools indicates that the idea itself is both well appreciated and pan-traditional, and has a pattern of acceptance in the Karaikkudi school limited to Lakshmi Ammal, her children, and grandchild. The inclusion of this *saṅgati* might be seen in light of Lakshmi Ammal's tendency to play more *saṅgati*-s, and for

those *saṅgati*-s to be more ornate than in performances of other Karaikkudi musicians such as Ranganayaki Rajagopalan.

As an example of rather extensive deviation from this *pāṭhāntara*, a rendition by the late T. R. Mahalingam is provided (ex. 35) in which not only is this *saṅgati* absent, but so also is the tail end of many of the "traditional" *saṅgati*-s absent or merely hinted at with typical "Mali" (as he is known) flourishes.

Unlike the *saṅgati*-s so far considered, some *saṅgati*-s may be neither borrowed nor typified by any general principle, but newly composed for a particular composition. Two such *saṅgati*-s are associated with Lakshmi Ammal and appear in the compositions "*sarasasāmadāna*" (tape 8 ex. 8) and "*sarasīruhā*" (ex. 7).

Example 8, an excerpt from the *caranam* of "*sarasasāmadāna*" performed by Lakshmi Ammal in the late 1970's, contains several *saṅgati*-s that differ from those played by performers such as Ranganayaki, of which one is particularly unique (C:7'57") in that it reaches *tāra ma*, comprises two cycles of the *tāla* and two renditions of the textural line, and is not repeated:

```
// .... ..dn srm. ..gmg / .rs. ..dnd / .pm. ..mg //
      na tasa   hō      da   ru      nī   rā

//rsrm pdnn .nn. n.n. / dsns.d ..pdp / pmm.p ..pd //
jē si rākanatasa hō   da   ru   nī   rā jē si

// n..s ..
   rā ka
```

(Rough translation: "You made [Ravana's] younger brother King [of Lanka]")¹²⁷

¹²⁷By making the younger brother of his foe Ravana, the king of Lanka (in the epic *Rāmāyana*) Rāma succeeded in making his enemies quarrel among themselves; this exhibits the quality called *bhēda*, one of four qualities discussed in this composition.

Like other *saṅgati*-s in this composition, this new *saṅgati* begins after 1½ *akṣara*-s, but in the second cycle of the *tāla*, the repetition of the line is delayed by one *akṣarakāla*--providing a rhythmic twist characteristic of Lakshmi Ammal's innovations. The second half of the *saṅgati* is patterned after earlier *saṅgati*-s in the composition, differing only in the syllable added to make up for the lost *akṣarakāla*. Among the performers represented in the taped examples of other compositions, Sugantha, Mallika, Sashi, Raajeswari, Sheela, Shanti, and Sharmilla all know this *saṅgati* and had regular contact with Lakshmi Ammal from at least as early as when the recording (ex. 8) was made until she died in 1985 (most of them had much longer contact with her), but I have not been able to determine when it was composed.

Another *saṅgati* composed by Lakshmi Ammal is found in the *anupallavi* of "*sarasīruhā*," on tape 8 ex. 7, and performed by her student S. Sharmilla:

// ..p. m.p. ..g. mp.. /..smr. rpm.mnp. / psn.rs npsn // pm
 śa raṇā ga tam mā ma vamañjulācaranaki sala

Unlike the *saṅgati* in "*sarasasāmadāna*," which must have been carefully composed and played on repeated occasions, this *saṅgati* is an example of the kind Lakshmi Ammal would improvise while teaching and is only played by a few of her students. On the day I learned it, Lakshmi Ammal was in a particularly creative mood and taught me several other *saṅgati*-s not usually found in this *kṛitī*; the next day, however, she did not recall precisely what she had taught me. I later realized that, by presenting me with a number of possible *saṅgati*-s she was tacitly providing a "model" for *niraval svara*. Lakshmi Ammal, who seldom taught either *kalpana svara* or *niraval svara* and, after her son died in the 1950's, no longer performed, would seem to have found her creative outlet not in the performance of these improvisa-

tional forms which are traditionally placed at the end of compositions, but in her renditions of the compositions themselves.

Summary

This section has been given to analysis of *saṅgati-s*, both added to and inserted into compositions, with several kinds of sources and functions:

1. *saṅgati-s* borrowed from other compositions.
2. *saṅgati-s* based on a general idea (i.e. cascading svara sets).
3. *saṅgati-s* borrowed from other performers.
4. *saṅgati-s* which seem to serve as emblems of style.
5. *saṅgati-s* which extend principles of elaboration implied by other *saṅgati-s* and contribute to the overall architecture of *saṅgati-s* in a composition.
6. *saṅgati-s* invented independently which are:
 - A. fixed and performed by several musicians, or
 - B. improvised, and possibly fixed in some renderings.

Different preferences for and modes of rendering *saṅgati-s* tend to occur in patterns according to different branches of the Karaikkudi style, which can be broadly characterized through the personal styles of Lakshmi Ammal and Ranganayaki Rajagopalan:

L.A.

Ranganayaki

Rhythm

displacement

regularity (in relation to akshara)

gamaka-s/oscillations

fast

slow

many

few

complicated

simple

Stability

a little different each time

almost exactly the same each time

Number of sangati-s

more taught

fewer taught

Origin of *sangati*-s

improvised
composed
other compositions
other performers

usually as taught; in cases where
song was learned in a simple form
she will develop her own *sangati*-s
All compositions learned from
Sambasiva Iyer are left virtually
unchanged.

3.3.1.5 Other insertions

Although in most cases musicians modify compositions by adding new *saṅgati*-s, they also do so by inserting such items as *ciṭṭasvara*-s and *rāga ālāpana*-like passages which fill gaps between sections of compositions (eg. *pallavi* and *anupallavi*). While the tendency to add *ciṭṭasvara*-s seems to be associated with the Karaikkudi and other styles in particular, the tendency to insert *rāga ālāpana*-like passages between sections of compositions is associated with most modern-day musicians performing *karnāṭaka saṅgīta*.

Lakshmi Ammal, who was not in the mainstream of modern-day performers, did not adopt the modern practice of adding long filler phrases between sections of compositions, but maintained her father and uncle's practices of composing and inserting new *ciṭṭasvara*-s into compositions--a practice Ranganayaki does not follow. Lakshmi Ammal composed two *ciṭṭasvara*-s, one of which is found in "*vanajāsana*," *śrī rāga*, *rūpaka tāḷa* (tape 8 ex. 5) and the other is found in "*vātāpi gaṇapatim*," *hamsadhvani rāga*, *ādi tāḷa* (ex. 6). The *ciṭṭasvara* in *śrī*, although simple, is unusual in that it is performed in two speeds.

Lakshmi Ammal may have chosen to add *ciṭṭasvara*-s to these two compositions in particular because the first, "*vanajāsana*," is traditionally the first *kṛiti* (strictly speaking--a *kīrtana*) taught to beginning students of the Karaikkudi style according to the practice of her father, and the

second, "vātāpi," is probably the most popular composition in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* today; by adding to these songs she may have ensured the longevity of her innovations, and, as two important items in a student's repertoire, marked them as "Karaikkudi" compositions.

In general, fewer and fewer Karaikkudi musicians have attempted to compose *ciṭṭasvara*-s, a result, in part, of the popular prejudice against the *vīṇā*, which is seen to be both an inadequate means to represent the human voice and to lack "continuity." Thus, for instrumentalists to perform many new *ciṭṭasvara*-s, which are perceived as instrumental items since they emphasize rhythm and lack text, is to invite disapproval. Ranganayaki's disinterest in composing *ciṭṭasvara*-s may be a result not only of a general disinclination toward composing, but also, as a professional performer, a consideration for what her audience will tolerate. Unlike Ranganayaki, Lakshmi Ammal did not have to consider the norms of popular performance and in the small city of Madurai she was, as a teacher and carrier of a famous *pāṇi*, one of the major figures.

Whereas musicians' inclinations toward composing *ciṭṭasvara*-s are, in part, a function of the style to which they belong, the practices of adding brief passages of *rāga ālāpāna* between *saṅgati*-s or between sections of compositions is a function of modern versus old fashioned practice--at least in the Karaikkudi style. Examples of fillers between *saṅgati*-s are indicated by the letter "f" in the analytical index (see, for example, "*kanu-ḡoṇṭini*"). That fillers between sections used to be non-existent or very brief is suggested by Subramanian and by the recording of the *kṛiti* "*śaṅkarinī*" performed by Sambasiva Iyer about which Subramanian writes, "Between sections Iyer holds onto the note where the next section is to begin.

This is a typically instrumental approach. This is absent in my performance" (Subramanian 1986, 194)--meaning that Sambasiva Iyer, instead of playing extensive filler phrases, concludes each section with a repetition of the first line of the *pallavi* (as is usually done), holds his finger on *pa* and strums the strings while the *mṛidaṅgam* player bridges the section with a *mōhara* (rhythmic cadence). Unlike her guru Sambasiva Iyer, Raajeswari plays particularly ornate filler passages, as do most performing vocal or instrumental artists of today. Ranganayaki plays comparatively short filler phrases, which are often those of her *guru*, although Ranganayaki too has followed the contemporary practice of extending these phrases. Lakshmi Ammal, who did not perform, kept her filler phrases brief.

Generally, degree of conservatism and whether or not a musician is a professional performer tends to regulate the composition of such musical additions as *ciṭṭasvara-s* and the inclusion of various filler phrases to a greater extent than does a musician's style, even though particular *ciṭṭasvara-s* and filler phrases may be typically associated with a particular style such as the Karaikkudi style.

3.3.1.6 Summary

The subject of this unit, 3.3.1, has been recent changes in the performance of composed music, *kalpita saṅgīta*, that has resulted from substitution and/or addition of constituent musical units such as *gamaka-s*, *prayōga-s*, and *saṅgati-s*, and of external items such as *ciṭṭasvara-s* and filler phrases. The specific qualities of these replacements and additions and the way they are used reflect the values and creative tendencies of the the musicians who introduced them.

Ranganayaki, for example, alters only compositions learned from artists

she does not consider to be of a "*nalla valī*" ("good style"), and what she adds conforms to her personal style, which includes such aspects as crisp, slow *gamaka*-s and dynamic accents that correspond with *akṣara* divisions. Raajeswari has "developed" quite a bit of the repertoire taught to her by Sambasiva Iyer by adding and changing *saṅgati*-s and by altering the overall rhythmic flow; compared to Ranganayaki's, her alterations are generally faster, busier, and they incorporate gestures from written and aural contemporary sources. Lakshmi Ammal, unlike Sambasiva Iyer and Ranganayaki, used to play compositions differently each time, inventing new *saṅgati*-s while performing. Her innovations were characterized by such features as rhythmic complexity and quick *gamaka*-s.

Some changes reflect current trends in field of *karṇāṭaka saṅgīta* including the inclusion of popular *saṅgati*-s and the use of extensive filler passages. Conversely, some current trends are taken from specific styles, such as the use of Karaikkudi *ciṭṭasvara*-s in compositions other than those for which they were composed and by musicians outside of the Karaikkudi school.

The role of the Karaikkudi style in the way each artist innovates is one of providing models and tools, but not one of prescription. Different musicians have considered different aspects of the repertoire in the Karaikkudi style to be immutable. Ranganayaki, who will not change "old" compositions, might cease to play or teach those that are not appreciated, while Raajeswari might either omit or alter compositions for acceptance in present day *karṇāṭaka saṅgīta*. Lakshmi Ammal, who might invent new *saṅgati*-s, felt the compositions themselves should continue to be played and taught.

Just as the attitudes toward changing and maintaining repertoire are

different among performers in the Karaikkudi style, so too are their innovations. This variety has led to a wide range of performance possibilities for compositions in the style--possibilities that not all performers in the style agree to accept.

3.3.2 *manodharma saṅgīta*

Musicians innovate both in the realm of *kalpita saṅgīta*, or composed music, and in that of improvised music, or *manodharma saṅgīta*. But unlike compositions, which have relatively fixed forms that can be compared in well defined units both historically and synchronically, passages of improvisation in such forms as *rāga ālāpāna*, *tānam*, and *svara kalpana*, cannot be compared in well defined units. Improvisation can be analyzed, however, in relationship to composed or frequently played material which may serve as models of, or for, improvisation.¹²⁸ The topics of this section will be the use of such models, changes which have been introduced into the structure of improvisation, and characteristic patterns by which some Karaikkudi *viṇā* players improvise.

I will begin by identifying phrases which are characteristic to Lakshmi Ammal's renditions of the *rāga-s bhairavi*, *kalyāṇi*, and *kāmbhōji*. Then, I will analyze these phrases as they appear in the performances of her students.¹²⁹

3.3.2.1 Extension and embellishment of phrase ideas

Toward the end of my first year of training (May 1983), Lakshmi Ammal

¹²⁸See Geertz (1973, 93) for a discussion of "models of" and "models for" in cultural symbolic systems in general.

¹²⁹see T. Viswanathan (1977, 51) for a similar analysis of performances by students of Ariyakkudi Ramanuja Ayyangar, Semmangudi Srinivasa Ayyar, and G. N. Balasubramanian.

began to teach me *rāga ālāpana*--one of several improvisational forms that is, in fact, sometimes taught. The short, semi-fixed *ālāpana*-s and *tāna*-s in *rāga*-s she taught me included the basic phrases and ideas on which she would base her improvisations, and these still run through my mind when I sing, play, or think about these *rāga*-s.

I came across such phrases and ideas when, in 1987, I was in Madras listening to a tape of a concert performed by Raajeswari Padmanabhan at Kalakshetra. This recollection prompted me to play these passages for Lakshmi Ammal's niece Sugantha, who confirmed my suspicion that Lakshmi Ammal often used to play such phrases--phrases which were not, to my knowledge, commonly played by other musicians. After returning to the U. S. and listening to recordings I had made while learning *bhairavi rāga* with Lakshmi Ammal, I noticed that Lakshmi Ammal and I played in unison the phrases I had heard on Raajeswari's tape--phrases which also appear on a tape recorded in 1972 by her student David Buck, (tape 9 ex. 1):¹³⁰

1		2		3		4
	{ss}				{ss}	
p-s	ss	srs	rsnd.	\ n.	srgrg	sr.
>	>>	>	>	>	>	>
				(p r)	rgrr-p	\ nsr
				>	>	>
						gmgrs
						\ >>
						>

The first phrase commences with a "sparkling *sphurita*" on 'srs' followed by a "hammer-on" to *ri*, which initiates a descending *prayōga*, 'rsnd' [containing *kaiṣiki niṣāda* ("Bb") and *catuṣruti-dhaivata* ("A") because it is

¹³⁰In this transcription, "-" between two *svara*-s indicates a slide (*jāru*) from the *svara* preceding the "-" to that following it. As in other transcriptions, ">" signifies a right hand finger pluck. "." signifies a pause of indefinite length. "(xyz)" means *svara*-s "xyz" are not essential to a phrase [often represents strokes of auxiliary strings]. {ss} above *svara*-s indicates they are rendered with the "sparkling *sphurita*" technique. "\" indicates phrase divisions.

followed by an ascending phrase]. Phrase two begins with a *kampita gamaka* (oscillation, in this case between *ni* and *tāra sa*) on *ni*, and is followed by a "hammer-on" the *ri svarasthāna* with the middle finger of the left hand, an oscillation between *ri* and *ga*, and a right hand finger pluck coupled with a left hand middle finger "hammer-on" from *sa* to *ri*.

The third phrase is preceded by a plucking of the open *pañcama* string and a reiteration of *ri* which is parenthesized in the transcription because, although it performs a filling and punctuating function, it is not not always included. The main part of the phrase is a "sparkling *sphurita*" on *ri* followed by a descending slide to *pa*.

The *ni* at the beginning of the fourth phrase is played as a deflection of the string on the *dha svarasthāna* reaching *tāra sa* and is followed by an articulation of *tāra sa* on its own fret, fingered with the left hand index finger. *tāra ri* is then sounded with a "hammer-on" by the left hand middle finger and leads into a *gamaka* for the *svara-s* 'gmgr', which contains four quicks oscillations and comprises, in detail, 'grmrgrgr'. The set of phrases ends with a "pull-off" to *tāra sa*.

The recording of Raajeswari on which similar phrases appear is from a concert at Kalakshetra sometime in the middle 1980s at which I was not present. I have arranged the recordings on tape 9 so that the "Lakshmi Ammal motives" can be heard both in the context of the entire *ālāpāna* (at 4'22", 5'22", 6'18", 7'43", and 9'13") and, extracted and juxtaposed with Lakshmi Ammal's performance (ex.s 3-8). Raajeswari's versions of motives (i.e small constituents of the units I have labeled "phrases") that I associate with her mother are rather elaborate and sometimes contain only a

shade of the "original" motive:¹³¹

{x}=x played on tala strings

	(a)	(b)	(c)
ex.4:	p-s ssss ss rsnd n. \	rs-ndp n. \	nsrmrsndp n. \
	> >> > > >	> > >	>> > > >

	{ss}	{ss}
ex.5:	nsrgrrss srsrgrrss srsrsnd n.\	
	>> > > > >	

	(a)	(b)
		{ss}
ex.6:	p-s ssss ssrsnd n. \	nsrgrrss rgrg sr. \
	> >> > > >	>> > >

(c)

{p}	r	{p}	r	p	r	p	r	p	dns	rgmpdnsrgmpdnsr	rgr	rs	\
>		>>>>>>>>		>	>	>	>	>					

(d)

{s}	r	gmgrs	{s}	\
-----	---	-------	-----	---

	(a)	(b)
ex.7:	p-s ss srs rsnd n. \	{s} rsn.s rgrg sr. \
	> > > > >	> >> >

(c)

{p}	r	{p}	r	{p}	r	r	{p}	r	p	r	p	r	gmpdnsrgmpdnsr	rgr	rs	\
>		>		>>		>>>>>		>	>			>	>			

(d)

{s}	smrn	srs	r	rm.rm.rmr	rmr	rmr	rmr
>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	

¹³¹I have neither conferred with Raajeswari on my analysis, nor would I expect her to agree with all parts of it. All connections I draw between her playing and that of her mother are based solely on my observation and experience.

(a) {ss} {ss}

ex.8: p-s ss rgrss srsrgrss srs rsnd n. \

> >> > > > >

(b)

{s} ns gr.n. srs r rmr.rmrmmrmrm. pdpmpmgr rs \

> > > >> > > >> > >

Each example contains all or some of Lakshmi Ammal's phrases expanded by repetition, insertion of punctuating *svara*-s in different octaves, or insertion of scalar sweeps. Raajeswari uses versions of phrase #1 in examples 4,6,7, and 8, in which, except for ex.8, she uses a "hammer-on" rather than a right hand finger pluck to reiterate *tāra sa*, and repeats *sa* more times than does Lakshmi Ammal. The technique of hammering on a reiterated note without a pluck and without using a different finger (Raajeswari uses her middle finger for both iterations) is less common in the Karaikkudi style than is plucking the string twice and while executing the "hammer-on" (the ordinary *sphurita* technique) as found on the recording of Lakshmi Ammal.

In ex.4a Raajeswari uses not the "sparkling *sphurita*" but the technique described above to repeat 'ss' and delay the descent from *tāra ri*, which then leads without a break into a *kampita gamaka* on *ni* (unlike in Lakshmi Ammal's version which pauses on *dha*)--longer and containing more oscillations than that of Lakshmi Ammal. The remainder of example four takes 4a as a point of departure for further development, beginning with a descent from *tāra ri* to *pa* followed by *ni* rendered with a *kampita*, and ending with a passage an octave lower containing an ascent from *mandra ni* to *ma*, a descent to *mandra pa* and a final *kampita* on *mandra ni*.

Ex. 5 seems to be an extension of phrase 2 'n. srgrg sr.' through the

insertion of "sparkling *sphurita*-s," left hand finger plucks, and "hammer-ons," which leads into the end of phrase 1 'srs rsnd n.' ending, once again, on *ni* rendered with a *kampita*.

Ex.6, which contains an "a" phrase identical to that of example 4, contains a "b" phrase which is phrase 2 of Lakshmi Ammal's performance with an insertion of (all in the *tāra sthāyi*) the "sparkling *sphurita*," 'rgrr', combined with 'rss' executed by a left hand middle finger "pull-off" from *ri* to *sa* followed by a "hammer-on" to reiterate *sa*.¹³² The third phrase of Lakshmi Ammal's performance contains, in essence, a descent from *tāra ri* to *madhya pa*--a descent that expanded in Raajeswari's performance (phrase "c") by descending through all the *pa*-s and *ri*-s on the *viṇā* to the lowest *svara* the instrument will produce (p). This descent is followed by an accelerating ascent, culminating in the *tāra sthāyi* with "rgr rs" and elaborated in phrase "d," 'r gmgrs'.

Ex. 7, in which phrase "a" is nearly identical to phrase one of Lakshmi Ammal's performance and phrase "b," is like Lakshmi Ammal's phrase 2 except for the initial insertion of 'rs' and a shorter *gamaka* on *ni*; it contains a third phrase ("c") which, like ex. 6c, elaborates Lakshmi Ammal's descent from *tāra ri* to *pa*. Phrase 7d differs from 6d in that it ends with an open-ended ascent, and, with the rather extensive *kampita gamaka*-s on *tāra ga* (notated explicitly as motion between *ri* and *ma*), provides a balance against the *kampita* on *ni* in phrase 7b.

Phrase "a" example 8 contains, in effect, example 5 grafted on to the first part of Lakshmi Ammal's first phrase. Phrase "b" is functionally the same as phrase "d" of example 7 and leads into the classic *bhairavi prayōga*

¹³²This *gamaka* is sometimes called a *ravai*.

'pdpmpmgr rs'.

Raajeswari's performance of examples 4-8 suggest her improvisations are based not only on those of her *guru*, Sambasiva Iyer, but also on models she was exposed to indirectly, from her mother, throughout her lifetime--models (but not necessarily fixed ones) she has drawn out and expanded by substituting, adding, rearranging, and inserting musical units just as musicians have transformed "old" compositions in the last three decades, and for that matter, just as people innovate in general (Barnett 1953, 181-225).¹³³

Raajeswari, like other mature artists, not only can, but is expected to base her innovations on models other than that of her *guru*--a practice which may be detrimental only if borrowed models conflict with one's style, or as Subramanian explains in reference to "ornamentation" (*gamaka*), "one kind of ornamentation could be totally irrelevant in a particular context to a particular style" (1986, 159). Raajeswari, who draws upon sources more eclectic than those of Ranganayaki, has diverged from the improvisations of Sambasiva Iyer more than has Ranganayaki. In addition, Raajeswari spent a period of years learning vocal music with Mysore Vasudevachariar--a famous composer, whose music and style, which has had some impact on that of Raajeswari, will not be discussed in this thesis.

Because Raajeswari stretches the phrases of *ālāpāna* found in her mother's performance, it would be difficult to extract them without having heard these phrases performed by Lakshmi Ammal. Raajeswari, too, probably has favorite phrases which can be played in plain or elaborate versions, but unless her students hear them in simple forms they may have difficulty

¹³³Barnett divides these "Basic Processes" into "configurations," "recombination," "identification," "substitution," "discrimination," and "gain and loss."

building upon them as Raajeswari seems to have built upon those of her mother. Tracing such processes of transmission may prove interesting as various models are reinterpreted by third and fourth generation students.

Unlike Raajeswari's highly developed versions of her mother's motives in *rāga ālāpana*, performances of Lakshmi Ammal's less advanced students contain less developed versions of such motives and/or of Lakshmi Ammal's general approaches to *rāga ālāpana*. Recordings of these students playing *ālāpana*-s in *kalyāṇi rāga*, unlike those of Raajeswari playing *bhairavi*, were made privately. The recording of Sashikala was made in 1972 when she was in her late teens or early 20's and still living at home. Because Sashikala made this recording for David Buck (a student of her mother's) she may have tried to include parts of Lakshmi Ammal's "fixed" versions of *rāga ālāpana* since he would have learned these from Lakshmi Ammal. The recordings of both Sheela and Mallika, who knew their performances were being recorded for comparison, were made in 1988 and may contain gestures purposely included to sound like Lakshmi Ammal (although I neither directed them to do so or to refrain from doing so). Because Sheela, who is now 16 (in 1989), learned *kalyāṇi rāga ālāpana* from Lakshmi Ammal on the night of Lakshmi Ammal's death in 1985, her renditions of *kalyāṇi* are particularly charged with emotion and adhere to the manner she was taught that night. Mallika's performance seems to contain *prayōga*-s typical of both Lakshmi Ammal and of Ranganayaki--from whom she now learns.

Lakshmi's students Sashikala Suryanarayana (ex. 10), R. Sheela (ex. 11) and S. Mallika (ex. 12), clearly preserve the general contour and opening phrases characteristic of Lakshmi Ammal's *ālāpana*-s in *kalyāṇi rāga*, of which example nine is typical:

ex. 9 r (s) rg..mp. pmg g... r (spr) p-gr gr rss s.n
 > > > > > > >

 ndndnndndnndd dnsrg. srsrg rr..
 > > > > > >>

Lakshmi Ammal characteristically began *kalyāṇi* with an ascent from *ri* to *pa*, followed by a descent from *pa* to *ga*, which was rendered as a *dirgha svara* (long), and a cadence with 'grgr rss' performed on the *pañcama* string and approached with an ascending slide from *mandra pa*. Each student of Lakshmi Ammal in examples 10-12 begins her performance of *kalyāṇi* in this manner.¹³⁴

Sheela's performance (ex. 11) contains *gamaka*-s executed on the *mandra dha svarasthāna* which are modeled after but slightly less elaborate than Lakshmi Ammal's characteristic *gamaka*, 'ndndnndndnndd' found in example 9. Mallika's version of this *gamaka* resembles, in its tempo and in the pauses that precede and follow it, Lakshmi Ammal's version, and in its simplicity, her current teacher Ranganayaki's version, 'ndnndn.d'.¹³⁵

The *svara*-s 'rr..' in the phrase 'dnsrg srsrg rr..', also characteristic of Lakshmi Ammal's *kalyāṇi*, are rendered with *gamaka*-s on the *ri svarasthāna* and are approached from *ga* through a deflection of the string--the phrase is found on ex. 10 (Sashi) as well as on example 9 (Lakshmi Ammal). Unlike Lakshmi Ammal, Ranganayaki would end this phrase with the *svara ga*, rendered plainly on its own *svrasthāna*.

¹³⁴Mallika does not approach 'grgr rss' from *pa*--a minor difference that may have come about either from contact with other musicians at the Sathguru Sangeetha Vidyalayam in Madurai where she teaches, or from Ranganayaki, from whom she now learns.

¹³⁵An example of Ranganayaki's *ālāpāna* in *kalyāṇi* is found on tape 10 side B.

Like her approaches to *ālāpana* in the *rāga-s bhairavi* and *kalyāṇi*, Lakshmi Ammal's approach to *kāmbhōji* was consistent and contained specific characteristic gestures which can be found in performances of her students. Unlike the scanty recorded examples of Lakshmi Ammal's expositions of *bhairavi* and *kalyāṇi*, three recordings of Lakshmi Ammal playing *kāmbhōji* (ex.s 13-15) and one recording of her singing (ex. 21) all contain the same opening motives and are found in performances of her students Sashi (ex. 16) and Mallika (ex. 17)--several of these recordings, however, were truncated due to technical problems. Excerpts from examples 13-17 appear in examples 19-20 to provide juxtaposed versions of the following phrases rendered by all three performers:

1

2

s-p pmgm p pd.. s s \ p ds. s.nnd. d.p pmg mgr...s \

3

sr dp pmg mgr... srg [followed by various phrases to sa]

These sequences of phrases, which frame sections of melodic elaboration in each octave, contain gestures typical of the Karaikkudi style and typical of Lakshmi Ammal's personal approach. The opening phrase 's-p pmgm' rendered with a *ravai*, a *gamaka* in which the "left [hand] finger slide is coupled with a left finger pluck and a 'drop'" and which Subramanian claims "is one of the important characteristics of the Karaikkudi school" (1986, 96), and more specific to Lakshmi Ammal's personal style are the *svara-s* 's.nnd' in phrase 2, which are rendered with a "sustained from above" *gamaka* on the *dha svarasthāna*--a type of *gamaka*, as describe earlier, characteristic of Lakshmi Ammal's and her sisters' playing.

Sashikala's performance in example 16 (excerpted in ex. 19) incor-

porates these phrases almost exactly--a result, in part, of the recording situation, in which, because her mother was present, Sashi may have refrained from departing from her mother's method, and because the recording was for Paul Butler, her mother's student, Sashi may have attempted to imitate her mother's "model" *ālāpana*. But even if Sashi was imitating her mother, her performance reflects such expansion techniques as substitution in which the *svara*-s 'd.p.' in 'sr. d.p. pmg mgr...' are replaced with a *gamaka* comprising 'd..(s)dp' [*tāra sa* is barely touched]--not only a typical kind of substitution in general, but also one found commonly in Sashi's performances. Mallika's performance was recorded under the same conditions as that of *kalyāṇi*, and strongly reflects the style of Lakshmi Ammal in both content and rendition.

Lakshmi Ammal's typical phrases in the performance of *rāga ālāpana* in *bhairavi*, *kalyāṇi*, and *kāmbhōji* contain gestures typical of her personal style in rendition, and emblematic of her style as flexible "compositions" or "models." These models are transformed in the performances of Lakshmi Ammal's students to produce, as it were, an image of Lakshmi Ammal as viewed through the personal styles of these students.

3.3.2.2 Fixed patterns

Characteristic but variable phrases of one's teacher are only one of many models on which performers build their improvisations. Other models are such fixed forms as compositions and basic exercises--which are not only models for improvisation but also models of improvisation, i.e. crystalized forms of a flexible performance tradition. The improvisations of each generation are constructed from building blocks of fixed patterns ingrained through explicit training and active listening.

I was first exposed to the idea of structuring an improvisation on the pattern of a *kṛiti*, for example, when Lakshmi Ammal, while teaching me the rather rare composition in *kāmbhōji rāga*, "*jananī*," demonstrated how the *svara* phrases of this *kṛiti* could be rendered as an *ālāpana*. Musicians in south India generally cite compositions to justify the use of particular *prayōga*-s in improvisation.

Such fixed patterns can be detected in phrases from *kalyāṇi* which, although not necessarily derived from, resemble those in the *kṛiti* "*ētāvunarā*". Lakshmi Ammal's phrase, which began on *ri*, ascended to *pa*, descended to *ga* (rendered as a *dīrgha svara*) and ended with the cadential phrase 'p-g rgr rss', follows the same pattern as the opening phrase of "*ētāvunarā*":

/ g..m p.pm g... g.r. r.g. rss. /

One need not establish a chain of influence from this composition to the performance by Lakshmi Ammal--both draw from the same tradition, and share features with still other compositions and other performers' improvisations. Some artists will deliberately use a phrase from a particular composition for its referential value.¹³⁶

The close connection between improvisation and fixed patterns drawn from compositions and exercises is present in all forms of improvisation. For example, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Sambasiva Iyer performed a *kalpana svara* at the end of the *kṛiti* "*sarasīruhā*" (tape 9B ex. 1, recorded in late 1950's) which resembles famous *svara* passages in the *pañcaratna kirtana* "*jagadānandakā*" in *nāṭa rāga* (ex. 2 and 3), and uses gestures from "*jaṇṭa*

¹³⁶T. R. Subramanian, in Madurai July 13 1985, sang a *rāgamalikā* that contained the *rāga pūrvikalyāṇi* and the word "*mīṇākṣi*"--when the word and *rāga* came together he cleverly chose to sing the opening phrase of the "*mīṇākṣi mēmudam*," a *kṛiti* in *pūrvikalyāṇi rāga*.

variṣai" in which ascending *svara*-s are repeated using the *sphurita* technique. Examples 1, 2, and 3 present the *kalpana svara* and the composed *svara*-s in their entirety and examples 4-8 are excerpts from the *svara* passages, isolated for comparison and analysis below.

ex. 4 (2'41"-2'58"): [from *kalpana svara*, ex. 1]

[// /...]s .npm // r..s .npm r..n .pmp / r..p .mr. / .pmr ..pm
 // r.p.m r.np mr.s nmpm /.rsn p.mr. / mr.p m.np //.sn. rs.s
 rggm mgsn / s [... ..// //]

ex. 5 (3'04"-3'15"): [from "*jagadānandakā*", ex. 3]

[//....] pm / g.mp nppg / mp.m g.p.m
 // r.np mr.s nmpm .rs. / ps.s p. [.../....//]

Examples 4 and 5 share a *srōtōvāha yati* based on the pattern 'pmr.', which, in the *svara kalpana*, is longer and imbedded in a larger pattern that begins with a *gopucca yati* (phrase of diminishing magnitude).

ex.6 (3'18"-3'24"): [from *kalpana svara*]

[//.... ...] s nmpm .npm / rs.p .s.s / nmpm rs.r // gmp. m.p.
 sa rasi

ex.7 (3'28"-3'35"): [from "*jagadānandakā*"]

[//....] mr.p mrrs / pp.s s.np / mrrs .rgm // p.p. p.np
 jaga da

Examples 6 and 7 share a cadential phrase which leads back to the "refrain," beginning on *pa*. A musician generally draws from a stock of such concluding phrases which both fit well with a particular *rāga* and lead smoothly to a particular *svara*--which in this case is *pa* and is shared by the two compositions. While one might say examples 6 and 7 share a "gram-

mathematical" model, example 8 reflects a technical model, *jaṇṭa variṣai*, by containing the ascending *jaṇṭa* phrase 'gg mm pp nn'.

While certain fixed forms in found Karaikkudi improvisations are common to *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* as a whole, not all types of fixed forms used by musicians in other styles are used by musicians in either the Karaikkudi style or in other old, conservative styles. Such forms include *mṛidaṅgam jati-s* or rhythmic patterns used by players of percussion instruments such as the *mṛidaṅgam*. Although Iyer, and for the most part Ranganayaki, Raajeswari, and the rest of the Karaikkudi school play *svara kalpana* in *sarva laghu*, or a steady stream of *akṣarakāla-s*, rather than extensive patterns of *kōrvai-s* (long rhythmic cadences consisting of two *mōhara-s* joined together) in overarching relationships to the *tāla*, the tendency to incorporate complicated *mṛidaṅgam jati-s* and long *kōrvai-s* into *svara kalpana* is gaining frequency among modern performers--a practice which dismays the old classicists but delights the younger generations and less conservative listeners. Although Ranganayaki and Raajeswari would seem to have conceded one aspect of performance practice by including brief *mōhara-s* at the end of the *svara kalpana* and *niraval* sections at the climax of their concerts, neither of them have indulged in lengthy rhythmic cadences in the manner of their contemporaries.¹³⁷

3.3.2.3 Individual habits

Each musician has his or her own familiar gestures for and approaches to improvisation which may consist of particular phrases, combinations of

¹³⁷According to Ranganayaki, Sambasiva Iyer never ended his *kalpana svara-s* or *niraval* with a *mōhara*--a statement partially supported by the recording of "*sarasīruhā*" (tape 9B ex. 1) even though Ranganayaki performed the actual *svara* (Iyer intersperses *svara-s* in the bass register).

svara-s, techniques and other aspects of performance--in the performances of Lakshmi Ammal such approaches have also included basic melodic contour. Raajeswari Padmanabhan's habits of improvisation can be characterized and contrasted with those of Ranganayaki Rajagopalan by such aspects as repetition, size of melodic units, techniques and structural articulations. For example, Raajeswari tends to repeat patterns of small units more than does Ranganayaki--a tendency illustrated on tape 10, on which Raajeswari (side A ex. 1) and Ranganayaki (side B ex. 1) play *ālāpana* and *tānam* in *kalyāṇi rāga*.¹³⁸

One of Raajeswari's habitual gestures begins on a particular *svara* "x", moves to the *svara* preceding it in the *rāga* "x-1", to the *svara* following the initial *svara* "x+1", and back to the original *svara* "x", and is accomplished by the techniques of a descending slide ("x" to "x-1") accompanied by a deflection of the string toward the initial *svara*, an ascending slide to the initial *svarasthāna* while simultaneously deflecting the string to the *svara* above it ("x+1"), and a relaxation of the string to sound the initial *svara* "x". Although Ranganayaki never uses this particular technique, she plays a similar string of *svara*-s (i.e. "'x" "x-1" "x+1" "x'") deflecting from the "x-1" *svarasthāna*. In Raajeswari's *ālāpana*, of 11'40" length, contains 21 separate contexts in which this motive is repeated two or three times and serves as a point of departure for a string of phrases. In *kalyāṇi* these motives comprise 'snrsnrsn' or 'pmdpmdpm'. While the analytical index lists the time at which each set of motives is played in example 1, three

¹³⁸To provide relatively equivalent performance contexts, both recordings were taken from radio broadcasts made within 2 years of each and both precede the composition "Ētāvunarā."

excerpts from this performance containing these motives are provided in example 2 (tape 10A).

A characteristic motive (in this case also a *gamaka*) of Ranganayaki's, unlike that of Raajeswari which appears in repetitions of two or three and generates further phrases, appears alone as a part of larger phrases, comprises the *svara*-s '"x"x-1"x-2"x-1"' where "x" is the initial *svara*, and is produced on the "x-2" *svarasthāna* through a series of deflections. Examples of this motive, technically known as a *ravai gamaka* when found in isolation and usually executed by a series of "pull-off"-s and "hammer-on"-s on the *svarasthāna*-s of the constituent *svara*-s (see description, p. 177), are found in three excerpts from Ranganayaki's performance in example 2 (tape 10B).

Not only can Ranganayaki's habits of improvisation be distinguished from those of Raajeswari by such specific motives as those described above, but also by the way they render contextually equivalent *gamaka*-s such as those in example 4 tape 10A rendered by Raajeswari and example 3 tape 10B rendered by Ranganayaki. Just as Ranganayaki's *gamaka*-s can be distinguished from those of Lakshmi Ammal by the number and frequency of oscillations, so too can they be distinguished from those of Raajeswari. For example, Ranganayaki renders a kind of *gamaka* which contains oscillations between *dha* and *ni* on the *dha svarasthāna* 'ndnndn.d' while Raajeswari performs the same kind of *gamaka* in the lower tetrachord by dwelling longer on and oscillating the internal *svara*-s 'gmgmmmmgg'--differences which are not bound to these particular instances, but which are characteristic.¹³⁹ That

¹³⁹Other differences in the interpretation of this *gamaka* are found in the performances of Lakshmi Ammal, R. Sheela, and S. Mallika (p. 180).

Raajeswari repeats smaller units (i.e. the motive in example 2 which is played two or three times each occurrence and the constituent *svara*-s in the *gamaka*-s of example 4) more than does Ranganayaki may derive, in part, from the practice of her mother, Lakshmi Ammal, who also used to use more oscillations than Ranganayaki, even though the specific nature of these oscillations was different. For example, in *kalyāṇi*, in Lakshmi Ammal's rendition of the *gamaka* 'ndndndndndnd' the extended oscillations are less reiterations of *svara*-s than oscillations between two distinct *svara*-s.

Just as balance is found in the *saṅgati*-s performed by Sambasiva Iyer and by other musicians who are considered conservative "classical" musicians, balance also bears upon "classical" constructions smaller than *saṅgati*-s, such as *gamaka*-s and strings of phrases. Subramanian mentions, for example, that "the 'secret' of the "classic" in "Viribhoni" is essentially one of balance and proportion" (Subramanian 1986, 185). Part of this balance involves structures that contain two repetitions of a musical unit, followed by a variation. Raajeswari seems to extend this principle by using smaller constituent units and repeating them more than two times. Example four and the last of three excerpts in example three on tape 10A illustrate many reiterations of the smallest possible unit, one *svara*, *nī*, in the context of *tānam* (the first is a *tānam*-like passage of *ālāpāna*) performed by Raajeswari. Unlike Raajeswari, who includes these rather extended gestures, Ranganayaki includes only repetitions of the type in example five on tape 10B, which involve the structure of two iterations followed by variation.

Differences between the improvisations of Ranganayaki and Raajeswari which are more overarching than those of specific motives, specific ways of rendering contextually equivalent gestures, and small-scale structural dif-

ferences in repetition include those of articulation between *ālāpana* and *tānam*. Raajeswari has sought to improve the Karaikkudi style by providing more "continuity" between *ālāpana* and *tānam*. Such continuity includes incorporating passages of *tānam* into passages of *ālāpana* (tape 10A ex. 3) and softening the articulation between the end of the *ālāpana* section and the beginning of the *tānam* section (ex. 6). Unlike Raajeswari, Ranganayaki adheres rigidly to Sambasiva Iyer's avoidance of mixing these forms and maintains a strong articulation between the end of *ālāpana* and the beginning of *tānam* (10B ex. 4). Raajeswari has further developed *tānam* by repeating the characteristic concluding cadence three times in three registers (10A ex. 7). This practice is commonly followed by modern performers outside the Karaikkudi style. Ranganayaki, who does not believe this practice is appropriate for the Karaikkudi style, concludes the *tānam* section in only one register (10B ex.6).

Ranganayaki and Raajeswari may have held different attitudes about music and played the instrument with different "touches" when they were young, but essentially followed the improvisational practices of their *guru* while he was alive. Now, thirty years after Sambasiva Iyer died, Raajeswari, in particular, has introduced changes in the style which she perceives as improvements--perceptions that are not shared by Ranganayaki. But unlike Raajeswari's "improvements" many of Ranganayaki's and Raajeswari's personal habits or favorite patterns of improvisation are less style-bound than are they developments of particular motives available in *karṇāṭaka saṅgīta* as a whole. The frequency with which and the manner in which these favorite patterns are used by the artists in their improvisations are not only ways in which their performances may be identified, but are also

markers of their personal styles and perhaps will also serve as markers of the branches of the Karaikkudi style composed of their students.

3.4 Techniques

Not only may the Karaikkudi style and sub-divisions of the Karaikkudi style be identified by such aspects of performance as the rendering compositions and habits of improvisation, they may also be identified by the choice of techniques and by the intentions underlying these choices. In this section are considered three such techniques, *aluttam*, harmonics, and *tribhinna* (stroking of three strings successively).

Although *aluttam* (pressure, force, grip) was a central feature of the Karaikkudi style at the time of Sambasiva Iyer, it plays a central role in the playing of only some Karaikkudi *viṇā* players today, among whom, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan is a prominent example. Unlike Ranganayaki, Raajeswari considers "fingering" the central and diagnostic feature of the Karaikkudi style and *aluttam* an obsolete technique she has replaced with gentler, subtler ways of gripping the instrument and performing to introduce more "continuity." This aspect of Raajeswari's personal style may have developed from that of her mother, Lakshmi Ammal, who played with a rather gentle touch.

Not only have musicians altered left hand techniques such as *aluttam* to provide more continuity in performing the instrument, but also they have altered aspects of right hand plucking. For example Subramanian, and to a lesser extent Raajeswari, allows the string to vibrate longer than did his predecessors and uses the left hand in addition to the right hand fingers to stop the string from vibrating. Subramanian writes, "I developed the left finger stop on my own to counter a certain 'tightness' I felt in the Karaik-

kudi school of plucking mode. The composition of my plucks is inclusive of both these qualities [i.e. damping the strings with either the left hand or the right hand fingers]." Aside, perhaps, from his sister Sashikala, all Subramanian's brothers and sisters tend to allow *svara*-s to resound longer in between plucks than does Ranganayaki, or than did Sambasiva Iyer or Lakshmi Ammal, and because this modification of the technique of plucking and of *aluttam* is associated primarily with students of or children of Lakshmi Ammal, her example may have helped instigate such changes--changes not present in the styles of Lakshmi Ammal's sisters Sankari and Meenakshi.

Subramanian and Raajeswari may have modified the techniques they learned from Sambasiva Iyer not only because their mother played differently from him, but also because their mother encouraged them to be creative--encouragement which promotes synthesizing and experimenting with the techniques of other performers. Because most instrumentalists in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* attempt to make the *viṇā* sound like the human voice by striving for the rather abstract ideal of "continuity," Subramanian's and Raajeswari's innovations may be both a part of the widespread movement toward "continuity" and subliminal or conscious extensions of their mother's technique.

An additional technique, harmonics, contributes to a continuous stream of sound and is found in the playing of Subramanian, Raajeswari, some of their students, and those who share mutual influences. Their use of this technique implies that neither musician finds it threatening to the style, though a modern development and a technique used by stringed instrument players in other cultures. Although Ranganayaki does not use harmonics, I have not heard her express disapproval of it.

Harmonics have parallels not only in the performance and composition of

Western music but also in other musics of the world and in other Indian performance traditions. The introduction of such techniques into *viṇā* playing, therefore, raises the slippery issue of whether such appearances represent influences, which direction the influences move, and what motivations may stimulate the influences. Another possible aspect of Western influence on *viṇā* playing concerns the use of "harmony" (not "harmonics"). For example, Bruno Nettl (1985, 38-9) writes,

The presence of Western Harmony in Non-Western music is in many instances limited and symbolic. . . There are many ways of using Western harmony in the world of non-Western music, but in each case it functions as the central feature of Western music and its use is a technique of associating the traditional with the modern.

Three examples of compositions performed by Karaikkudi *viṇā* players suggest that attempts to associate the "traditional with the modern," through "Western Harmony" or any other aspect of Western Music, depends on whether a particular instance of simultaneous sounding notes indeed represents "Western harmony."

In the first example, the characteristically Karaikkudi rendition of the *kṛiti* "*sarasasāmadāna*" (tape 4 ex. 4) employs the seemingly "harmonic" technique called "*tribhinna*" (successive sounding of three main strings of the *viṇā*) at the beginning of the composition and in the *anupallavi* (and its parallel section in the *caraṇam*) on such words as "*paramasambava*" ("great siva"). In current usage *tribhinna* is a *gamaka* produced,

by placing the left-hand playing fingers on a *svarasthana* in a horizontal manner; so that the fingers are in contact with the three strings, *Sārani*, *Panchama*, and *Mandaram* and then by plucking the three strings with the right hand fingers either simultaneously or successively. When the notes in the three *sthānas* are produced simultaneously, harmony results (Sambamoorthy 1982c, 137).

R. Ayyangar describes *tribhinna*, which appeared in the 13th century

treatise *saṅgīta ratnākara*, as a "decelerated Kampita stretching over three notes" (Rangaramanuja Ayyangar 1978, 141) but neither its manner of production nor mention of any "harmonic" effect is included in this description. There seems to be disagreement on the 13th-century usage of the term. If the term *tribhinna* described in the *saṅgīta ratnākara* corresponds to the *tribhinna* of today (which it probably does not), modern use of the technique is not necessarily an attempt to associate the "traditional with the modern." Sambamoorthy's use of the word "harmony" in his description of *tribhinna* represents, perhaps, an attempt to glorify an ancient instrumental technique by showing that Indians used Western "harmony" even in medieval times. More likely, however, this term has been given new meanings that assign such "modern" aspects of music as harmony traditional status through reference to ancient Sanscrit treatises.

The Karaikkudi brothers may have used *tribhinna* in the context of "*sarasasāmadāna*," not to modernize their music but, for example, to highlight such words as "great Siva"--and in so doing, emphasizing values central to the style (i.e. importance of text). Interestingly, the Karaikkudi rendition of this composition creates an initial impression on some Indian and Western listeners alike as being strikingly "Western"--in part because of the mixolydian-like melodic content, and in part because of the chordal effect of the *tribhinna*, but considering Sambasiva Iyer's rather conservative stance on mixing genres and popularizing music, this perception of the composition does not likely match those of the brothers themselves.

A second example of apparent Western influences is found in the genre called "note"-s. "Note"-s typically contain chordal arpeggios, trumpet calls, and other motives that bring to mind military band music. Sambasiva

Iyer's "note"-s generally modulate, change mode or change tonic--three characteristics that are rare in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* (except in *rāgamālikā*-s). Eleven examples of notes (none of which have names) are found on side B of tape 6, and will not be analyzed. One can assume the "note"-s played by several performers on tape 6 are more frequently remembered and/or more popular among Karaikkudī *viṇā* players than those played by only one performer because I asked each artist to play all the "note"-s that he or she remembered. Each performance is somewhat varied, and most "note"-s end on the fourth degree, or *ma*. Because these recordings were made informally, they contain performers' errors, memory lapses and other imperfections. My intention in using such informality was to observe the variations and tendencies to end on the *svara ma* without having the performers practice and plan their performances.

Although arpeggios, which are present in some examples and can be understood melodically as well as harmonically, are instances of "Western Harmony" only if such was Sambasiva Iyer's intent, the repetition of a phrase occurring at the end of example 1 (with Sambasiva Iyer) 'gmp.g.ndp... \ gpm.r.n.s...' seems to contain a contrapuntal addition which is not entirely clear from the recording, and if it is intentional and not a mistake, it may represent an experimental attempt at harmony--i.e. an attempt to represent the independence of melodic lines found in band music--without an understanding of the theory that lies behind it. Although this example is probably an error of performance since it is neither reproduced in any of the other recordings nor in any other performances I have heard, one must not assume this is necessarily the case. Even though Sambasiva Iyer did not believe in mixing separate musics, the "note," a ready-made genre for

Western tunes, would seem to be ideal for incorporating other aspects of Western music such as harmony.

The "note" in example 1 seems to be the most frequently played among Iyer's "note"-s and like other "note"-s usually ends on the *svara ma*. The ending *svara* might be a marker of style (see pp. 73-75), or it could be a reinterpretation of a dominant tonic cadence in which the relationship of the fifth to the tonic is expressed by the relationship of the tonic to the fourth.

A third example might be interpreted as "accidental harmony" and is found in the unique manner in which a second *viṇā* player in the Karaikkudi style sometimes accompanies passages of improvisation. Most of the old recordings on which Sambasiva Iyer performs feature the playing of Ranganayaki and Raajeswari accompanied by Iyer's sparse punctuations in the bass register emphasizing certain notes of the *rāga* (see tape 9B ex. 1: *kalpana svara* to "*sarasīruhā*"). This practice, which may remind one of the stretched out exposition of notes in medieval organum, functions to produce a series of moving drones and may be the extent to which anything resembling "harmony" might be incorporated into *karnāṭaka saṅgīta*.

In regard to this manner of performance, the notes to a record of Subramanian and Raajeswari made in 1975 reads "In other *ālāpanams* also (A3 and C), he [Subramanian] supports Raajeswari's predominant notes, a practice which complies with tradition; for in the very same manner Karaikkudi Sambasiva Ayyar himself accompanies Raajeswari in a recording of the 1950's" (Srinivasan 1980). This passage, written not by the performers but by a student of theirs, seems to imply this innovative "harmonic" practice is traditional not because it is supported by a continuous performance tradi-

tion, but by a recording. Karaikkudi musicians themselves, especially those too young to have heard or remember Sambasiva Iyer's concerts, justify some of their own practices through recordings of Sambasiva Iyer. K. S. Subramanian, for example, could only have imitated what he heard on the recording or remembered from the few concerts he would have attended because he never performed with Iyer, but Raajeswari and Ranganayaki, who themselves never played the role of accompanying in the bass, were present while Iyer played such passages. Perhaps Iyer was not truly "accompanying" his young disciples Ranganayaki and Raajeswari at all, but encouraging them to play independently while introducing his own ideas, and musically commenting on their ideas, without interrupting the overall flow, or perhaps it represents a rather diminished version of the common practice of accompanying in octaves. Neither Ranganayaki nor Raajeswari have commented on this practice in my discussions with them.

Although what appears to be "Western Harmony" may be one of a number of practices which may or may not involve "modernizing" traditional music, the manner in which these practices are perpetuated and/or developed among present generations of Karaikkudi *viṇā* players may suggest new chains of influence with Western music; but as of yet, Raajeswari and her daughter Sri Vidya, who also play such sections as *ālāpāna* with melodic punctuations in the bass register, have not elaborated upon the practice of Sambasiva Iyer or added fuller sonorities, or "functional" or coloristic harmony--ways which would call for a reassessment of the intentions behind these techniques.

This chapter has considered innovation in contexts such as fixed forms (*varṇa*-s and *kṛiti*-s), improvisations, and their possible models, structure

of genres such as *ālāpāna* and *tānam*, techniques such as harmonics, deemphasis of such techniques as *aluttam*, and using techniques in vertical combinations. Now we will need to consider the social, economic, and other factors which may have promoted these stylistic developments.

3.5 Factors promoting style change

In this section I explore the effect of twentieth century changes in society on the Karaikkudi style of *viṇā* playing. Like people in Western cultures who reminisce about the "good old days," some Indians speak of a time when classical music was "pure," when the only motivation for performing it was "devotional," and when the only recompense a musician desired was "grace from god" and enough food to eat. South Indians perceive the twentieth century as one in which an increase in mixed musical forms and an increase in economic rather than in devotional motivations for performing in public have changed *karnāṭaka saṅgita*--although they compare the present to a utopian past which probably never existed. Such changes are seen to have followed from the breakdown of the *gurukula* system and from the dissolution of princely patronage, for without the financial support of India's Maharajas, musicians became increasingly dependant on the support of the population at large, albeit "elite" portions of it, and were subject to satisfying popular aesthetic tastes. The effects of this shift "from prince to populace," as discussed by Jon Higgins (1976, 21), include:

1. Development of *sabha*-s (music halls) resulting in shorter concerts
2. More *rāga*-s in each concert, with less time given to the elaboration of each.
3. Novelties introduced to compete with the film industry
4. Secularization
5. Loss of extra musical connotations
6. Loss of intimacy in large gatherings
7. Admission charge to all, resulting in non-attendance of other great musicians who would traditionally encourage musicians.

8. Decrease in social and economic stature, need for other financial support.

These changes may account for certain musical innovations in performances of musicians in the Karaikkudi style and in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* as a whole. Some of these changes may not only be the result of the changes in patronage but also of such factors as increased industrialization.

3.5.1 Changes in audiences

In earlier times musicians were subject to the aesthetic tastes of wealthy patrons, but such patrons were obliged to allow musicians, especially renowned musicians, to play what and how they pleased; for, although it was an honor for a musician to be invited to play in the court of a Maharaja, it was also an honor for a King to boast the presence of such musicians in his court. Such reciprocal respect is suggested, for example, by the occasion on which the Karaikkudi brothers startled the king with their rendition of "*rāmabāṇa*" (pp.23-24). When this system of patronage was no longer viable, musicians had to compete for public support, and such competition involved drawing large audiences rather than being invited to play for small educated ones.

One may ask, then, if and how performing members of the Karaikkudi style changed their playing to accommodate large audiences. Because the physical constraints of playing for large audiences required louder and simpler playing than for small audiences, the Karaikkudi brothers' loud, concise, uncomplicated style might have been an adaptation (or a continuation of a style which became physically ideal) designed to reach large audiences before microphones were introduced to the concert hall. This interpretation is supported by Rangaramanuja Ayyangar (1972, 273), who

writes, the brothers "dowered it [the *viṇā*] with a tremendous volume so as to reach an audience of 2000 without a microphone," and by the fact that the brothers were already famous before the microphone was introduced to concert halls in the 1930s.¹⁴⁰

That the Karaikkudi style is ideal for reaching large audiences without a microphone does not imply the style was caused by such a need, and the fact that Ranganayaki has continued to play loudly and concisely, despite her use of a contact microphone and despite other technological advances which allow musicians to play as soft or as loud as they wish, suggests the aesthetics of the style are invented, appreciated, and transmitted independently of functional aspects. Perhaps the great success of the Karaikkudi brothers derives in part from the mutual benefits of their own aesthetic goals and the functional needs of audiences at the time they performed.

Unlike Ranganayaki, who has not changed volume-producing aspects of style such as *aluttam*, Raajeswari, who finds *aluttam* a rather obsolete feature of the style, has developed a gentle touch which would have been impractical for a professional, performing musician before the microphone was introduced. Other such changes in *karnāṭaka saṅgīta* which would have been impractical without a microphone include, a general lowering of tonic pitches by vocalists such as the late M. D. Ramanathan, who no longer had to "shout" to be heard; *viṇā* players, such as Chitti Babu, who use thin strings at low tensions to accomodate extensive bending and delicate ornamentation; and flutists, such as Ramani, who use soft, low pitched flutes in addition to louder high pitched ones.

¹⁴⁰The Karaikkudi brothers' career together ended with Subbarama Iyer's death in 1936, two years before radio broadcasting began, and 11 years after the first microphone was heard in Madras (L'Armand 1983, 423-4).

Large audiences demanded not only acoustic changes but also changes in concert format, in balance of compositions, and in other aspects of performing practice. Such changes include,

1. Shortening of concerts
2. Increasing the speed of rendition
3. Emphasizing virtuosity
4. Inventing and incorporating technical "gimmicks" (harmonics, strumming, extended pulling and prolonged left hand acrobatics following a single pluck)
5. Moving parts of the face and body in response to, or for the benefit of the audience
6. Inclusion of many "light" *raga*-s
7. Inclusion of extra percussion instruments

The length of a south Indian classical music concert used to depend, for the most part, on a musician's mood, but nowadays depends on the concert organizers. Unlike Sambasiva Iyer, in whose lifetime such control passed from the musician to the organizer and who preferred being cut-off to limiting his *manodharma* (improvisational sections of a performance), Ranganayaki and Raajeswari comply with the wishes of the concert organizers on whom they depend. Such time constraints necessitate planning in "real" rather than relative time the internal time limits for each section, the number of compositions, and overall balance between sections of a concert.

Another aspect of planning concerts in relation to the audience involves adjusting the proportion of intellectual to popular numbers to the interests of the audience and to the performance context. For example, a musician performing at the Music Academy in Madras would be expected to perform weighty *rāga*-s and *pallavi*-s, whereas a musician performing at a wedding would be expected to perform light, popular numbers. Although some performers incorporate such light songs as cinema tunes into their repertoire, Karaikkudi musicians do not, but even such conservative musicians as

Sambasiva Iyer had favorite light songs such as "note"-s, and classical numbers based on such folksong types as the *kāvaticintu* and the *kummi*. Although Sambasiva Iyer's students and other members of the Karaikkudi style continue to play such songs, there has been neither a marked increase nor a marked decrease in their performance over the years.

Not only do musicians sometimes include more "light" songs in their concerts in order to please less sophisticated and sometimes impatient audiences, but also they tend to play the classical numbers faster than they used to be performed. A preference for rendering certain compositions more quickly than they may have been in the past has become common to many but not all performers. For example, while Ranganayaki tends to play pieces at a quicker tempo than they used to be performed, Lakshmi Ammal and her sisters maintain the practice of playing at a slow tempo.

While such facts suggest that whether or not musicians perform publicly rather than conservatism may effect the speed at which musicians render compositions, such factors as personal style may also play a role. For example, Ranganayaki's personal style, which involves clear, slow and relatively simple *gamaka*-s, is more suited for playing fast than was that of Lakshmi Ammal who employed intricate and internally brisk ornaments and subtle shifts of accent.

Fast playing is also one manifestation of the trend toward virtuosity in modern performances. Although Ranganayaki plays some compositions at a brisk pace, she is not considered virtuosic--in part because she avoids fast *brikka* passages which she feels to be inappropriate for the *viṇā*. Raajeswari, who plays a comparatively greater number of fast, technical passages, has not been accused of practicing virtuosity for its own sake, perhaps be-

cause she is seen to balance brisk, virtuosic playing with classical, conservative, and sensitive playing.

Just as virtuosity for its own sake is common despite being frowned upon by conservative musicians, so too are "gimmicks" common in modern performances of *karṇāṭaka saṅgīta*. "Gimmicks" are instrumental or vocal gestures seen to draw applause solely because they are difficult to produce and/or because they sound novel, especially when such gestures are not seen to enhance the musical context in which they appear. Although musicians are unlikely to call any of the gestures in Ranganayaki's playing "gimmicks," some might find "gimmicky" such repetitive phrases as 'śnṛśnṛśn' in Raajeswari's performances of *rāga ālāpana* in the *rāga kalyāṇi*. Harmonics, which Raajeswari and Subramanian occasionally use, and athletic bends to the interval of a fifth or more, which S. Balachander uses, are other modern gestures on the *viṇā* which some consider to be "gimmicks."

Performers attract and sustain the attention of the audience not only through their playing, but also through their rapport with the audience, sometimes expressed through "body language." In the Karaikkudi school, musicians such as Lakshmi Ammal and Ranganayaki avoid extra-musical body motion, moving the *viṇā*, and movement of the hands and arms while playing the *viṇā*, but others, such as Raajeswari, tend to smile and remain slightly less still while performing. Such differences in performance tend to characterize different branches of the Karaikkudi style today just as do patterns by which certain musicians innovate, render compositions, and approach the idea of composing new material and other aspects of musical change discussed in this chapter. Ranganayaki and Lakshmi Ammal, who were raised under rather conservative conditions, remain stern and almost ceremoniously still

while playing, whereas Raajeswari, who was experimental and playful even while learning music as a child, appears less rigid on stage. Raajeswari's attentive stage presence has probably contributed to her commercial success as a performer.

Both musical content and the composition of the musical ensemble characterize the performances of certain styles in some performance contexts. For example, performers such as Kunnakudi Vaidyanathan, a popular violinist, are appreciated in part for the lively percussion "orchestras," which accompany them. Although Bhuvarahan (1978, 13) recalls that Sambasiva Iyer "delighted in percussive bouts with the mridangist and kanjeera players," today's members of the Karaikkudi style seem to have deemphasized this aspect of performance--perhaps because it is now associated with commercialism and lack of classicism.

3.5.2 Changes in teaching of music: Time and institutions

The rise of professional musicianship in south India was a result of not only the change from royal to public support for musicians but also of India's struggle to become a modern industrial nation in which Western-type jobs rather than ritual or seasonal concerns began to regulate people's time schedules. While the reordering of time schedules may have discouraged men from becoming accomplished amateurs it also encouraged women to become amateur musicians by placing responsibility on women to maintain and teach ritual and cultural values at home (see p.81).

Industrialization has affected not only the time structures in which people learn and perform music, but also the units of time and manner of teaching music and other forms of traditional knowledge such as Sanskrit, which used to be taught in the *gurukula* system and are now taught in

schools. Because music institutions produce few excellent musicians, the change in context for teaching has widened the gulf between musicians of musical families (who still receive the benefits of training in the home) and those who learn in schools (in isolated chunks of time). One aspect of this gulf lies in the composition of style; for example, whereas students in a family of musicians may learn all the values, attitudes, and family customs which are associated with a style and are taught as part and parcel of *gurukula* training, students in a music institution, if they can learn a particular style at all, are taught, for the most part, musical products.

The movement from teaching music in the home to teaching music in schools seems to have brought about some of the diversity now found in the Karaikkudi school. Such a conclusion might help to explain why Raajeswari Padmanabhan, who has taught in a music institution (Kalakshetra) longer than anyone else in the Karaikkudi style, has, according to the findings of this thesis, instigated more development and change within the Karaikkudi style than has any other performer since the Karaikkudi brothers. Ranganayaki, who taught at the Madras Music Academy for only ten years, has remained relatively faithful to her *guru's* practices. Some of the practices encouraged by Kalakshetra seem to conflict with the practices of Sambasiva Iyer, but not necessarily with her own practices or those of her mother. Such practices include composing new songs (at the request of Kalakshetra's founder, Rukmini Devi), teaching students who had previously learned other styles, teaching students in short periods of time and in time slots determined by the school, and using teaching materials such as exercises, compositions, and genres which are specified in the school curriculum.

In comparison with *gurukulavāsa* in the Karaikkudi style, music schools

promote differences not only in specific practices but also in general attitudes. For example, while the traditional method of teaching in India discourages students from asking questions and from listening to and learning from other people, music institutions foster outward-looking attitudes by representing a variety of styles and by hosting students who wish to learn popular versions of compositions. These attitudes tend to induce a certain degree of stylistic homogeneity because students learn from many teachers at music schools. These teachers constantly interact with one another, are subjected to unified standards for teaching, and compete to perform in the same arenas.

Raajeswari's attitudes are both outward-looking and universalistic, and thus have brought about some degree of stylistic homogeneity even though, by her own standards, the Karaikkudi style remains unique. For example, in order to introduce a certain "sweetness" she finds in north Indian music, Raajeswari has altered the "choppy" quality she perceives in the Karaikkudi technique by allowing the strings to resonate longer between plucks and by deemphasizing *aluttam*. Although she says north and south Indian musics are different and have different systems, she justifies her changes saying that one was derived from the other and by implying that her innovation merely returns musical aspects that have been lost over centuries of musical evolution (Padmanabhan 1988).

While such examples suggest that institutions stimulate changes which blur the differences between styles, some institutions reinforce fundamental stylistic values and practices. For example, students who proceed through the institutional system are often required to learn Telugu and Sanskrit and sometimes Tamil or Kanada, to enable them to understand the meaning of com-

positions as well as scholarly texts and musical notations. Although Sambasiva Iyer expressed the importance of understanding the *sāhitya* (text), few Karaikkudi vina players after him fully understood the texts they sang or played, and as mentioned earlier, the brothers themselves only understood such texts superficially. Now such musicians as Mallika, who understand the meaning of the songs they play, continue to enrich the expressivity of their playing and observe appropriate performance contexts (see p.105).

Institutions reinforce stylistic values by encouraging language learning and by exposing students to scholarly or semi-scholarly works which may help reconstruct compositions or sections of compositions that have been forgotten, or help to guide new innovations. For example, by the time Lakshmi Ammal taught "*vanajāsana*" to her students the composer of this composition had been forgotten, both through aural transmission and through lack of reference to written documents. S. Mallika discovered the composition was composed by Subbarayya Sastri and originally contained a *svara sāhitya* (a *svara* passage which is sung first with *svara* names and then with textual syllables), and, along with Lakshmi Ammal, modified Lakshmi Ammal's *ciṭṭasvara* (see p.168) to accommodate the *svara sāhitya* text. Such an innovation combines scholarly intentions (a partial product of music institutions which, alone, might have encouraged "correcting" Lakshmi Ammal's version by replacing the *ciṭṭasvara* with the written notation) with inward-looking stylistic values (a product of *gurukulavāsa* which, alone, might have resisted such change).

Stylistic values have also been revitalized by such members of the Karaikkudi style as K. S. Subramanian, who, noticing that students of Raajeswari and Ranganayaki lacked confidence in fundamental lessons such as

sarali and *janṭa varisai*-s, devised new ways, including verbal modes of teaching and founded the "Karaikkudi School" (see p.113) to leave time for Ranganayaki and Raajeswari to teach advanced students.

The breakdown of the *gurukula* system has resulted not only in such new systems of learning as that associated with music schools, but also in modified versions of the traditional system. Such modified versions involve students learning in discrete lessons at their *guru*'s or their own house. Some teachers are more willing to adhere to rigid time schedules than are others. Lakshmi Ammal, for example, would often have her students listen to other lessons, practice on their own, or do small chores before teaching them, and then, only if she was in the mood, teach new lessons. Other teachers, such as Ranganayaki, adhere closer to a fixed time schedule. Just as Lakshmi Ammal's schedule of teaching approximates aspects of the "old" way, so too is her insistence that her students thoroughly learn fundamental lessons before any other, a carryover from the *gurukula* system; and just as Ranganayaki's schedule of teaching represents a modern modification of the "old" way, so too is her insistence that the student be responsible for practicing a modern teaching phenomenon.

Summary

Such economic changes as decline of princely patronage and the rise of industry have encouraged serious musicians to become professionals, changed the contexts in which music is taught, and introduced new audiences through the advent of music *sabha*-s (halls). Such changes, although apparent to different extents among different musicians, have encouraged musicians to seek popularity and monetary benefit. Part of this monetary benefit is obtained by teaching music in schools, where, in the Karaikkudi style for in-

stance, variety has been induced by exposing such musicians as Raajeswari to new ideas and styles and encouraging synthesis. Although diversity is promoted within particular styles such as the Karaikkudi style which have various degrees of contact with different institutions, homogeneity is promoted within the musical institutions themselves, where teachers are expected to conform to theoretical standards and curricula decided upon by the schools' administrators. Generally the institutionalization of music has changed the characterization of style from a holistic one (one that considers values, performance contexts and teaching processes as well as repertoire and technique) to a technical one (one more centered on aspects of technique), although institutions have also reinforced such traditional stylistic values as importance of understanding *sāhitya*-s and emphasis on fundamental lessons. Now, having considered the effects on the Karaikkudi style of relatively broad changes in society, we will need to consider the changes in and role of local sources of musicianship, the family.

3.5.3 Role of family in 20th-century musicianship

In traditional Hindu families where sons and daughters are taught not to think of personal benefit but of what may benefit the family, daughters are compelled to behave in a manner (which sometimes involves learning music--see pp.82-83) that will enable their parents to arrange her marriage, and sons are expected to remain in school or university only as long as it takes to qualify for a prestigious or well paying job but not to exceed that amount of time or learn for the sake of knowledge. Although such values and practices are changing in urban centers and among "modernized" families, conservative values against which such modernization is occurring stress the family over the individual, conformity over indivi-

dualism, and practicality over interest.

Conservative values combined with modern economic pressures discourage families without a hereditary lineage of musicians from pursuing music as a career. On the other hand, members of families in which music is both part of every day life and part of their family history, inevitably learn music. While students from families who are not themselves musicians occasionally overcome social barriers and economic hardship to become great musicians, musicians whose parents were famous have less difficulty in making a name for themselves.

Being part of Karaikkudi Sambasiva Iyer's family, for instance, aided Raajeswari in obtaining her post at Kalakshetra in 1958. After Sambasiva Iyer died, Rukmini Devi, who founded Kalakshetra, insisted that Raajeswari continue the Karaikkudi family legacy by teaching there, even though Ranganayaki, who had studied with Sambasiva Iyer for ten years longer than had Raajeswari, was more qualified in some ways. Rukmini Devi's desire to legitimize Kalakshetra with "musical blood" may have been an attempt to reconcile a personal desire for dynastic legitimacy, for she was one of the first brahmins to learn *bharatanāṭyam* dancing--an art formerly reserved for lower caste women--and lacked the "authenticity" a family of dancers would have seemed to provide.

Coming from a musical family not only aids in bringing success but also gives legitimacy to musicians' idiosyncracies and innovations, although to a lesser extent any association with great musicians tends to legitimize both musicians' claims to tradition and their innovations (Nettl 1985, 107). Such seemingly automatic legitimacy allows members of a musical family to stretch

the notion of traditionality, whether or not they choose to do so.¹⁴¹ This phenomenon might account in small part for the degree to which Raajeswari has boldly introduced new materials, ideas, and techniques into the Karaikkudi style, while Ranganayaki has for the most part held rigidly to the forms and gestures of her *guru*. Raajeswari will always be associated with the Karaikkudi style because her grandfather and granduncle were the Karaikkudi brothers, but Ranganayaki must rely on her playing alone and the memory of her training with her *guru* as claims to membership in the Karaikkudi style.

Such factors as encouragement of innovation within the family also account for Raajeswari's willingness to try new ways of playing. Because Lakshmi Ammal encouraged all her children to be creative, the personal styles of Raajeswari, Subramanian, Chandramouli, Sashi, Sugantha, and Shanti are each unique. Somewhat unlike Lakshmi Ammal, her sister Meenakshi, who has a more conservative notion of what innovations are acceptable, claims to play exactly as she was taught. For this reason one might expect to find slightly less diversity among her students and children than among those of Lakshmi Ammal, but the present study does not contain enough information on Meenakshi's students to confirm such a hypothesis.

Just as work schedules in modern industrial cities required music and other aspects of education to be taught in isolated chunks of time, especially in music institutions but also in homes, so too do other products of modern industry tend to change the patterns of teaching even within musical households. For example, the presence of an electronic mixer or any other

¹⁴¹However, Dr. T. Viswanathan, a member of a renowned family of musicians and dancers himself, does not find that membership in a musical family affects the legitimacy of his innovations.

noisy appliance in Lakshmi Ammal's home would have not only have changed her family's household work habits, it would also have interfered with the aspect of her teaching in which she left a student to practice alone while she attended to other chores.¹⁴² While doing such chores which included feeding babies, cleaning, cooking, or talking, she would remain attentive to the student's practicing. If the student hesitated or made an error she would sing the particular passage or return to the room in which the student was practicing and correct it. Such practices, which are holdovers from the *gurukula* system, would not be possible if cooking or cleaning were accomplished with noisy modern appliances; would make using such appliances activities which could not be carried on while doing other activities; and would necessitate setting aside a block of time exclusively for music.

Other labor saving devices also induce such compartmentalization. For example, Lakshmi Ammal and K. S. Subramanian remember learning music or listening to relatives sing to the rhythm of washing cloths, pumping water, and grinding rice. In such contexts, which are often absent in wealthy or modern households, musicians also try out new ideas. Technology (as well as the use of servants) replace these contexts for experimentation and teaching with leisure time. But carrying out all musical training and practice in absence of other activities, while perhaps conducive to concentration and rapid progress, is different from learning in a variety of contexts over a longer period of time. Other households, such as those of Raajeswari and Ranganayaki, are not only filled with such products as appliances and television sets, but also require time commitments that prevent a method of teaching

¹⁴²When I mentioned this observation to Lakshmi Ammal's husband Narayana Iyer he heartily agreed.

like that of Lakshmi Ammal.

Summary

Families exert a strong influence on who will become a musician in south India. Economic concerns usually prevent men from seriously pursuing music unless they do so professionally, and women are often encouraged to learn music, not as a profession, but to increase their eligibility for marriage. Membership in a musical family greatly aids success in the performance field and may provide more legitimacy for innovations than non-membership in musical families. Learning in the home is an advantage children of musicians have over other children, who must learn in discrete lessons or in music schools because the *gurukula* system is no longer functional, but even learning in the home is changing due to changing time schedules and technological advances in the home. Not only do appliances effect such changes, but also do such aural media as radio and recordings.

3.5.4 Media: Radio and recordings

Not only in India, but in most countries where music has been made into a commodity, radio and recordings have effected both the learning of and the performance of music. While written traditions, like those of the West, and semi-written, semi-aural traditions, like those of India, both require interpretations in performance, recordings provide models which require less interpretation, and consequently may limit the variety of the performances which are based on them.

Although south Indian musicians have always, to varying degrees, learned by listening to the performances of other musicians, such learning (before the radio, television and recordings) was limited to the amount one could remember and imitate from one or two hearings. The performers who

could internalize a great deal from a single listening were also likely to be advanced enough to create material on their own. For example, although Sambasiva Iyer was known to use *saṅgati*-s his contemporaries had invented, he was never thought of as an imitator; in one instance, he paused during a *rāga ālāpana* in *mandāri* and gave credit to the performer who invented a particular phrase (N. Chandramouli, pers. com. 1987)

While it is now common for people to learn songs off the radio and off cassettes, legitimacy as a musician requires association with well known artists. To create the appearance of such an association students may begin by learning five or six lessons from musicians they admire and continue by imitating recordings. They then can not only claim discipleship but also, in proving such discipleship, perform a few songs or *ālāpana*-s as they appear on tape.

Sometimes artists, while not claiming discipleship, might model their style after a great performer of the past. Such seems to be the case for Balamurali Krishna, who is known for the Western cultivated quality of his voice, which also resembles that of the late G. N. Balasubramanian. But Balamurali is not a disciple of G. N. Balasubramanian, only an imitator. Imitating a style by focusing on the musical product and not on learning processes or social affiliation is a modern phenomenon brought about, in part, by the enormous availability of music. Such availability is made possible both through radio and recordings and through quick and convenient transportation.

Some members of the Karaikkudi style also learn new compositions off tape recordings and the radio. Ranganayaki learns compositions off cassettes and considers such learning to be like learning from a performer

directly. For example, rather than saying she learned "*dinamanivamsa*" from a cassette of Maharajapuram Santhanam she says she learned it from Maharajapuram Santhanam. But learning compositions from recordings is seen to be acceptable only for advanced musicians whose styles are firmly established, otherwise they are likely to make mistakes and/or mix styles.

The extent to which one can legitimately learn musicians' versions of songs or *rāga*-s from recordings depends in part on the degree to which those musicians vary their performances, and the extent to which those variations are captured on the recordings used. For example, Ranganayaki allowed me to record my lessons because, perhaps, she generally maintains a consistent sequence of *saṅgati*-s from performance to performance. Unlike Ranganayaki, Lakshmi Ammal, who used to vary her renditions from performance to performance and varied the complexity of renditions according to the level of the student, was reluctant to allow students to record her. She allowed me to record songs only after she was satisfied that I had "mastered" them.

Summary

Just as teaching music in schools has had the partial effect of emphasizing the components of style which involve musical products, so too has the wide availability of music, especially through cassette recordings, made the learning of a musician's "style" become a matter of imitating a musician's technique and rendition. Although some effects of the recording industry have been a decrease in the variety of performances of particular compositions and less variability from performance to performance by a particular performer, such performers as Ranganayaki were always rather consistent in their ways of performing. For this reason, Ranganayaki does not feel that teaching through tape recordings conflicts with the teaching

method found in the Karaikkudi style, as long as the student involved is familiar with the correct technique and has a developed ear.

3.6 Conclusions

For many generations, the style of *viṇā* playing associated with ancestors of Subbarama Iyer and Sambasiva Iyer, now called the Karaikkudi style, represented the practices of a rather limited number of individuals--maybe two or three in each generation. Although these individuals may have taught other relatives and students, the history of the Karaikkudi style is reckoned by the descent of the male line, and no evidence suggests these early practitioners thought of themselves as playing in a certain style, or, if so, what characterized that style. What people now call style (*pāṇi*, *vali* or other term musicians translate as style) was simply the ways or manners of playing, teaching, or thinking about music. Just as the practices of diverse groups of people on the Indian subcontinent was given the name Hinduism, and just as some of the devotional musics people sang extemporaneously in north and south India were given the names "Hindustani" and "Karnatak," so too did the diverse practices of individuals performing such musics become known as "styles."

Although the English word "style" is used freely in India, indigenous terms for style refer to matters of practice, tradition, history, and ways of doing something; and whereas the names of styles such as the Karaikkudi style came about after the fact, styles in south India are now self-conscious aspects of performance which musicians seek in advance. Such self-consciousness may not always have been part of *karṇāṭaka saṅgīta*, however, for although music in India boasts a long history of written discourse, this discourse is found in documents which center on theory and

which describe normative practices rather than performances practices of specific groups, or style, of musicians.

In earlier times, *guru-s* taught music as one element in a whole way of life, taught both directly and indirectly, and both musically useful information and information unrelated to music. The parable about the man and his mule (see p.24), for example, teaches not only the general lesson that one should think for one's self, but also a specific lesson pertaining to the development of musicianship (i.e. that one should not alter one's performance for popular demand). Although style, as a "way," encompassed many aspects of life, style is now, primarily, a musical phenomenon because learning in a university, learning two or three hours a week in a teacher's home, or copying what is heard in concerts, on the radio and off of cassettes, do not allow students to imbibe the way of life which once composed the family "style," or "way" of doing things.

In a further manifestation of the trend toward conceiving style in terms of musical products, most musicians (in the Karaikkudi style, if not in general) are interested in artistic questions rather than social, religious, or other extra musical questions. For example, such questions as how and to what extent the *vīṇā* should be used in worship may have been concerns of Sambasiva Iyer (if one may extrapolate such a possibility from his practices and statements), but they do not seem to be concerns of his disciples Ranganayaki and Raajeswari. Many of the broad changes in the Karaikkudi playing style introduced by Raajeswari, for example, have involved attempts to overcome the physical problem of "continuity" posed by the innate limita-

tions of *viṇā*.¹⁴³ Smaller variations between the performances of members of the style involve the interpretation of such musical units as the *svara* (internal *gamaka*-s), *prayōga*, *saṅgati*, and other configurations of *svara*-s. Other changes include the manipulation of musical forms in *kalpita* and *manodharma saṅgita* such as Lakshmi Ammal's introducing *manodharma* into her rendering of *kṛiti*-s and Raajeswari's softening the articulation between and mixing sections of *ālāpana* and *tānam*. All such innovations or interpretations of traditional material reflect musical interests.

Not only the use but also the function of various musical forms has been interpreted differently by different members of the style. Such functions include pedagogic (useful for teaching purposes), aesthetic (providing aesthetic enjoyment), and symbolic (emblematic of a style) ones. Lakshmi Ammal, who insisted on using *particular* exercises and compositions in teaching, interpreted the early lessons as fulfilling symbolic as well as pedagogic functions (perhaps also aesthetic functions). Ranganayaki, who, while continuing to teach traditional exercises, teaches compositions which are equally simple as but more popular than those of her *guru*, interprets the early compositions as fulfilling a particular pedagogic function (a function which could be equally fulfilled by other compositions). The pedagogic function of early lessons is stressed by Meenakshi Ammal, who reluctantly used the aesthetic attraction of items such as "note"-s to persuade her students to practice.

Assessing the function of various musical forms and other items which compose the Karaikkudi repertoire raises a broader question with which musi-

¹⁴³Kubler ([1962] 1976) developed a model for discussing styles as series' of linked solutions to problems. Meyer (1983) criticizes this approach as suffering from "causalism."

cians must come to terms, the notion of what constitutes style: what is fixed, what is changeable, and what is obsolete. Each musician relies on certain emblems of, markers of, or claims to style to maintain a link with the past. Such emblems and markers may be found in the performance of entire compositions or of such small patterns as *ciṭṭasvara*-s and typical *ālāpana* phrases; particular ways of teaching and materials used for teaching, ways of acting with the audience, and certain techniques are also aspects of style to which musicians adhere; and being born into a family of musicians who belong to a style is a compelling claim to legitimacy in a style.

Some individual interpretations of style present attitudes and patterns of performance which can be detected in several stylistic domains. For example, Lakshmi Ammal tends to use the double oscillation-double echappée *gamaka* (see p.88-89) not only in compositions but also in basic exercises; this tendency can be viewed within her general tendency to use complicated rhythmic and melodic patterns both in *gamaka*-s and in *saṅgati*-s. Raajeswari's tendency toward universalizing and homogenizing musical forms and incorporating new ideas is expressed in her mixing of *ālāpana* and *tānam* and in her catholic attitude toward borrowing. The characteristic *aḷuttam* in Ranganayaki's playing, and the sternness of her face while she performs are both aspects of performance associated with her guru and metaphors for her general philosophy of firmness, rigidity, and tenacity over maintaining classicism and the practices of her guru.

Since the deaths of the Karaikkudi brothers the Karaikkudi style can no longer be described by the practices of one or two individuals. The lifestyles of today's members of the Karaikkudi style may involve little or no

internal contact, and may involve adopting role models in teachers and performers outside the Karaikkudi style. While musicians in the Karaikkudi style adopt what they believe to be central characteristics of the style, such characteristics are by no means agreed upon. For example Raajeswari finds "fingering" to be such a core characteristic while Ranganayaki considers *aluttam* central.

Such a multiplicity of interpretations might equally be found in any south Indian musical style (or in any analogous performance tradition) which has existed for at least two generations, for although the recognition of each style may originate, in part, as a recognition of a unique manner of performance, the continued "life" of a style depends on various connections with the style's originators. Thus the issue of stylistic definition becomes one of changing modes of classification. Style, to an analyst (music historian, art historian, etc.) usually involves classifying observably similar items together through a series of genera and differentiae. Such a method is only partially applicable in the study of *pāṇi*-s because even "within" a *pāṇi* such criteria are disputed. As a scholar of "style," however, one seems at loss to decide who is "inside" and who is "outside" a style without some sort of criteria.

Such criteria may come only from specific studies isolating first of all what is considered important to a style by particular members, and secondly, how such aspects are transmitted to the next generation. Such lines of transmission have been established between Sambasiva Iyer and Ranganayaki, and between Lakshmi Ammal and some of her students. One need not expect to find the same aspects stressed by all musicians.

In time, disciples of today's Karaikkudi musicians may innovate in

radically new ways, or use materials from the past in such skillful manners as to be seen as founders of an independent styles. Or, if disciples of today's Karaikkudi musicians continue to play in the "Karaikkudi style" (whatever that comes to mean), when Sambasiva Iyer is no longer in living memory, today's performance practice will be seen as the "old way" (or old ways), and future generations will have to reconcile their innovations with those of today.

Throughout this thesis the aspects of style promoted by Lakshmi Ammal has been referred to as a different "branch" from that of Ranganayaki, Raajeswari and others. Each musician has built upon the practices of the Karaikkudi brothers and may only relate to each other in the historical past, but not in particular aspects of style agreed upon as central. The "trunk" of the Karaikkudi brothers is a point of departure--not a core, not a central feature of performance, but a point of departure. Such a recognition prompted Subramanian to begin the "Karaikkudi school," for by ensuring that *viṇā* players in the Karaikkudi style receive the same basic training, he ensures a certain degree of underlying unity. Such a sense of history and a shared method of training both unify the Karaikkudi style and serve as a backdrop to each musician's innovations and interpretation of stylistic material.

Appendix I

Basic Exercises for vīṇā

sarali varisai

Each exercise (except the first) is played in three speeds, each time doubling the speed of the previous rendition and doubling the number of repetitions. For example, the second exercise is played once in the first speed, twice in the second speed and four times in the third speed. The first exercise is played in four speeds, the first of which being half the speed of the other exercises.

* = exercise unique to the Karaikkudi style

1. //srgm/pd/ns//srgm/pd/ns//śrgm/pd/ñś//śndp/mg/rs//
 śndp/mg/rs//
2. //srgmpdnś/śndp/mgrs//
3. //srsrsrgm/srgm/pdnś//śnśnśndp/śndp/mgrs//
4. //srgsrgsr/srgm/pdnś//śndśndśn/śndp/mgrs//
5. //srgmsrgm/srgm/pdnś//śndpśndp/śndp/mgrs//
6. //srgmsrgm/srsr/srgm//srgmpdnś/śndp/śndp//
 śnśnśndp/śndp/mgrs//*
7. //srgmp.sr/srgm/pdnś//śndpm.śn/śndp/mgrs//
8. //srgmppsr/srgm/pdnś//śndpmmśn/śndp/mgrs//
9. //srgmpdsr/srgm/pdnś//śndpmgśn/śndp/mgrs//
10. //srgmpmgr/srgm/pdnś//śndpmpdn/śndp/mgrs//
11. //srgmpmdp/srgm/pdnś//śndpmpgm/śndp/mgrs//
12. //srgmp.gm/p.../p...//gmpdndpm/gmpg/mgrs//
 ś.ndn.dp/d.pm/p.mg//gmpdndpm/gmpg/mgrs//
 śśndnndp/ddpm/ppmg//gmpdndpm/gmpg/mgrs//
 srgrg.gm/ppm./dpd./mpdpdndp/mpdp/mgrs//
 srgrgmgm/gmpm/pdpd/śndndpdp/mpmg/mgrs//

jan̄ta varisai

1. //ssrrggmm/ppdd/nnśś//śśnnddpp/mmgg/rrss//
2. //ssrrggmm/rrgg/mmpp//ggmmppdd/mmpp/ddnn//ppddnnśś/śśnn/ddpp//
nnddppmm/ddpp/mmgg//ppmmggrr/mmgg/rrss//
3. //s.ssr.rr/g.gg/m.mm//p.ppd.dd/n.nn/ś.śś//ś.śśn.nn/d.dd/p.pp//
m.mmg.gg/r.rr/s.ss//
4. //s.ssr.rr/g.gg/m.mm//r.rrg.gg/m.mm/p.pp//g.ggm.mm/p.pp/d.dd//
m.mmp.pp/d.dd/n.nn//p.ppd.dd/n.nn/ś.śś//ś.śśn.nn/d.dd/p.pp//
n.nnd.dd/p.pp/m.mm//d.ddp.pp/m.mm/g.gg//p.ppm.mm/g.gg/r.rr//
m.mmg.gg/r.rr/s.ss//
5. //ssssrrrr/gggg/mmmm//ppppdddd/nnnn/śśśś//śśśśnnnn/dddd/pppp//
mmmmgggg/rrrr/ssss//
6. //ssssrrrr/gggg/mmmm//rrrrgggg/mmmm/pppp//ggggmmmm/pppp/dddd//
mmmmpppp/dddd/nnnn//ppppdddd/nnnn/śśśś//śśśśnnnn/dddd/pppp//
nnnndddd/pppp/mmmm//ddddpppp/mmmm/gggg//ppppmmmm/gggg/rrrr//
mmmmgggg/rrrr/ssss//
7. //s.sr.rgg/ssrr/ggmm//r.rg.gmm/rrgg/mmpp//g.gm.mpp/ggmm/ppdd//
m.mp.pdd/mmpp/ddnn//p.pd.dnn/ppdd/nnśś//ś.śn.ndd/śśnn/ddpp//
n.nd.dpp/nndd/ppmm//d.dp.pmm/ddpp/mmgg//p.pm.mgg/ppmm/ggrr//
m.mg.grr/mmgg/rrss//
8. //ssssrrrgg/ssrr/ggmm//rrrgggmm/rrgg/mmpp//ggggmmpp/ggmm/ppdd//
mmmmppdd/mmpp/ddnn//pppddnn/ppdd/nnśś//śśśnnndd/śśnn/ddpp//
nnndddpp/nndd/ppmm//dddpmm/ddpp/mmgg//ppppmmgg/ppmm/ggrr//
mmmgggrr/mmgg/rrss//
9. //srrgrggm/ssrr/ggmm//rggmgmpp/rrgg/mmpp//gmmpmpd/ggmm/ppdd//
mppdpddn/mmpp/ddnn//pddndnnś/ppdd/nnśś//śnnnddp/śśnn/ddpp//
nddpdppm/nndd/ppmm//dppmpmmg/ddpp/mmgg//pmmgmgr/ppmm/ggrr//
mggrgrrs/mmgg/rrss//
10. //sr.rg.sr/.rg./srg./srg.srrg/gmsr/rggm//rg.gm.rg/.gm./rgm.//
rgm.rggm/mprg/gmmp//gm.mp.gm/.mp./gmp./gmp.gmmp/pdgm/mppd//
mp.pd.mp/.pd./mpd./mpd.mppd/dnmp/pddn//pd.dn.pd/.dn./pdn.//
pdn.pddn/nśpd/dnnś//śn.nd.śn/.nd./śnd./śnd.śnnd/dpśn/nddp//
nd.dp.nd/.dp./ndp./ndp.nddp/pmnd/dppm//dp.pm.dp/.pm./dpm.//
dpm.dppm/mgdp/pmmg//pm.mg.pm/.mg./pmg./pmg.pmmg/grpm/mggr//
mg.gr.mg/.gr./mgr./mgr.mggr/rsmg/grrs//

alaṅkāram

1. dhrūva tāḷa

//srgm/gr/srgr/srgm//rgmp/mg/rgmg/rgmp//gmpd/pm/gmpm/gmpd//
mpdn/dp/mpdp/mpdn//pdnś/nd/pdnd/pdnś//śndp/dn/śndn/śndp//
ndpm/pd/ndpd/ndpm//dpmg/mp/dpmp/dpmg//pmgr/gm/pmgm/pmgr//
mgrs/rg/mgrg/mgrs//

2. maṭya tāḷa

//srgr/sr/srgm//rgmg/rg/rgmp//gmpm/gm/gmpd//mpdp/mp/mpdn//
pdnd/pd/pdnś//śndn/śn/śndp//ndpd/nd/ndpm//dpmp/dp/dpmg//
pmgm/pm/pmgr//mgrg/mg/mgrs//

3. rūpaka tāḷa

//sr/srgm//rg/rgmp//gm/gmpd//mp/mpdn//pd/pdnś//śn/śndp//
nd/ndpm//dp/dpmg//pm/pmgr//mg/mgrs//

4. jampa tāḷa

//srgsrgr/g/m.//rgmrgrg/m/p.//gmpgmgm/p/d.//mpdmpmp/d/n.//
pdnpdpd/n/ś.//śndśnśn/d/p.//ndpndnd/p/m.//dpmdpdp/m/g.//
pmgpmpm/g/r.//mgrmgmg/r/s.//

5. tripuṭa tāḷa

//srg/sr/gm//rgm/rg/mp//gmp/gm/pd//mpd/mp/dn//pdn/pd/nś//
śnd/śn/dp//ndp/nd/pm//dpm/dp/mg//pmg/pm/gr//mgr/mg/rs//

6. aṭa tāḷa

//sr.g./s.rg./m./m.//rg.m./r.gm./p./p.//gm.p./g.mp./d./d.//
mp.d./m.pd./n./n.//pd.n./p.dn./ś./ś.//śn.d./ś.nd./p./p.//
nd.p./n.dp./m./m.//dp.m./d.pm./g./g.//pm.g./p.mg./r./r.//
mg.r./m.gr./s./s.//

7. eka tāḷa

//srgm//rgmp//gmpd//mpdn//pdnś//śndp//ndpm//dpmg//pmgr//mgrs//

APPENDIX II: Compositions

key: "name of composition," *rāga*, *tāla*, composer
,?, = information not available for particular item

I. Partial list of compositions Sambasiva Iyer taught to
Raajeswari Padmanabhan (according to Raajesari, Jan, 1988):

varṇa-s

"*calamēla*," *śaṅkarābharaṇam*, *aṭa*, Svati Tirunal
"*ērāṇāpai*," *tōḍi*, *ādi*, Patnam Subramania Iyer
"*intacalamu*," *kāmbhōji*, *aṭa*, Pallavi Gopalayyar
"*kanakāṅgi*," *tōḍi*, *aṭa*, Pallavi Gopalayyar
"*sāmininnē*," *śaṅkarābharaṇam*, *ādi*, Vina Kuppayyar
"*sarasijanābha*," *kāmbhōji*, *aṭa*, Vadivelu
"*vanajākṣi*," *kalyāṇi*, *aṭa*, Pallavi Gopalayyar
"*viribhōṇi*," *bhairavi*, *aṭa*, Pacchimiriādiappayyar
"?", *rāgamalikā*, *aṭa*, ?

kṛitī-s, *kirtana-s* and other compositions

"*alaittuvāpōṭi*" (*patam*), *kalyāṇi*, *rūpaka*, Ghanam Krishna Ayyar
"*dāridāpulēka*," *sāvēri*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*edutanilacitē*," *śaṅkarābharaṇam*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*ēlanīdayarādu*," *aṭhāṇa*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*ēmi jēsītē*," *tōḍi*, *miśra chāpu*, Tyagaraja
"*entavēḍukondu*," *sarasvati manōhari*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*erundālpārādēvi*," *kāmbhōji*, *rūpaka*, Maruvai Chidambara Bharati
"*evarimāṭa*," *kāmbhōji*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*gurumaikaruṇa*," *maṅgalakaisika*, ?, ?
"*jagadānandakā*," *nāṭa*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*kaddanuvāriki*," *tōḍi*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*kañjadalāyatākṣi*," *kamalamanōhari*, *ādi*, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
"*kārttikēyamūrtti*," *sāvēri*, *ādi*, Kavikunjula Bharati
"*kripajūcutaku*," *chāyātaraṅgiṇi*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*ksinamaitiruga*," *mukhāri*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*lēmidelpa*," *pāvani*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*mājānaki*," *kāmbhōji*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*manatuyarai*," *dvi jāvanti*, *ādi*, Chidambara Bharati
"*mārubalka*," *śrī rañjani*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*munduvenugu*," *darbār*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*nāmorālakiñci*," *dhanyāsi*, *rūpaka*, Vina Kuppayyar
"*padavinī*," *sālagabhairavi*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*rāmanīsamāna*," *kharaharapriya*, *rūpaka*, Tyagaraja
"*śaṅkarinī*," *bēgaḍa*, *rūpaka*, Subbaraya Sastri
"*sarasasāmadāna*," *kāpi nārāyani*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja
"*sarasīruhāsana*," *nāṭa*, *ādi*, Puliyur Doraiswamy Ayyar
"*śrikāntanī*," *bhavapriya*, *ādi*, Tyagaraja

"*śrī varalakṣmi*," *śrī*, rūpaka, Muttuswami Dikshitar
 "*tanayunibrōva*," *bhairavi*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*vanajāsana*," *śrī*, rūpaka, Subbaraya Sastri
 "*vantanakantanai*" (*patam*), *bhairavi*, rūpaka, ?
 "*varanārada*," *vijayaśrī*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*vēlavarē*" (*patam*), *bhairavi*, ādi, Ghanam Krishnayyar

II. Songs Sambasiva Iyer taught to Ranganayaki Rajagopalan:

varṇa-s

"*sāmininnē*," *śaṅkarābharāṇam*, ādi, Vīna Kuppayyar
 "*vanajākṣi*," *kalyāṇi*, āta, Pallavi Gopalayyar
 "*viribhōṇi*," *bhairavi*, āta, Pacchimiriādiappayyar
 "?", *rāgamalikā*, āta, ?

kṛiti-s, kīrtana-s, and other compositions

"?", *kāpi*, ?, Chidambara Bharati
 "?", *saurāṣṭram*, ?, Muttutandavar
 "*alaittuvāpōṭi*" (*patam*), *kalyāṇi*, rūpaka, Ghanam Krishna Ayyar
 "*ālakalallāḍaga*," *madhyamāvati*, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "*ampa karuṇai*" (*sp?*), *bēgaḍa*, *tripuṭa*, Chidambara Bharati
 "*anādhudānugānu*," *jīṅglā*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*anurāgamulēni*," *sarasvati*, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "*appārāmbhakti*," *pantuvārāli*, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "*ayya ragurama*" (*sp?*), *mukhāri*, ?, Arunachalam Kavirayar
 "*bhajarē gōpāla*," *cēñjurūti*, ?, Sadasiva Brahmendra
 "*bhavanuta*," *mōhana*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*brōvasamayamu*," *punnāgavarāli*, ādi, Shyama Sastry
 "*cakkanirāja*," *kharaharapriya*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*canitōḍitēvē*," *harikāmbhōji*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*daridāpūlēka*," *sāvēri*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*darinitelusukōṇṭi*," *śuddasāvēri*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*dolorē*," *khamās jilla*, ādi, ?
 "*eduṭānilacitē*," *śaṅkarābharāṇam*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*ēlanīdayarādu*," *aṭhāṇa*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*ēmi jēsītē*," *tōḍi*, *miśra chāpu*, Tyagaraja
 "*ennaḍudaya vaccūṇō*," *balahamsa*, rūpaka, Patnam Subramanya Iyer
 "*endukaugalinturā*," *śuddadēśi*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*entabhāgyamu*," *sāranga*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*entavēḍukondu*," *sarasvati manōhari*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*erundālpārādēvi*," *kāmbhōji*, rūpaka, Maruvai Chidambara Bharati
 "*evaraiṇālērā*," *siddhasēna*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*evarimāṭa*," *kāmbhōji*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "*gānalōlā karuṇa*" (*sp?*) [*pallavi*], *tōḍi*, (ādi?), ?
 "*iṅgē nīr vantā*" (*sp?*), *navarōj*, ?, Chidambara Bharati
 "*inta telisi*" [*pallavi*], *bilahari*, (*m. chāpu* ?), (*Kshetragna* ?)
 "*itaradaivamulavalla*," *chāyātaraṅgiṇi*, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "*jagadānandakā*," *nāṭa*, ādi, Tyagaraja

"jānakīramaṇa," *śuddha simantini*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "janmamenduku," *malayamārutam*, ādi, Patnam Subramanya Iyer
 "kaddanuvāriki," *tōḍi*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "kālaharanamēlarā," *śuddhasāvēri*, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "kanakasabhēṣa" (sp?), *sāvēri*, ?, ?
 "kañjadalāyatākṣi," *kamalamanōhari*, ādi, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
 "kanugōṭṭini," *bilahari*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "kārttikēyamūrtti," *sāvēri*, ādi, Kavikunjula Bharati
 "karuṇai purintu," *nāṭakurañji*, tripuṭa, Chidambara Bharati
 "karuṇāsamudra," *dēvagāndhāri*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "kommarō" [*jāvali*], *khamās*, ādi, Dharmapura Subbarayar
 "kridatamaduvana" (sp?), *hambir* (?), ?, ?
 "kripajūcutaku," *chāyātaraṅgiṇi*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "kṣiṇamaitiruga," *mukhāri*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "lēmidelpa," *pāvani*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "lēkanāninnu," *asāvēri*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "mācil vīnaiyum" [*tēvāram*], *yadukulakāmbhōji*, tripuṭa, Appar (text) and
 Karaikkudi Subbarama Iyer (music)
 "mājānaki," *kāmbhōji*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "mākēlarā vicāramu," *ravicandrika*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "manasuviṣayanata," *nāṭakurañji*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "manatuyarai," *dvijāvanti*, ādi, Chidambara Bharati
 "manitaṅgu" (sp?) [*kummippāṭṭu*], *rāgamālika*, *tiśra*, Chidambara Bharati
 "marivēredikkeva," *ṣaṇmukhapriya*, ādi, Patnam Subramanya Iyer
 "marivērēgati," *ānandabhairavi*, *miśra chāpu*, Shyama Sastry
 "mārubbalka," *śrī rañjani*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "mīnakṣi mēmudam," *pūrvikalyāṇi*, ādi, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
 "muddumomu ēlāgu," *sūryakāntam*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "munduvenugu," *darbār*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "nādabindu kaladi" (sp?) [*tēvāram*], *ceñcuruti*, ?, ?
 "naḍacinadaci," *kharaharapriya*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "nāmorālakiñci," *dhanyāsi*, rūpaka, Vina Kuppayyar
 "nandaya gōvinda" (sp?), *khamās*, ?, ?
 "nārada gurusvāmī," *darbār*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "nenaruñcinānu," *māḷavi*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "nija marmamulanu," *umābharaṇam*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "ninnujeppakāraṇa," *mandāri*, ādi, Patnam Subramanya Iyer
 "nīpadapaṅkajamulanu," *bēgada*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "nrityati nrityati," *śaṅkarābharaṇam*, ādi, Swati Tirunal
 "olamitu curumpu" (sp?) [*tirupukal*], *sindhu bhairavi*, ?, Arunagirinatar (text)
 "ōrajūpucūcēdi," *kannādagaula*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "orukkāl śivacitamparam," *śaṅkarābharaṇam*, ādi, Muttutandavar
 "padavinī," *sālagabhairavi*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "pāhi pāhi," *bhāuli*, ādi (?), Narayana Tirtha (text?)
 "paradēvi," *surati*, rūpaka, Vina Kuppayyar
 "pralayapayō" (sp?) [*aṣṭapadi*], *pūrvikalyāṇi*, ?, Jayadeva (text)
 "raghupatērāma," *sahāna*, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "rāmabhakti," *śuddhabaṅgāḷa*, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "rāmacandram bhāvayāmi," *vasanta*, rūpaka, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
 "rāmacandrena," *māñji*, rūpaka, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
 "rāmanāmasuddhārāsa," *darbāri kānaḍa*, ādi, Purandaradasa (text)
 "rāmanīsamāna," *kharaharapriya*, rūpaka, Tyagaraja

"sahaiyayarim" (sp?) [tēvāram], māmālavagaula, ?, ?
 "śaṅkarakailāsapatē" (sp?) [pallavi], māmālavagaula, ?, ?
 "śaṅkarinī," bēgaḍa, rūpaka, Subbaraya Sastri
 "śāntamulēka," sāmā, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "sarasaśamadāna," kāpi nārāyaṇi, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "sarasīruhāsana," nāṭa, ādi, Puliyur Doraiswamy Ayyar
 "sārvabhauma," rāgapāñjaram, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "śōbhillu saptasvara," jaganmohini, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "smaraṇē sukham," janarañjani, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "śrikāntanī," bhavapriya, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "śrī madurāpuravāsini," śahāna, rūpaka, ?
 "śrīmāninīmanōhara," pūrṇaśadjam, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "śrīpatē nīpadacintanē," nāgasvarāvali, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "śrī vakulamahi (sp?), " ārabhi, ādi, ?
 "śrī varalakṣmī," śrī, rūpaka, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
 "svararāgasudhā," śaṅkarābharaṇam, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "śyāmasundarāṅga," dhanyāsi, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "tanayunibrōva," bhairavi, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "tarakabrima svarupini" (sp?) [pallavi], kalyāṇi, ?, ?
 "tattvamēruḡa," garuḍadhvani, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "telisirāma," pūrṇacāndrika, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "tinisira" (sp?) [bhajan], ceñjuruti, ādi, Tukaram
 "uttakurilē" [siddhar pāṭṭu], ceñjuruti, ādi, ?
 "vanajāsana," śrī, rūpaka, Subbaraya Sastri
 "vantanakantanai" (patam), bhairavi, rūpaka, ?
 "varanārada," vijayaśrī, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "vātāpigaṇapatim," hamsadhvani, ādi, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
 "vēlavarē" (patam), bhairavi, ādi, Ghanam Krishnayyar
 "vidulaku mrokkeḍa," māmālavagaula, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "vinarādanāmanavi," dēvagāndhāri, ādi, Tyagaraja

III. Partial list of Songs Subbarama Iyer taught to Meenakshi Ammal

varṇa-s (rāga-s)

āhiri
 āthāṇā
 bhairavi
 bilahari
 kalyāṇi
 kāmbhōji
 mōhana
 nāṭa
 śaṅkarābharaṇam
 tōḍi
 yaḍukulakāmbhōji

kṛiti-s kirtana-s and other compositions

"alaittuvāpōṭi" (patam), kalyāṇi, rūpaka, Ghanam Krishna Ayyar
 "amba nilāyatākṣi," nilāmbari, ādi, Muttuswamy Dikshitar

"anādhudānugānu," jīṅglā, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "bālalōcana," dhanyāsi, ādi, Muthiah Bhagvatar
 "brōvasamayamu," punnāgavarāli, ādi, Shyama Sastry
 "cakkanirāja," kharaharapriya, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "cēsinadella," tōḍi, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "dharma samvardhaṇi," (madhyamāvatī ?), (rūpaka ?), (Muttuswami Dikshitar ?)
 "darinitelusukonti," śuddhasāvēri, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "dudukugala," gaṭṭa, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "edutānilacitē," śaṅkarābharaṇam, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "ēlanidayarādu," athāṇa, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "ēmi jēsitē," tōḍi, miśra chāpu, Tyagaraja
 "ennaḍudaya vaccunō," balahamsa, rūpaka, Patnam Subramanya Iyer
 "endarōmahānubhāvulu," śrī, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "entavēdukundu," sarasvatī manōhari, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "erundālpāradēvi," kāmbohji, rūpaka, Maruvai Chidambara Bharati
 "evarani," dēvāmratavarsini, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "evarimāta," kāmbohji, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "gurumaikaruṇa," maṅgalakaisika, ?, ?
 "guruvaipanindu" (sp?), madhyamāvatī, ādi, ?
 "jagadānandakā," nāṭa, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "kaddanuvāriki," tōḍi, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "kālaharaṇamēlarā," śuddhasāvēri, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "kanakasabhēsa" (sp?), sāvēri, ?, ?
 "kanakśrī," punnāgavarāli, ?, ?
 "kañjadalāyatākṣi," kamālanāhari, ādi, Muttuswami Dikshitar
 "kanugontini," bilahari, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "kārttikēyamūrtti," sāvēri, ādi, Kavikunjula Bharati
 "karuṇāsamudra," dēvagāndhāri, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "koluvamaregadā," tōḍi, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "kommarō" [jāvali], khamās, ādi, Dharmapura Subbarayar
 "kṣiṇamaitiruga," mukhāri, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "lēkananinnu," asāvēri, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "mācil vīnaiyum" [tēvāram], yadukulakāmbohji, tripuṭa, Appar (text) and
 Karaikkudi Subbarama Iyer (music)
 "mājānaki," kāmbohji, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "mākēlarā vicāramu," ravicandrika, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "manitaṅgu" (sp?) [kummippāttu], rāgamālika, tiśra, Chidambara Bharati
 "manatuyarai," dvijāvanti, ādi, Chidambara Bharati
 "marivērēgati," ānandabhairavi, miśra chāpu, Shyama Sastry
 "marubāri" [jāvali], ceñjuruti, rūpaka, Dharmapura Subbarayar
 "marugēlarā," jayantaśrī, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "marulu konna," (khamās ?), (ādi ?), (Poochi Srinivasa Iyengar ?)
 "māyē," ?, ?, ?
 "mīnakṣi mēmudam," pūrvikalyāṇi, ādi, Muttuswami Dikshitar
 "mokṣamugaladā," saramati, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "naḍācināḍaci," kharaharapriya, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "nagumomu ganalēni," ābhēri, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "nāmorālakiñci," dhanyāsi, rūpaka, Vina Kuppayyar
 "nanu pālampa," mohana, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "nībhajanagāna," nāyaki, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "nīlakantham bhajēham," kēdaragaṭṭa, rūpaka, Muttuswami Dikshitar
 "nrityati nrityati," śaṅkarābharaṇam, ādi, Swati Tirunal

"ōrajūpucūcēdi," kannadagauḷa, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "pāhi pāhi," bhauli, ādi (?), Narayana Tirtha (text?)
 "pāhi śrī," ānandabhairavi, ?, ?
 "paradēvi," suraṭi, rūpaka, Vina Kuppayyar
 "pralāyapayō" (sp?) [aṣṭapadi], pūrvikalyāṇi, ?, Jayadeva (text)
 "rādhikā kṛṣṇa" [aṣṭapadi], ?, ?, Jayadeva
 "rāmacandram bhāvayāmi," vasanta, rūpaka, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
 "rāmacandreṇa," māñji, rūpaka, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
 "rāmānīpai," kēdāram, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "sādhincenē," ārabhi, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "sambho mahadēva" (sp?), ?, ?, ?
 "śaṅkarinī," bēgaḍa, rūpaka, Subbaraya Sastri
 "sarasasāmadāna," kāpi nārāyaṇi, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "sārasasamamukha," khamās, ādi, Swati Tirunal
 "sarasīruhānana rāma," mukhāri, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "sarasīruhāsana," nāṭa, ādi, Puliyur Doraiswamy Ayyar
 "sītamma māyamma," lālita, rūpaka, Tyagaraja
 "śrī jagadambika" (sp?), ?, ?, ?
 "śrī madurāpuravāsini," śahāna, rūpaka, ?
 "śrī raghura" (sp ?), ārabhi, ?, ?
 "śrī raghuvara" (sp?), ?, ?, ?
 "śrī rāma jayarāma," (madhyamāvatī ?), (ādi ?), (Tyagaraja ?)
 "śrī vakulamahi" (sp?), ārabhi, ādi, ?
 "śrī varalakṣmi," śrī, rūpaka, Muttuswami Dikshitar
 "svararāgasudhā," śaṅkarābharaṇam, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "tanayunibrōva," bhairavi, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "vanajāsana," śrī, rūpaka, Subbaraya Sastri
 "varanārada," vijayaśrī, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "vātāpigaṇapatim," hamsadhvani, ādi, Muttuswamy Dikshitar
 "vēlavarē" (patam), bhairavi, ādi, Ghanam Krishnayyar
 "vērevvarēgati," suraṭi, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "vidulaku mrokkeda," māyāmālāvagaḷa, ādi, Tyagaraja
 "vīṇaiyaḍi" (sp?), ?, ?, ?
 "yocana kamala lōcana," darbār, ādi, Tyagaraja

Appendix III

Analytical Index of Taped Examples

The following index contains timings for each example on cassettes 1-10. Some examples are divided into sections labeled with letters A, B etc. which can be matched to the *tāla aṅga*-s (sections). Successive subscripts of particular letters indicate successive elaborations (i.e. from one *saṅgati* to the next) of the melodic fragments signified by those letters. Use of different letters in analogous contexts (in the structure of the *tāla*) indicates substantially different melodic content. Use of prime, double primes and triple primes indicates relatively minor differences.

For example, in *ādi tāla*, '//A/B/C//' means all sections 'A' (whether A₁, A₂' or any other version) represent segments of *saṅgati*-s which occupy the *laghu* of the *tāla*, sections 'B' occupy the first *drutam*, and sections 'C', the second *drutam*.

A sequence of *saṅgati*-s which differ from one another by differences in the second *drutam* of the *tāla* might be notated as:

<i>saṅgati</i> #	Structure	Time
1.	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁	0:00
2.	A ₁ B ₁ C ₂	1:00
3.	A ₁ B ₁ C ₃	2:00

If, for example, the fourth *saṅgati* introduces an entirely new (melodic) section in the first *drutam*, and if the 'C' section were played as in C₃ but with a slightly different *gamaka*, the fourth *saṅgati* would be notated,

4. A₁D₁C₃'

In some cases the same letters will be used for several examples of the same composition played by different performers. In such circumstances the notation becomes a bit more complicated. For example, a minor variation of C₃' (which incorporates C₃') might be notated (C₃')' to differentiate it from a minor variation which builds on C₃, which might be notated C₃" or C₃'''. All such analyses have obviously required my own interpretations of what variations are of greater and lesser importance. Where such differences are pertinent to my discussion of style, I have elaborated about them in the main body of this thesis. Elsewhere, my (letter) analysis is intended as a general guide to the examples--instead of a detailed transcription.

Timings are in minutes and seconds counted from the beginning of a particular side of a tape (eg. 8:21 means 8 minutes and 21 seconds into the tape).

Tape 1

Title: Techniques and *ciṭṭasvara*-s

Example #	Description	Time
Side A		
1.	Excerpt of <i>sarasiruhā</i> performed by Chittbabu (demonstrates relative absence of <i>aluttam</i>). Year: 1982	0:00
2.	Excerpt of <i>sarasiruhā</i> performed by Karaikkudi Sambasiva Iyer and disciples (demonstrates <i>aluttam</i>). Late 1950's	1:07
3.	Example of <i>sphurita</i> technique performed by the author. 1988	2:19
4.	Example of the <i>pratyāhata</i> technique performed by the author. 1988	2:42
5.	Example of the "sparkling <i>sphurita</i> " technique performed by the author. 1989	3:05
Side B		
	Name of composition in which <i>ciṭṭasvara</i> appears, <i>rāga</i> , <i>tāla</i> , performer, date of recording.	
1.	" <i>kanuṅṇi</i> ," <i>bilahari</i> , <i>ādi</i> , Sashikala Suryanarayana, 1983	0:00
2.	" <i>yocana kamala lōcana</i> ," <i>darbār</i> , <i>ādi</i> , Lakshmi Ammal, 1983	0:33
3.	" <i>rāmacandram bhāvayāmi</i> ," <i>vasanta</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, c. 1984	1:12
4.	" <i>nāmorālakiñci</i> ," <i>dhanyāsi</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, c. 1984	2:24
5.	" <i>śōbhillu saptasvara</i> ," <i>jaganmōhini</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, c. 1984	4:11
6.	" <i>alaittuvāpōti</i> ," <i>kalyāṇi</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.	5:30
7.	" <i>śrī madurāpuravāsini</i> ," <i>śahāna</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.	6:21
8.	" <i>erundālpāradēvi</i> ," <i>kāmbōji</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.	7:17

9. "śrī varalakṣmi," śrī, rūpaka, 8:11
Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, c. 1984.

Tape 2

Title: *sarālī varisai* and *jaṇṭa varisai*

Example #	Exercise # (according to Appendix I), performer, date of recording. notes.	Time
-----------	---	------

Side A: *sarālī varisai*

- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 1. | 1, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.
4 speeds. On fourth speed
exercise is repeated only 4 times
(not 8) for the sake of this recording | 0:00 |
| 2. | 1, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983
4 speeds | 4:00 |
| 3. | 2, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983
4 speeds | 8:36 |

[most of the remaining examples of *sarālī* and *jaṇṭa* are played in 3 speeds with the number of repetitions reduced for the sake of this recording; thus, the first speed and second speed are played once and the third speed twice (instead of once, twice and four times)]

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-------|
| 4. | 3, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 10:04 |
| 5. | 4, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 10:50 |
| 6. | 5, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 11:41 |
| 7. | 6, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 12:28 |
| 8. | 7, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 13:55 |
| 9. | 8, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 14:41 |
| 10. | 9, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 15:27 |
| 11. | 10, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 16:13 |
| 12. | 11, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 16:59 |
| 13. | 12, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 17:46 |
| 14. | 12, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988 | 22:01 |

jaṇṭa varisai

15.	1, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983	25:49
16.	2, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983	26:39
17.	3, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983	29:46
18.	4, Lakshmi Ammal, 1983	31:26
19.	5, Lakshmi Ammal and Sugantha Sridharan, 1983.	35:54
20.	6, Lakshmi Ammal and Sugantha Sridharan, 1983.	37:32

Side B

1.	7, Lakshmi Ammal and Sugantha Sridharan, 1983.	0:00
2.	8, Lakshmi Ammal and Sugantha Sridharan, 1983.	4:46
3.	9, Lakshmi Ammal and Sugantha Sridharan, 1983.	8:51
4.	10, Lakshmi Ammal and Sugantha Sridharan, 1983.	12:55
5.	9, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988	21:36
6.	10, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988	25:13

Tape 3

Title: *alankāra* and *gīta*

Side A

alankāra-s performed by Lakshmi Ammal in 3 speeds (ordinarily the first speed is played once, second speed twice, and third speed three times. For this recording the second speed is played once and the third speed twice). Recordings from 1983.

Example #	<i>tāla</i>	Time
1.	<i>dhrūva</i>	0:00
2.	<i>matya</i>	3:14

3.	<i>rūpaka</i>	5:35
4.	<i>jampa</i>	7:01
5.	<i>tripuṭa</i>	9:29
6.	<i>aṭa</i> (part of 1st speed missing)	11:12

gīta-s

Example #	Name of <i>gīta</i> , <i>rāga</i> , <i>tāla</i> , performer, year of recording.	Time
7.	" <i>śrī gaṇanāda</i> ," <i>malahari</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.	14:51
8.	" <i>śrī gaṇanāda</i> ," <i>malahari</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Sugantha Sridharan, 1983.	19:50
9.	" <i>padmanābha</i> ," <i>malahari</i> , <i>tripuṭa</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.	26:50
10.	" <i>ānalēkara</i> ," <i>suddha sāvēri</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.	34:05
11.	" <i>sakalasurada</i> ," <i>gaṇa</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.	37:29
12.	" <i>āreyānaka</i> ," <i>nāṭa</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.	41:05

Side B

1.	" <i>āreyānaka</i> ," <i>nāṭa</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Raajeswari Padmanabhan, 1988.	0:00
2.	" <i>āreyānaka</i> ," <i>nāṭa</i> , <i>rūpaka</i> , Meenakshi Ammal, 1988.	3:37
3.	" <i>mīnākṣi</i> ," <i>śrī</i> , <i>tripuṭa</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988.	9:25
4.	" <i>mīnākṣi</i> ," <i>śrī</i> , <i>tripuṭa</i> , Raajeswari Padmanabhan, 1988.	15:21
5.	" <i>mīnākṣi</i> ," <i>śrī</i> , <i>tripuṭa</i> , Meenakshi Ammal, 1988.	20:33

* * * * *

6. "viribhōṇi," (*varṇam*), *bhairavi rāga*, 26:06
aṭa tāḷa, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan
 and Raajeswari Padmanabhan (e. 1960's)

Tape 4

Title: Famous items in the Karaikkudi style

Example #	Name of item, performer, year	Time
Side A		
1.	<i>nāṭa rāga ālāpana</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1986.	0:00
2.	<i>nāṭa tānam</i> , Ranganayaki Rajagopalan 1986.	5:32
3.	" <i>sarasīruhā</i> ," Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Raajeswari Padmanabhan, early 1960's.	11:55
4.	" <i>sarasasāmadāna</i> ," Sambasiva Iyer and disciples, late 1950's.	18:36
5.	" <i>varanārada</i> ," Sambasiva Iyer and disciples, late 1950's.	23:17
6.	" <i>ninnu jeppa</i> ," Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Raajeswari Padmanabhan, early 1960's.	28:15
7.	" <i>manitaṅgu</i> ," Sashikala Suryanarayana, 1988.	32:36

Side B	section	saṅgati #	structure	Time
1.	"entavēḍukondu," Chembai Vaidyanatha Bhagvatar, (1950's ?) [From broadcast of All India Radio, 26 Jan 1988].			
	<i>pallavi</i>			0:00
	<i>anupallavi</i>	1	C ₁ D ₁	1:20
		2	C ₂ D ₂	1:42
		3	C ₂ D ₃	2:04
	(new text)	1	C ₃ G ₁	2:37
	<i>caranam</i>			3:27

2. "entavēḍukondu," Ranganayaki Rajagopalan,
c. 1984. * = not repeated

<i>pallavi</i>			6:39
<i>anupallavi</i>	1	C ₁ E ₁	8:26
	2	C ₂ *	8:50
		C ₂ '*	8:56
	3	C ₃ *	9:02
		C ₃ F ₁	9:08
	4	C ₃ F ₂	9:32
(new text)	5	C ₃ F ₃	9:56
<i>caranam</i>			10:44

3. "kanugōṭṭini," Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 13:38
c. 1984 [*Sangeetha GMSC 6097*].

Tape 5

Title: 8 versions of "padavinī." 4 versions of "ēlanīdayarādu."

Side A: 8 versions of "padavinī."

Example #	Performer, date	Section	<i>saṅgati</i> #	Time
			(each is repeated except those marked with an asterisk)	

1. Ranganayaki Rajagopalan
and Raajeswari Padmanabhan,
early 1960's.

<i>pallavi</i>	1	0:00
	2	0:18
	3	0:35
<i>anupallavi</i>	1	1:02
	2	1:19
	3	1:35
<i>caranam</i>	1	2:13
	2	2:31
	3	2:50

2. Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1984

<i>pallavi</i>	1	3:33
	2	3:52
	3*	4:10
<i>anupallavi</i>	1	4:27
	2	4:45
	3	5:07
<i>caranam</i>	1	5:39
	2	5:57
	3	6:14

3. Sankari Ammal, late 1970's

<i>pallavi</i>	1	6:57
	2	7:21
	3	7:41
<i>anupallavi</i>	1	8:13
	2	8:32
	3	8:52
<i>caranam</i>	1	9:39
	2	9:57
	3	10:14

4. Meenakshi Ammal, late 1970's

<i>pallavi</i>	1	10:55
	2	11:14
	3	11:32
<i>anupallavi</i>	1	11:59
	2	12:15
	3	12:32
<i>caranam</i>	1*	13:07
	2*	13:14
	3	13:22

5. Sugantha Sridharan, 1985

<i>pallavi</i>	1	13:56
	2	14:12
	3	14:28
<i>anupallavi</i>	1	14:51
	2	15:06
	3	15:21
	4	15:37

	<i>caranam</i>	1	16:08
		2	16:22
		3	16:37
6.	Raajeswari Padmanabhan and Sri Vidya, 1985 (AIR)		
	<i>pallavi</i>	1	17:27
		2	17:43
		3	17:51
	<i>anupallavi</i>	1	18:14
		2	18:30
		3	18:45
		4*	19:01
	<i>caranam</i>	1	19:24
		2	19:39
		3	19:55
		4*	20:10
7.	Raajeswari Padmanabhan and Sri Vidya, 1985 (AIR)		
	<i>pallavi</i>	1	20:36
		2	20:56
		3	21:13
	<i>anupallavi</i>	1	21:40
		2	21:58
		3	22:16
		4*	22:36
	<i>caranam</i>	1	23:04
		2	23:22
		3(3 times)	23:31
8.	Semmangudi Srinivasa Iyer, [<i>Oriental Records BGRP 1015 1016</i>]		25:00
Side B	4 versions of "ēlanidayarādu."		
1.	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988		0:00
2.	Sashikala Suryanarayana, 1988		3:04
3.	Sugantha Sridharan, 1985		7:46
4.	Raajeswari Padmanabhan, 1988		12:20

Tape 6

Title: New Compositions. "Note"-s

Example # Composition, Performer, Year of recording Time

Side A New Compositions

- | | | |
|----|--|-------|
| 1. | "caraṇampāva," T. M. Tyagarajan, 1982 | 0:00 |
| 2. | "caraṇampāva," Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1985. | 5:12 |
| 3. | "dinamaṇivamśa," Maharajapuram Santhanam [Sangeetha 6ECDB 7077]. | 9:47 |
| 4. | "dinamaṇivamśa," Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988. | 15:51 |
| 5. | "ētāvunarā," Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1984 | 27:20 |
| 6. | "ētāvunarā," Raajeswari Padmanabhan, c. 1984 | 37:10 |

Side B "Note"-s

- | Example # | Performer, Year | "note" # | Time |
|-----------|--|----------|-------|
| 1. | Sambasiva Iyer, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, Raajesari Padmanabhan, late 1950's. | 1a | 0:00 |
| | | 1b | 2:15 |
| 2. | Meenakshi Ammal, 1988 | 1a | 3:27 |
| 3. | Lakshmi Ammal, 1983 | 1a | 5:29 |
| | | 3b | 8:41 |
| | (madhmāvatī rāga) | | 12:00 |
| 4. | Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988 | 1a | 12:55 |
| | | 4b | 14:25 |
| 5. | Sashikala Suryanarayana, 1988 | 4b | 15:24 |
| | | 5b | 17:23 |
| | | 5c | 19:25 |
| 6. | N. Chandramouli, 1983 | 6a | 21:51 |

Tape 7

1st four examples--pallavi of "sarasiruhā,"

key: (ādi tāla) // A / B / B continued // C / C cont. / C cont.//
f = filler. * = not repeated

Example #	Performer, Year	saṅgati #	structure	Time
1.	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Raajeswari Padmanabhan, early 1960's			
		1	A ₁ f*	0:00
			A ₁ 'f*	0:05
			A ₂ B ₁ *	0:12
			A ₁ 'B ₁ *	0:18
		2	A ₃ B ₁ '*	0:24
			A ₃ B ₁ 'C ₁ *	0:30
			A ₂ B ₁ C ₁ *	0:43
		3	A ₂ B ₁ C ₂	0:55
2.	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan 1984.			
		1	A ₁ '*	1:43
			A ₁ 'B ₁ "	1:50
		2	A ₃ (B ₁ ')'*	2:04
			A ₃ B ₁ 'C ₁ '*	2:11
			A ₂ B ₁ C ₁ '*	2:18
		3	A ₂ B ₁ C ₂ *	2:40
			A ₂ B ₁ "C ₂ *	2:55
3.	S. Mallika, 1988			
		1	(A ₁ ')'B ₁	3:28
		2	A ₃ B ₁ '	3:43
		3	A ₃ B ₂ *	3:57
			A ₃ B ₂ C ₁ '*	4:06
		4	A ₃ B ₃ C ₁ '*	4:22
			A ₃ B ₃ C ₂ *	4:36
4.	Raajeswari Padmanabhan [AVM MEI-SR 1076].			
		1	A ₁	5:07
			A ₁ D ₁	5:20
		2	A ₁ D ₂	5:32
		3	A ₁ 'D ₂ '*	5:45
			(A ₁ ')'D ₂ 'C ₁ "*	5:51
			A ₁ 'D ₂ 'C ₁ " *	6:03
		4	A ₁ 'D ₂ 'C ₂ *	6:16

Examples 5 and 6: 1st two *saṅgati*-s of "nāmorālakiñci,"
saṅgati 1 = A₁ and *saṅgati* 2 = A₂

5. Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1984

1	A ₁ *	6:46
	A ₁ '*	6:56
2	A ₂	7:06

6. Meenakshi Ammal, 1988

1	A ₁ "	7:42
2	A ₂ '	8:05

Examples 7 and 8: 1st two *saṅgati*-s of "ēmi jēsītē,"
miśra chāpu: A = 1st two *āvarta*-s of *saṅgati*
B = 2nd two *āvarta*-s of *saṅgati*

7. Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1984

1	A ₁ B ₁	8:45
2	A ₂ B ₁	9:07

8. Sugantha Sridharan, 1988

1	A ₁	9:50
	A ₁ ^f	10:16
	A ₁ B ₁ '	10:40
2	A ₂ 'B ₁ '*	11:05

Examples 9 and 10: 1st three *saṅgati*-s of "sāmininnē,"
ādi tāḷa, //A/B/B cont.//

9. Lakshmi Ammal, late 1970's

1	A ₁ B ₁	11:15
2	A ₂ B ₂	11:41
3	A ₃ B ₃ *	12:08
[new text 1	C etc.]	12:22

10. Sugantha Sridharan, 1985

1	A ₁ 'B ₁	12:35
2	A ₂ B ₁	13:05
3	A ₃ B ₃	13:34
[new text 1	C etc.]	14:04

11. *anupallavi* of "sāmininnē,"
Lakshmi Ammal, late 1970's
// A / B / C // letters do
not correspond to examples
9 and 10, but do relate to
examples 12 and 13. see text.

1	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ *	14:12
	A ₁ 'B ₁ C ₁	
2	A ₂ B ₁ 'C ₁ '	14:37
3	A ₂ 'B ₂ C ₂	15:03
	A ₂ 'B ₁ 'C ₀ *	15:31

12. *anupallavi* of "valaci vacci,"
Lakshmi Ammal, 1985, ādi tāḷa
// D / B / C // E / E cont. /
E cont. // Letters correspond
to ex. 11 and 13 (melodic, not
textual equivalence).

1	D ₁ B ₀ C ₀ *	15:47
	D ₁ B ₀ C ₀ E ₁ *	15:57
	[F]	16:08

13. *anupallavi* of "valaci vacci,"
Sugantha Sridharan, 1985

1	D ₁ B ₀ C ₀	16:27
2	D ₁ 'B ₁ 'C ₁ *	16:49
	D ₁ 'B ₁ 'C ₁ '*	17:01
	D ₁ 'B ₀ C ₀ *	17:12
[1]	E ₁ *	17:24
	E ₁ '*	17:36

Examples 14-17: *anupallavi* of "entavēḍukondu,"
ādi tāḷa,

key:

A ----- B -----
// / / //

// / / //

//
A ----- C -----
// / / //

//
D -----
// / / //

//

Example #	Performer, Year	saṅgati #	Structure	Time
14.	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1984.			
		1	A ₁ B ₁	18:00
		2	A ₁ C ₁	18:23
		3	A ₁ C ₁ '*	18:35
			A ₁ C ₁ 'D ₁	18:42
		4	A ₁ C ₁ 'D ₁ '	19:03
		5	A ₁ C ₁ 'D ₁ "	19:29
15.	Raajeswari Padmanabhan, 1988.			
		1	A ₁ B ₁ *	19:58
		2	A ₁ B ₁ '*	20:06
		3	A ₁ C ₁ *	20:15
		4	A ₁ C ₁ 'D ₁	20:21
		5	A ₁ C ₁ 'D ₁ '	20:30
		6	A ₁ C ₁ 'D ₁ "	20:39
16	Sugantha Sridharan, [from repetition of music from <i>anupallavi</i> in <i>caraṇam</i>], 1985.			
		1	A ₁ B ₁ *	21:19
		2	A ₁ C ₁ *	21:30
		3	A ₁ C ₁ '*	21:37
		4	A ₁ C ₁ "D ₁ *	21:42
		5	A ₁ C ₁ 'D ₁ '*	21:54
		6	A ₁ C ₁ 'D ₁ "	22:05
17	Sashikala Suryanarayana, 1988.			
		1	A ₁ (B ₁)'*	22:39
		2	A ₁ (C ₁)'*	22:50
		3	A ₁ (C ₁ ')'*	22:57
		4	A ₁ (C ₁ ")'D ₁ *	23:02
		5	A ₁ (C ₁ ")'D ₁ '*	23:13
		6	A ₁ (C ₁ ")'D ₁ "	23:25

Examples 18-20: *anupallavi* of "kanugoṇṭini,"
ādi tāḷa,

key:

A ----- B ----- C -----
 // / / //

E ----- F ----- G ----- H -----
 // / / //

Example #	Performer, Year	saṅgati #	Structure	Time
18	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan,			
		1	A ₁ f*	24:06
			A ₁ f'*	24:12
			A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ *	24:17
			A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ '*	24:22
		2	A ₁ B ₃ C ₂	24:27
		3	A ₁ B ₃ C ₂ '	24:38
	[new text]	1	E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ H ₁	24:49
		2	E ₁ 'F ₁ G ₂ H ₁ *	25:00
			E ₁ F ₁ G ₂ H ₁ *	25:05
		3	E ₁ F ₁ G ₃ H ₁	25:10
19	N. Chandramouli, 1983			
		1	A ₁ *	25:29
			A ₁ f"*	25:35
			A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ *	25:41
			A ₁ B ₁ (C ₁)'*	25:48
		2	A ₁ B ₃ (C ₂)'*	25:54
		3	A ₁ 'B ₄ (C ₂)'*	26:01
			A ₁ 'B ₄ C ₁ *	26:07
	[new text]	1	(E ₁)F ₁ G ₁ H ₁ *	26:14
			E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ H ₁ *	26:19
		2	E ₁ 'F ₁ G ₂ H ₁	26:26
		3	E ₁ 'F ₁ G ₃ H ₁	26:38
20	Sashikala Suryanarayana, 1983.			
		1	[]f*	26:55
			A ₁ f*	27:00
			A ₁ 'f	27:05
			A ₁ 'B ₁ (C ₁)'*	27:16
		2	A ₁ B ₂ (C ₁)'*	27:23
		3	A ₁ B ₃ (C ₂)'*	27:29
			A ₁ 'B ₃ (C ₂)'*	27:36
		4	A ₁ 'B ₄ (C ₂ ')"*	27:42
			A ₁ "B ₄ (C ₂ ')"*	27:48
			A ₁ 'B ₄ (C ₂ ')"*	27:54
	[new text]	1	E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ H ₁ *	28:01
			E ₁ F ₁ 'G ₁ H ₁ *	28:07
		2	E ₁ F ₁ G ₂ H ₁	28:13
		3	E ₁ 'F ₁ G ₃ H ₁	28:26

Tape 8

Examples 1 and 2: 1st two *saṅgati*-s of "rāmabāṇa,"
ādi tāḷa,

key: A-- B----
 // / / //

Example #	Performer, Year	<i>saṅgati</i> #	Structure	Time
1	Sashikala Suryanarayana, 1983.			
		1	A ₁ B ₁ *	0:13
		2	A ₁ B ₁ '*	0:27
			A ₁ 'B ₁ '*	0:40
2	Richard Wolf, 1988			
		1	A ₁ B ₁	1:08
		2	(A ₁)'B ₁ '	1:35

Examples 3 and 4: *cittasvara* in *vasanta rāga*, *rūpaka tāḷa*

3	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, c. 1984	2:17
4	Lakshmi Ammal, 1983	3:26

Ex. #	Performer, Description, Year	<i>saṅgati</i> #	Structure	Time
5	Lakshmi Ammal, <i>cittasvara</i> in <i>śrī rāga</i> , <i>rūpaka tāḷa</i> , 1983.			4:56
6	Sugantha Sridharan, <i>cittasvara</i> in <i>hamsadhvani rāga</i> , <i>ādi tāḷa</i> , 1985.			5:35
7	S. Sharmilla, <i>anupallavi</i> of "sarasīruhā," 1988.			
	A----- B -----			
	// / . . . / . . . //			
	C ----- D -----			
	// / . . . / . . . //			
		1	A ₁ ^f	6:18
			A ₁ ^f '	6:31
			A ₁ B ₁ *	6:44
			A ₁ 'B ₁ *	6:50
		2	A ₁ 'B ₂ *	7:00
			A ₁ B ₂	7:10
	[new text]	1	C ₁ D ₁	7:17
		2	C ₁ D ₁ '*	7:37

8

Lakshmi Ammal, excerpt from *caranam*
of "*sarasasāmadāna*," late 1970's.

A----- B -----
//.. .. / .. / .. // ..
C -----
//.. .. / .. / .. // ..

[]B ₁ *	7:47
A ₁ B ₁ *	7:52
C ₁ A ₁ 'B ₁ *	7:57
A ₂ B ₂ *	8:10
A ₂ B ₃ *	8:17
A ₂ 'B ₄ *	8:23
(A ₂ ')'B ₄ '*	8:31
[etc.]	

Examples 9-13: 1st two *saṅgati*-s of "*viribhōṇi*,"
aṭa tāla,

// A // B / C / D //

9

Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Raajeswari
Padmanabhan, early 1960's.

1	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ D ₁	8:45
2	A ₂ 'B ₁ 'C ₁ D ₁ '*	9:23
	A ₂ B ₁ 'C ₁ D ₁ '*	9:42

10

Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1984.

1	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ D ₁	10:14
2	A ₂ B ₁ 'C ₁ D ₁	10:58
	[etc.]	

11

Meenakshi Ammal, late 1970's

1	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ D ₁ *	11:47
2	A ₃ B ₁ 'C ₁ D ₁ *	12:04
	[etc.]	

12

Sankari Ammal, late 1970's

1	A ₁ 'B ₁ C ₁ D ₁ '*	12:30
	A ₁ "B ₁ 'C ₁ (D ₁ ')'*	12:53
2	A ₂ B ₁ "C ₁ D ₁ '*	13:13
	A ₂ 'B ₁ "C ₁ D ₁ *	13:32
	[etc.]	

13 Sugantha Sridharan, 1985

1	$A_1B_1C_1D_1^*$	13:59
	$A_1(B_1')'C_1(D_1)'^*$	14:25
2	$A_3'(B_1')'C_1(D_1)'$	14:43

Examples 14-18: 1st *saṅgati* of *caraṇam* of "viribhōṇi,"

A ----- B ----- C --- D --- E --- //
 // / .. / .. //

14 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan and Raajeswari
 Padmanabhan, early 1960's.

$A_1B_1C_1D_1E_1$	15:34
[etc.]	

15 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1984

$A_1B_1C_1D_1E_1$	16:21
[etc.]	

16 Meenakshi Ammal, late 1970's

$A_1'B_1C_1D_1E_2$	17:15
[etc.]	

17 Sankari Ammal, late 1970's

$A_1B_1C_1D_1E_2^*$	17:45
$(A_1')'B_1C_1D_1^*$	18:00
[1st <i>svara</i>]	18:16

18 Sugantha Sridharan, 1985

$A_1B_1C_1D_1E_2$	18:23
[etc.]	

Examples 19-20: *caraṇam* and 1st *svara* of "sāmininnē,"
 ādi tāḷa,

// A / B / C // [texted section]
 // D / E / F // [*svara* section]

19 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1984

1	$A_1B_1C_1$	19:00
2	$A_2B_2C_2$	19:26
3	$A_3B_2C_2$	19:51

	<i>svara</i> 1	D ₁ E ₁ F ₁ *	20:15
		A ₂ B ₂ C ₂ *	20:28
		D ₁ E ₁ F ₁ *	20:41
		[etc.]	

20 Sashikala Suryanarayana, 1985

	1	A ₁ 'B ₁ 'C ₁ '*	21:01
	2	A ₂ 'B ₂ C ₂ *	21:14
	3	A ₃ 'B ₂ C ₂ *	21:27
	<i>svara</i> 1	D ₁ 'E ₁ 'F ₁ '*	21:40
		(D ₁ ')'E ₁ 'F ₁ '*	21:55
		[etc.]	

Examples 21-23: "alaittuvāpoṭi," rūpaka tāla,

pallavi: // A // B // C // D //

anupallavi: // E // F // G // H //

svara: I ; *ciṭṭasvara*: J

caranam: K (8 āvarta-s) and L (4 avarta-s)

svara: M

21 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988

<i>pallavi</i>	1	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ D ₁ *	22:20
	2	A ₁ 'B ₂ C ₁ D ₁ *	22:30
	transition	A ₂ *	22:41
<i>anupallavi</i>	1	E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ H ₁ *	22:46
	2	E ₁ 'F ₂ G ₁ H ₁ *	22:57
	<i>svara</i>	I*	23:09
		I'*	23:19
	<i>ciṭṭasvara</i>	J*	23:29
	transition		24:11
<i>caranam</i>		K*	24:30
		L*	24:50
		M*	25:03
	transition and end		24:13

22 Sashikala Suryanarayana, 1988

<i>pallavi</i>	1	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ D ₁ *	25:34
	2	A ₁ 'B ₃ C ₁ D ₁ *	25:43
	transition	A ₂ '*	25:51

<i>anupallavi</i>	1	E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ H ₁ *	26:00
	2	E ₁ F ₃ G ₁ H ₁ '*	26:09
	<i>svara</i>	I*	26:18
	<i>cittasvara</i>	J*	26:26
	transition		27:01
<i>caranam</i>		K'*	27:18
		L*	27:38
		M*	27:46
		J*	27:54
	transition and end		28:28

23 Richard Wolf, 1988

<i>pallavi</i>	1	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ D ₁	28:47
	2	A ₁ 'B ₁ 'C ₁ D ₁	29:06
	3	A ₁ 'B ₃ C ₁ D ₁	29:25
	transition	A ₂ "	29:45
<i>anupallavi</i>	1	E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ H ₁	29:55
	2	E ₁ F ₂ 'G ₁ 'H ₁ '	30:15
	3	E ₁ F ₃ G ₁ 'H ₁ '	30:36
	<i>svara</i>	I	30:55
	<i>cittasvara</i>	J*	31:16
	transition		31:55
<i>caranam</i>		K	32:15
		L	33:01
		M	33:21
		J*	33:40
	transition and end		34:20

Side B

Examples 24-35: *pallavi* of "eduṭānilacitē," ādi tāḷa,

1st line // A / B / C //
 2nd line D-- E-- F-- G--
 // / . . / . . //

24 Sambasiva Iyer, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan
 Raajeswari Padmanabhan, 1950's (AIR
 Broadcast 2/19/83)

	1	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁	0:00
	2	A ₂ B ₂ C ₂	0:12
	3	A ₂ 'B ₃ C ₃	0:47
[new text]	1	D ₁ E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ *	1:11
		D ₁ 'E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ *	1:27

2	D ₁ 'E ₂ F ₁ G ₁	1:38
3	D ₁ 'E ₃ F ₂ G ₂ *	2:01
	D ₂ E ₃ F ₂ G ₂ *	2:07
transition	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ *	2:18

25 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1988 (Paris concert)

1	A ₁ B ₁ 'C ₁ *	2:39
	A ₁ (B ₁ ')'C ₁ *	2:51
2	A ₂ B ₂ 'C ₂	3:05
3	A ₂ 'B ₃ 'C ₃	3:28
[new text] 1	D ₁ E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ *	3:53
	D ₁ 'E ₁ F ₁ G ₁ *	4:12
2	D ₁ 'E ₂ F ₁ G ₁	4:21
3	D ₁ 'E ₃ F ₂ G ₂ *	4:43
	D ₂ E ₃ F ₂ G ₂ *	4:57
transition	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ *	5:08

26 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, 1985 (home)

1	A ₁ (B ₁ ')'C ₁	5:27
2	A ₁ B ₂ 'C ₂	5:52
3	A ₂ 'B ₃ 'C ₃	6:18
[new text] 1	D ₁ E ₁ F ₁ G ₁	6:43
2	D ₁ E ₂ F ₁ G ₁	7:08
3	D ₁ 'E ₃ F ₂ G ₂ *	7:33
	D ₂ E ₃ F ₂ G ₂ *	7:46
transition	A ₁ [etc.]	7:58

27 Lakshmi Ammal, V. Shanti and Sugantha
Sridharan (vocal), 1979.

1	A ₁ B ₁ C ₁	8:14
2	A ₂ B ₂ C ₂	8:26
3	A ₂ B ₃ C ₃	9:03
4	A ₂ 'B ₃ C ₃ *	9:28
[new text] 1	D ₁ E ₁ F ₁ G ₁	9:40
2	D ₁ E ₂ F ₁ G ₁	10:05
3	D ₁ E ₃ F ₂ G ₂	10:25
4	A ₂ "B ₃ C ₃ *	10:42
	D ₁ E ₃ F ₄ G ₃ *	10:53
transition	A ₁ [etc.]	11:18

28

Sankari Ammal, 1987

	1	$A_1B_1C_1$	11:38
	2	$A_2B_2C_2$	12:04
	3	$A_2'B_3C_3$	12:28
[new text]	1	$D_1E_1F_1(G_1)'*$	12:52
		$(D_1)'E_1F_1(G_1)'*$	13:04
	2	$(D_1)'E_2F_1(G_1)'$	13:16
	3	$(D_1)'E_3F_2G_2*$	13:39
transition		A_1 [etc.]	13:51

29

Raajeswari Padmanabhan and K. S.
Subramanian, 1975 [*Museum Collection*
Berlin (West) MC 8]

	1	$A_1(B_1)'C_1$	14:14
	2	$A_1(B_1)'C_{1.5}$	14:40
	3	$A_2B_2'C_2$	15:06
	4	$A_2'B_2'C_3$	15:32
[new text]	1	$D_1E_1F_1G_1$	15:44
	2	$D_1'E_2F_1G_1$	16:11
	3	$D_1'E_3F_2G_2*$	16:35
		$D_2E_3F_2G_2*$	16:47
	4	$D_2E_3F_4G_3*$	16:59
transition		A_1 [etc.]	17:11

30

Raajeswari Padmanabhan, 1988

	1	$A_1B_1C_1*$	17:32
		$A_1B_1'C_1*$	17:45
	2	$A_2B_2'C_2*$	17:57
	3	$A_2'B_3'C_3*$	18:10
[new text]	1	$D_1E_1F_1G_1*$	18:21
		$D_1''E_1F_1G_1*$	18:33
	2	$D_1''E_3F_2G_1*$	18:46
	3	$D_1''E_3F_4G_3*$	18:58
transition		A_1 [etc.]	19:09

31

Sugantha Sridharan, 1985
(slight technical problems in
this recording)

	1	$A_1(B_1)'C_1'$	19:26
	2	$A_1(B_1)''C_1'$	19:52
	3	$A_2B_2C_2*$	20:19
	4	$A_2'B_3C_3$	20:31
[new text]	1	$D_1E_1F_1G_1$	20:56
	2	$(D_1)'E_2F_1G_1$	21:36
	3	$(D_1)'E_3F_2G_1*$	22:04
	4	$(D_1)'E_3F_4G_3*$	22:16
transition		A_1 [etc.]	22:29

32	Vedavalli Srinivasan, 1970's		
	1	$A_1 B_1 C_{1.5}$	22:44
	2	$A_1 B_2 C_2$	23:11
	3	$A_2 "B_3 C_3$	23:37
	[new text] 1	$D_1 E_1 F_1 G_1^*$	24:04
		$D_1' E_1 F_1 G_1^*$	24:21
	2	$(D_1)' E_2' F_1 G_1$	24:28
	3	$(D_1)' E_2' F_2 G_2^*$	24:48
	transition	$A_2' [etc.]$	25:01
33	Chembai Vaidyanatha Bhagvatar [33 ESX 6009]		
	1	$A_1 B_1 C_{1.5}$	25:46
	2	$A_1' B_2 "C_2$	26:06
	3	$A_3 B_3 "C_3$	26:28
	[new text] 1	$D_1 E_1 F_1 G_1^*$	26:50
	2	$D_1 (E_2)' F_1' G_4^*$	27:01
	3	$D_1 (E_3)' F_1' G_5$	27:11
	transition	$A_1 [etc.]$	27:31
34	V. Ramachandran, 1981 (Univ. of Illinois)		
	1	$A_1 B_1 C_1$	27:44
	2	$A_1' (B_1) "C_{1.5}$	28:05
	3	$(A_2)' (B_1) " 'C_{1.5}$	28:25
	4	$(A_2')' B_3 C_3$	28:46
	[new text] 1	$D_1 E_1 F_1 G_1^*$	29:04
		$D_1' E_1 F_1 G_1^*$	29:15
	2	$D_1' E_2 F_1 G_1$	29:24
		$D_1' E_2 F_1 "G_1' ^*$	29:44
	3	$D_1 E_3 F_4 G_3$	29:54
	transition	$A_1 [etc.]$	30:12
35	T. R. Mahalingam, 1975		
	1	$A_1 B_1' C_1$	30:38
	2	$A_1 "B_1' C_1'$	31:06
	3	$A_1 "B_3 C_1'$	31:35
	[new text] 1	$D_1 E_1 F_1 ---^*$	32:03
		$D_1 (E_1) F_1 ---^*$	32:32
	2	$D_1' (E_2) F_1 " ' f^*$	32:39
		$A_1 "B_3 C_1' ^*$	32:49
	3	$D_1 E_3 F_6 f^*$	33:01
	transition	$A_1 [etc.]$	33:15

Tape 9

Title: Models and Improvisations

Examples 1-8: *ālāpana* in *bhairavi rāga*

Example #	Performer, (Description), Year	Time
1	Lakshmi Ammal, 1972	0:00
2	Raajeswari Padmanabhan, 1980's	1:19
	"Lakshmi Ammal motive" [i.e. phrase characteristic of Lakshmi Ammal's playing elaborated upon in Raajeswari's performance].	4:22 5:22 6:18 7:43 9:13
3	"Lakshmi Ammal motive" isolated from example 1.	16:54
4	Elaborated versions isolated from example 2.	17:10
5		17:28
6		17:40
7		18:09
8		18:39

Examples 9-12: *rāga ālāpana* in *kalyāṇi rāga*

9	Lakshmi Ammal, excerpted phrases, 1983	19:06
10	Sashikala Suryanarayana, excerpt, 1972	21:23
11	R. Sheela, excerpt, 1987	23:06
12	S. Mallika, excerpts, 1987	24:47

Examples 13-21: *rāga ālāpana* in *kāmbhōji rāga*

13	Lakshmi Ammal, early 1980's	26:48
14	Lakshmi Ammal, early 1980's	29:05
15	Lakshmi Ammal, early 1980's	32:37

16	Sashikala Suryanarayana, fragment, early 1980's	36:27
17	S. Mallika, 1987	37:39
18	Lakshmi Ammal, excerpt of basic phrase	40:13
19	Sashikala Suryanarayana, excerpt of basic phrase.	41:17
20	S. Mallika, excerpt of basic phrase.	41:52
21	Lakshmi Ammal, vocal <i>ālāpana</i> , late 1970's	42:48

Side B

1	Sambasiva Iyer, Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, last <i>kalpana svara</i> in performance of " <i>sarasīruhā</i> ," late 1950's.	0:00
2	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, <i>svara</i> from " <i>jagadānandakā</i> ," 1985.	1:37
3	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan, <i>svara</i> from " <i>jagadānandakā</i> ," 1985.	2:15
4	Excerpt from example 1	2:41
5	Excerpt from example 3	3:04
6	Excerpt from example 1	3:18
7	Excerpt from example 2	3:28
8	Excerpt from example 1 (<i>janṭa</i> phrases)	3:40

Tape 10

Title: *kalyāṇi rāga*: Ranganayaki and Raajeswari

Side A Raajeswari Padmanabhan

Example #	Performer, Description	Time
1	Raajeswari Padmanabhan, <i>ālāpana</i> and <i>tānam</i> , AIR Madras 1983	0:00
2a	Characteristic motive (3 examples)	18:27
2b		18:42
2c		18:55

3a	<i>tānam</i> phrases in <i>ālāpana</i> (3 examples)	19:09
3b		19:36
3c		19:53
4a	Characteristic <i>gamaka</i> -s (3 examples)	20:19
4b		20:26
4c		20:32
5	Repetition	20:41
6	Link between <i>ālāpana</i> and <i>tānam</i>	21:02
7	3 <i>sthāyi tānam</i> cadence	21:44
Side B	Ranganayaki Rajagopalan	
1	<i>ālāpana</i> and <i>tānam</i> , 1980's	0:00
2a	Characteristic motive (3 examples)	12:35
2b		12:43
2c		12:53
3a	Characteristic <i>gamaka</i> -s (3 examples)	13:03
3b		13:15
3c		13:24
4	Link between <i>ālāpana</i> and <i>tānam</i>	13:39
5a	Repetition (2 examples)	14:35
5b		14:55
6	Ending of <i>tānam</i>	15:28

GLOSSARY

Language from which script is transcribed, and or language from which term is derived is indicated in brackets:

Tamil = T
Telugu = Tel
Sanskrit = Skt

<i>ācāri</i>	[T] Artisan (eg. <i>viṇā</i> maker).
<i>akṣara</i>	[Skt] Primary beats of the <i>tāla</i> (eg. <i>ādi tāla</i> contains 8 <i>akṣara</i> -s).
<i>akṣarakāla</i>	[Skt] Divisions of an <i>akṣara</i> .
<i>alaṅkāram</i>	[T < Skt <i>alaṅkāra</i>] Set of exercises taught after <i>jaṇṭa variṣai</i> . Ornament; patterns of <i>svara</i> -s.
<i>ālāpana</i>	[Skt] Short for <i>rāga ālāpana</i> ; exposition of a <i>rāga</i> in free rhythm.
<i>aluttam</i>	[T] Emphasis, pressure. Used to describe grip on the <i>viṇā</i> and manner of playing.
<i>aṅga</i>	[Skt] Division.
<i>anumandra</i>	[Skt] Two octaves below main octave.
<i>anumantiram</i>	[T] Fourth main string on the <i>viṇā</i> , tuned to <i>anumandra pa</i> .
<i>anupallavi</i>	[Skt] Section (usually the second) of a musical composition.
<i>arcanā</i>	[Skt] Worship
<i>ārōhaṇa</i>	[Skt] Ascending scale.
<i>avarōhaṇa</i>	[Skt] Descending scale.
<i>āvarta</i>	[Skt] Cycle of <i>tāla</i> .
<i>bāj</i>	[Hindi] Style of playing an instrument, especially <i>tabla</i> , in <i>hindusthāni</i> music.
<i>bānī</i>	Same as <i>pāṇi</i> .
<i>bhakti</i>	[Skt] Intense, loving devotion for god.

<i>brikka</i>	[< Skt ?] <i>pirukka</i> , etc. Fast section at end of <i>ālāpana</i> . Style of singing which involves fast rendering of successive <i>svara</i> -s.
<i>caraṇam</i>	[T < Skt <i>carana</i>] Section (usually the final) of a composition.
<i>caturasra</i>	[Skt] Quadruple division.
<i>chāpu</i>	[Hindi] Group of <i>tāla</i> -s outside the system of 35 <i>tāla</i> -s which are executed with claps and waves.
<i>chaturṣruti dhaivata</i>	[Skt] The higher variety of the 6th <i>svara</i> , <i>dha</i> --played on the ninth fret of the <i>viṇā</i> (<i>dha</i> ₂).
<i>chayāsvara</i>	[Skt] <i>svara</i> that gives individuality to a <i>rāga</i> . Same as <i>jiva svara</i> .
<i>ciṭṭasvara</i>	[Skt] Composed passage of <i>svara</i> -s added to a composition. Sometimes used for <i>muktāyisvara</i> .
"conservation of <i>saṅgati</i> -s"	Term coined by the author to refer to <i>saṅgati</i> -s which use material from other <i>saṅgati</i> -s in new configurations.
<i>dāṭu svara</i>	[Tel] <i>svara</i> -s separated by a leap of several <i>svara</i> -s
<i>dēvadāsi</i>	[Skt] "Servants of god." Name given to girls and women dedicated to south Indian temples to serve god by dancing and singing.
<i>dirgha</i>	[Skt] Long.
<i>dhrupad</i>	[Hindi] North Indian genre of classical music.
"double-oscillation echappée"	Term coined by the author to describe a characteristic way in which Lakshmi Ammal ended some of her <i>gamaka</i> -s--i.e. with two quick oscillations.
<i>drutam</i>	[(T <i>trutam</i>) < Skt <i>druta</i>] Portion of <i>tāla</i> executed by a clap and a wave.
<i>gamaka</i>	[Skt] Integral ornament.
<i>gati</i>	[Tel] Same as <i>naṭai</i> .
<i>gāyaki</i>	[Skt] Singer.

<i>ghana rāga</i>	[Skt] "Deep" <i>rāga</i> ; <i>rāga</i> -s suited for extensive elaboration, esp. through <i>tānam</i> . Usually used in reference to the <i>rāga</i> -s <i>nāṭa</i> , <i>gauḷa</i> , <i>ārabhi</i> , <i>varāli</i> , and <i>śrī</i> .
<i>gharānā</i>	[Skt] Lineage of musicians.
<i>ghāta</i>	[Skt] Clapped beat of the <i>tāḷa</i> (eg. beats 1, 5, and 7 of <i>ādi tāḷa</i>).
<i>gītam</i>	[T < Skt <i>gīta</i>] Genre of devotional song taught to beginners after <i>alaṅkāram</i> and before <i>varṇam</i> .
<i>gōpuccha yati</i>	[Tel; < Skt <i>gopuccha</i> + <i>yati</i>] Rhythmic pattern containing phrases of decreasing magnitude (like the tail of a cow, or <i>gopuccha</i>).
<i>gōṭuvādyam</i>	[< T <i>kōṭṭuvādyam</i> (Sambamoorthy 1959, 201)] Stringed instrument shaped like a <i>viṇā</i> played with a stick to slide across the strings (like a slide on a slide guitar or a pedal steel).
<i>graha svara</i>	[Skt] Initial <i>svara</i> .
<i>guru</i>	[Skt] Teacher, master.
<i>gurukula</i>	[Skt] System of learning in which students live with their teacher. (also: <i>gurukulavāsa</i>)
<i>iṣṭadēvatā</i>	[Skt] Deity chosen for worship by an individual, or one's family deity.
<i>janṭa variṣai</i>	[T] Exercises following <i>otta variṣai</i> .
<i>jāru</i>	[Skt] A type of <i>gamaka</i> ; <i>glissando</i> .
<i>jati</i>	[T; Tel] Name given to rhythmic <i>soḷfège</i> syllables. Same as <i>solkaṭṭu</i> .
<i>jāti</i>	[Skt] The five varieties of <i>laghu</i> : <i>tiśra</i> (3 beats) <i>caturasra</i> (4 beats), <i>khaṇḍa</i> (5 beats), <i>miśra</i> (7 beats), and <i>saṅkirṇa</i> (9 beats).
<i>jīva svara</i>	[Skt] <i>svara</i> that gives individuality ("life") to a <i>rāga</i> . Same as <i>chayāsvara</i> .
<i>kaiṣiki niṣāda</i>	[Skt] Lower variety of seventh <i>svara</i> , played on tenth fret (<i>svarasthāna</i>) of the <i>viṇā</i> .
<i>kākaḷi niṣāda</i>	[Skt] Higher variety of seventh <i>svara</i> , played on eleventh fret (<i>svarasthāna</i>) of the <i>viṇā</i> .

<i>kampita</i>	[Skt] A type of <i>gamaka</i> ; oscillation.
<i>kalpana svara</i>	[Skt] Form of improvisation involving rendition of <i>sofège</i> syllables within the framework of the <i>tāla</i> .
<i>kalpita</i>	[Skt] Short for <i>kalpita saṅgita</i> ; branch of music involving the performance of composed material.
Karaikkudi	A town 35 miles north-east of Madurai in Tamilnadu where Subbarama Iyer and Sambasiva Iyer lived. The style of <i>viṇā</i> playing under discussion in this thesis is associated with this town, although all musicians with "Karaikkudi" preceding their given names do not necessarily belong to this school (eg. Karaikkudi Mani is a <i>mridaṅgam</i> player who has no connection with the Karaikkudi style of <i>viṇā</i> playing).
<i>kārvai</i>	[T] Temporal interval, elongation of <i>svara</i> -s, rest.
<i>kāvaticintu</i>	[T] Folk song type often sung or played at the end of <i>karnāṭaka saṅgita</i> concerts.
<i>khaṇḍa</i>	[Skt] Quintuple division.
<i>kīrtana</i>	[Skt] Musical composition in which devotional aspect of text is considered primary. Usually does not feature <i>saṅgati</i> -s. Said to be predecessor of <i>kṛiti</i> . Term sometimes used interchangeably with <i>kṛiti</i> .
<i>kōrvai</i>	[T] Rhythmic cadence involving the repetition of a phrase three times.
<i>kṛiti</i>	[Skt] Musical composition usually containing three sections: <i>pallavi</i> , <i>anupallavi</i> , and <i>caranam</i> . Features use of <i>saṅgati</i> -s. Sometimes used interchangeably with <i>kīrtana</i> .
<i>kummi</i>	[T] Women's dance in Tamilnadu.
<i>kuṭam</i>	[T] Main (wooden) resonator on the <i>viṇā</i> .
<i>kuṭukkai</i>	[T] Auxiliary resonator on the <i>viṇā</i> , usually made of gourd or paper mache.
<i>laghu</i>	[Skt] Portion (<i>aṅga</i>) of <i>tāla</i> performed by a clap and finger count.

<i>laya</i>	[Skt] Speed or tempo. Also short for <i>laya jñana</i> , knowledge or control of rhythmic complexities.
<i>madhyama kāla</i>	[Skt] Middle speed. Quicker tempo <i>rāga</i> elaboration. Old term for <i>tānam</i> .
<i>madhya sthāyi</i>	[Skt] Middle octave.
<i>makutaṃ</i>	[T; < Skt <i>makuta</i>] Crown. Name given to climactic ending of <i>kalpana svara</i> or other <i>svara</i> section.
<i>mandra sthāyi</i>	[Skt] Lower octave.
<i>manodharma</i>	[Skt] Short for <i>manodharma saṅgīta</i> ; branch of music involving improvisation.
<i>mantiram</i>	[T] Third string on the <i>viṇā</i> , tuned to <i>mandra sa</i> .
<i>mārga</i>	[Skt] Way, style.
<i>miśra</i>	[Skt] Division of 7.
<i>mīṭṭu</i>	[T] Act of plucking the strings of the <i>viṇā</i> .
<i>mōhara</i>	[?] Long rhythmic cadence ending with a <i>korvai</i> .
<i>mōra</i>	Same as <i>mōhara</i> .
<i>muktāyisvara</i>	[Skt] Composed <i>svara</i> passage after <i>anupallavi</i> of a <i>varṇam</i> .
<i>nāda</i>	[Skt] Sound.
<i>naṭai</i>	[T] Subdivision of <i>akṣara</i> or <i>akṣarakāla</i> . Same as <i>gati</i> .
<i>niraval svara</i>	[Skt ?] Improvising melodies on a line of text from a composition. Is found at the end of a <i>kṛiti</i> or in a <i>pallavi</i> .
<i>nyāsa svara</i>	[Skt] Final <i>svara</i> .
<i>otta variṣai</i>	[T] Lessons following <i>sarālī variṣai</i> ; sometimes included in <i>sarālī variṣai</i> .
<i>paḷakkam</i>	[T] Custom, training.
<i>pallavi</i>	[Skt] Section (usually first) of a musical composition. Genre of musical performance involving rhythmic and melodic improvisation which is considered the climax of a concert in <i>karnāṭaka saṅgīta</i> .

<i>pañcama</i>	[Skt] Fifth of the scale, abbreviated <i>pa</i> .
<i>pañcamam</i>	[T] Second string on the <i>viṇā</i> , tuned to <i>mandra pa</i> .
<i>pāṇi</i>	[T < Urdu <i>bānī</i>] Style, manner, peculiarity.
<i>paramparā</i>	[Skt] Lineage, tradition.
<i>patam</i>	[T < Skt <i>pada</i>] Musical composition. Usually slow and containing texts of love. Used especially for dance.
<i>pāṭhāntara</i>	[Skt] "Variant reading." Used to refer to the lineage, or versions, of compositions.
<i>pirukkā</i>	[T] See <i>brikka</i> .
<i>piṭippu</i>	[T] Grasping. A term used to describe the grip used while playing the <i>viṇā</i> .
<i>pratyāhata</i>	[Skt] Technique of emphasizing the second of repeated <i>svara</i> -s in descending passages.
<i>prayōga</i>	[Tel < Skt] Phrase in a <i>rāga</i> .
<i>pūjā</i>	[Skt] Worship.
<i>pūjāri</i>	[Skt] Priest who performs <i>pūjā</i> .
<i>rāgamālikā</i>	[Skt] Series of <i>rāga</i> -s rendered in succession.
<i>rāma</i>	[Skt] A Hindu god.
<i>ravai</i>	[T < Skt <i>rava</i>] A type of <i>gamaka</i> .
<i>sabha</i>	[Skt] Music hall.
<i>sāhitya</i>	[Skt] Text.
<i>śakti</i>	[Skt] Power, energy. Personified as the divine consort of the god <i>śiva</i> .
<i>sama</i>	[Skt] First beat of the <i>tāḷa</i> .
<i>sampradāya</i>	[Skt] Tradition.
<i>sañcāra</i>	[Skt] Phrase or series of phrases in a <i>rāga</i> .
<i>saṅgati</i>	[Skt] Composed melodic variations on a fixed text, found especially in <i>kṛiti</i> -s.

<i>saṅgīta</i>	[Skt] Music.
<i>sarālī variṣai</i>	[T] Beginning set of <i>svara</i> exercises. Also called <i>svarāvalī variṣai</i> .
<i>sarasvati pūjā</i>	[Skt] Hindu holiday on which books, musical instruments, and other items associated with the goddess Saraswati are used in worshipping her.
<i>sārīṇi</i>	[T] First main string on the <i>vīṇā</i> , tuned to <i>sa</i> .
<i>sarva laghu</i>	[Skt] Manner of performance involving a steady stream of even time units as opposed to additive rhythmic units of three, five, seven, etc.
<i>sargam</i>	[Hindi ?] Indian <i>solfège</i> syllables.
<i>sātakam</i>	[T < Skt <i>sādhaka</i>] Practice.
<i>śiṣya</i>	[Skt] Disciple.
"sparkling <i>sphurita</i> "	Term coined by K. S. Subramanian to describe a particular technique for stressing a <i>svara</i> which gives a "sparkling" or shimmering effect.
<i>sphurita</i>	[Skt] Technique of stressing repeated <i>svara</i> -s in ascending passages.
<i>srōtōvāha yati</i>	[Tel; <Skt <i>srotovahā</i> + <i>yati</i>] Rhythmic pattern containing phrases of increasing magnitude (like the widening of a river, <i>srotovahā</i>)
<i>śruti</i>	[Skt] Pitch; intonation; smallest unit of difference perceivable between two <i>svara</i> -s; one of twenty-two divisions of the octave in Indian music theory.
<i>sthāyi</i>	[Skt] Octave (i.e. register).
"sustained from above"	Term coined by the author to describe a characteristic <i>gamaka</i> used by Lakshmi Ammal.
<i>svara</i>	[Skt] Pitch. Unit which includes a pitch and its constituent <i>gamaka</i> -s or ornaments depending on the <i>rāga</i> . Sometimes short for <i>ciṭṭasvara</i> , <i>kalpana svara</i> , <i>muktāyisvara</i> , or <i>ettugaḍa svara</i> .
<i>svara jñāna</i>	[Skt] Sense of pitch.
<i>tānam</i>	[T < disputed] Elaboration of a <i>rāga</i> in a steady pulse, but without meter or <i>tāla</i> .

<i>tāra sthāyi</i>	[Skt] Upper octave.
<i>tiśra</i>	[Skt] Triple division.
<i>tribhinna</i>	[Skt] Lit. "3 broken." Technique on the <i>viṇā</i> involving the successive sounding of the <i>sāriṇi</i> , <i>pañcamam</i> and <i>mantiram</i> while barring one fret with the index or middle finger of the left hand. May have meant other things in earlier times.
<i>upāsaka</i>	[Skt] Worshipper.
<i>vaiṇika</i>	[Skt] <i>viṇā</i> player.
<i>vakra</i>	[Skt] Crooked.
<i>vali</i>	[T] Way; manner; lineage; style.
<i>varṇam</i>	[T < Skt <i>varṇa</i>] Lengthy piece rendered in several speeds occurring at beginning of concerts. Genre of composition taught to students after <i>gītam</i> . <i>tāna varṇam</i> . (<i>pata varṇam</i> is a dance piece).
<i>vidvān</i>	[Skt] Great musician (lit. "one who knows")
<i>viṣayādaśamī</i>	[Skt] Name of Hindu holiday--an auspicious day for beginning any undertaking.
<i>viśeṣa</i>	[Skt] Special, peculiar.
<i>yāli</i>	[T < Skt <i>vyāḷa</i>] Mythological animal, half lion and half elephant, whose head is depicted on the end of the south Indian <i>viṇā</i> .

References

- Ackerman, James S.
1967 A theory of style. In *Aesthetic inquiry: Essays in art criticism and the philosophy of art*, ed. M. Beardsley and H. Shueller, 54-66. Belmont, Calif.: Dickenson Publishing Company. (First published in *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 20(1962).]
1978 On rereading "Style." *Social Research* 45:153-63.
- B. S. S. Music School: 'Veena visarada' Smt. Ranganayaki Rajagopalan
1984 [Pamphlet released in connection with unveiling a portrait of Sambasiva Iyer and conferring title of 'Veena Visaradha' on Ranganayaki Rajagopalan on 26 Jan. 1984 at Srinivasa Sastri Hall in Madras].
- Balaji, Nithya
1988-1989 Rajeswari Pdamanabhan: Looking back and ahead. *Sruti* 51/52 (Dec.-Jan.): 35-36.
- Balasubramanyam, G.N.
1955 Karnatak music. In *Radio Sangeet Sammeln*, 10-15 November 1955. Delhi: The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.
- Barnett, H. G.
1953 *Innovation: The basis of cultural change*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Benary, Barbara
1972 Composers and tradition in Karnatic music. *Asian Music* 3(2): 42-51.
- Bhuvarahan, N.R.
1978 Veena Sambasiva Aiyar. *Shanmukha* (Bombay) 4:11-15.
1988 Vina Sambasiva Aiyar. In *Birth Centenary* [7-10].
- Birth centenary of Sangita Kalanidhi Karaikudi Sambasiva Iyer*
1988 [Pamphlet released in connection with celebration of Sambasiva Iyer's birth centenary, 26 March 1988. Sponsored by the India International Rural Cultural Center. Held at the Music Academy of Madras.]
- Björn, Lars
1981 The mass society and group action theories of cultural production: The case of stylistic innovation in jazz. *Social Forces* 60, no.2 (December): 377-94.
- Blacking, John
1977 Some problems of theory and method in the study of musical change. *Yearbook of the International Folk Music Council* 9:1-26.

- 1986 Identifying processes of musical change. *The World of Music* 28(1): 3-12.
- Brinda, T.
1981 *Javalis of Patnam Subrahmanya Iyer, Tiruppanandal Pattabhiramayya, Dharmapuri Subbarayar, Tirupati Narayanaswami and others*. Madras: The Music Academy.
- Brown, Charles Philip, M. Venkara Ratnam, W. H. Campbell, and Rao Bahadur K. Veeresalingam
1987 *Dictionary Telugu English*. 2nd ed. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.
- Caplan, Patricia
1985 *Class and Gender in India*. New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Catlin, Amy Ruth
1980 Variability and change in three karnataka kriti-s: a study of south Indian classical music. Ph.D. diss., Brown University, Providence.
1985 *Pallavi and kriti of Karnatak music: Evolutionary processes and survival strategies*. *National Centre of the Performing Arts Quarterly Journal* 14, no. 1 (March): 26-44.
- Daniel, Sheryl B.
1980 Marriage in Tamil culture, the problem of conflicting models. In *The powers of Tamil women*, ed. Susan Wadley, 61-92. New York: Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse Univ.
- Deshpande, Vamanrao
1973 *Indian musical traditions: An aesthetic study of the gharanas in Hindustani music*. Trans. S. H. Deshpande. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
- Dhandapani, M. N. and D. Pattammal
1984 *Ragapravaham: Index to Carnatic ragas*. Delhi: The Central Natak Academy.
- Dikshitar, Sri Subbarama
1961-1983 *Sangita Sampradaya Pradarsini*. Translated into Tamil by S. Ramanathan and B. Rajam Ayyar. 5 parts. Madras: The Music Academy, Madras.
- Doraiswamy, P. K.
1985 Pearl-diving with the veena. *Sruti* 17(June): 15-16.
- Dubois, Abbe J. A.
[1906] 1986 *Hindu manners, customs and ceremonies*. Reprint of 3rd ed., trans. Henry K. Beauchamp. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.

- Ellarvi [L. R. Venkataramayyar]
[1965] 1967 *kāraikkūti cakōtararkal*. In *kalai maṇikal*, 103-19. cennai [Madras]: amuta nilaiyam limitēṭ.
- Geertz, Clifford
1973 Religion as a cultural system. In *The interpretation of cultures*, 87-125. New York: Basic Books, Inc. (first published in *Anthropological approaches to the study of religion*, ed. M. Banton, 1-46. London: Tavistock Publications Ltd, 1966.)
- Gomati Sankara Ayyar, V. S. [kōmaticaṅkara aiyar, V. S.]
1970 pallavi cuppaiyāpākavatar, vīnai cupparāma aiyar, vīnai cāmpaciva aiyar. In *icaikkalai vallunakal*, 167-83. annāmalainakar [Annamalai nagar]: civakāmi accakam [Sivakami press].
- Gombrich, E. H.
1968 Style. In *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, ed. David L. Sills, vol. 15. New York: Macmillan.
- Government of India
1974 *Toward equality: The report of the committee on the status of women in India*. New Delhi: Department of Social Welfare, Ministry of Education and Social Welfare. [Cited in Caplan (1985, 82)].
- Hayek, Friedrich A. von
1963 Rules, perception, and intelligibility. *Proceedings* (British Academy) 48:321-44.
- Hibbert, Lloyd
1958 A note on musical styles. *Musical Review* 19:201-10.
- Higgins, Jon B.
1973 The music of *bharata nāṭyam*. Ph.D. diss., Wesleyan University, Conn.
1976 From prince to populace: patronage as a determinant of change in south Indian (karnatak) music. *Asian Music* 7(2): 20-26.
- Hobsbawm, Eric
1983 Introduction: Inventing traditions. In *The invention of tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Jagadisa Ayyar, P. V.
1982 *South Indian festivities*. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.
- Jagannadha Ravu, 'Kalapravina' Mancala, and Vadrevu Purusottam
1981 *tyāgarāja kīrtanalū: modaṭi bhāgamu (svara sahitamu)*. 6 vols. Tirupati: T. T. Devasthanams.

- Jayasitalakshmi, S. R.
1984 Chitta svaras in musical compositions. *The Journal of the Madras Music Academy* 40:139-56.
- Jha, Akhileswar
1980 *The imprisoned mind*. New Delhi: Ambika Publications.
- Journal of the Music Academy of Madras*
1953 24:9-21, 33-5.
1957 27:37-8.
- Kalki [Karnatakam, pseud.]
1941 ātal pāṭal--apūrva kaccēri. *Ananda Vikatan* Sept. 14. [Photocopy of typewritten transcription obtained from Smt. Karaikkudi Ranganayaki Rajagopalan.]
- Kartomi, Margaret J.
1981 The processes and results of musical culture contact: A discussion of terminology and concepts. *Ethnomusicology* 25(2): 227-249.
- Kersenboom-Story, Saskia C.
1987 *Nityasumaṅgali: Devadasi tradition in south India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Khatschi Khatschi
1962 *Der Dastgah Studien Zur Neuen Persischen Musik*. Regensburg: Gustav Bosse Verlag.
- Krishna Iyengar, Gana Visharada Titte
1964 A note on tana. *The Journal of the Music Academy Madras* 35:85-87.
- Kroeber, A. L.
1957 *Style and civilizations*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Kubler, George
[1962] 1976 *The shape of time*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- Kuppuswamy, Gowri and M. Hariharan
1981 *Index of songs in south Indian music*. Delhi: B. R. Publishing Corporation.
- Lang, Berel
1982 Looking for the styleme. *Critical Inquiry* 9, no. 2 (December): 405-13.
- L'Armand, Kathleen and Adrian L'Armand
1978 Music in Madras: the urbanization of a cultural tradition. In *Eight Urban Musical Cultures*, ed. Bruno Nettl, 115-145. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

- 1983 One hundred years of music in Madras: a case study in secondary urbanization. *Ethnomusicology* 27(3): 411-38.
- Lord, Albert B.
[1960] 1964 *The singer of tales*. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature no. 24. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mahalingam, T.R.
1985 The Carnatic Bani. *Sruti* 19 (October): 37-39.
- Meenakshi Ammal, Karaikkudi
1988 Interview with author, Jan. 10, Periyakulam, Tamilnadu.
- Meyer, Leonard B.
1983 Innovation, choice and the history of music. *Critical Inquiry* 9, no. 3 (March): 517-44.
- Monier-Williams, Sir Monier, E. Leumann, and C. Cappeller and other scholars
[1899] 1979 *A Sanskrit-English dictionary: Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*. New ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Murphy, J. Middleton
[1922] 1960 *The problem of style*. London: Oxford Univ. press.
- Muttu Iyer, Karaikkudi
1970's Interview by David Reck. Tape recording.
- Narayan, Radhika Raj
1984 Contemporary styles of veena playing: A listeners' guide. *Sruti*, April, 17-19.
- Narayana Iyengar, Devakkottai
1988 Karaikkudi Sambasiva Iyer. In *Birth Centenary*, [11-13]. (Translation of article first published in *kalaimakal*, n.d.)
- Narayana Iyer, D. K.
[1986a] *anpumikka unkal ammavin valkkai*. Photocopy.
[1986b] *vainika paramparai*. Photocopy
- Natarajan, Sarada
1984 Veena service at Srirangam temple: An old tradition continued. *Sruti*, June, 40-41.
- Needham, Rodney
1975 Polythetic classification: Convergence and consequences. *Man*, n.s. 10:349-69.
1979 *Symbolic classification*. Santa Monica: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.

- Nettl, Bruno
 1974 Thoughts on improvisation: A comparative approach. *The Musical Quarterly* 60(1): 1-19.
 1978 Some aspects of the history of world music in the twentieth century: Questions, problems, concepts. *Ethnomusicology* 22(1): 123-36.
 1985 *The Western impact on world music: Change, adaptation, and survival*. New York: Shirmer.
 1986 History and change in Blackfoot Indian musical culture and thought. *The World of Music* 28(1): 70-84.
 1987 *The radif of Persian music*. Champaign: Elephant and Cat.
- Nettl, Bruno, ed.
 1978 *Eight urban musical cultures: Tradition and change*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.
- Neuman, Daniel M.
 1980 *The life of music in north India*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Orr, P.
 1988-1989 Training under Sambasiva Iyer: His way or not at all. *Sruti*, 51/52 (Dec.-Jan.):32
- Padmanabhan, Raajeswari
 1970's Interview by David Reck. Tape recording.
 1988 Interview with the author, Jan. 8., Mandavalli, Madras.
- Panchapakesa Iyer, A. S.
 1987 *Gānāmṛutha varṇa mālikā*. Madras: Gānāmṛutha Prachuram.
- Pārttasārati, Ti. Es. [T. S. Parthasarathy]
 [1967] 1982 *śrī tiyākarājasvāmi kīrttanāikal*. cennai [Madras]: hikkin pātams limitēṭ [Higginbotham's Limited].
- Popper, Karl R.
 [1961] 1964 *The poverty of historicism*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Harper and Row.
- Powers, Harold S.
 1959 The background of the south Indian raga-system. PhD. diss., Princeton University.
 1980 India II, 6: instruments. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*.
- Raghavan, A.
 1971 *isayum yazhum [icaiyum yālum]*. Tirunelveli: kalainūr patippakam.
- Raghavan, V.
 1981 Introductory thesis to *The spiritual heritage of Tyagaraja*, by C. Ramanujachari. Madras: Sri Ramakrishna Math.

- Rajagopalan, Ranganayaki
1988 Interview with the author, Jan. 6, West Mambalam, Madras.
- Ramachandra Iyer, Thirugokarnam
1970's Interview by David Reck. Tape recording.
- Raman, N. Pattabhi, K. R. Rajagopalan, and T. Sankaran
1986 Veena Dhanammal: A mere musician, but a great artist. *Sruti*, 23/23-S (June-July), 25-34.
- Raman, N. Pattabhi, and T. Sankaran
1986-1987 Endaro Mahanubhavulu. . . Carnatic musicians of Kerala. *Sruti* 27/28 (Dec.-Jan.): 71-79.
- Ramamurthy, Kamala
1985 Notebook of compositions taught to the author. Handwritten.
- Ramanujachari, C.
1981 *The spiritual heritage of Tyagaraja*. Madras: Sri Ramakrishna Math.
- Ramaswamy Sastri, T. N.
1970's Interview by David Reck. Tape recording.
- Rangaramanuja Ayyangar, R.
1972 *History of south Indian (Carnatic) music*. Madras: R. Rangaramanuja Ayyangar, "Sabarmati."
1976 *śrī kiruti maṇi mālai: śrī tiyākarāja nūrrāṇṭu ninaivu nūl*. 3rd ed. Parts 1-2. Bombay: India Publishing House.
1978 *Sangeeta ratnakaram: A study*. Bombay: Wilco Publishing House.
1983 *śrī kruti maṇi mālai: mūnrām pākam: śrī muttusvāmi tīkṣitar krutikaḷ-400*. 2nd ed. Part 3. Bombay.
1987 *śrī kruti maṇi mālai: nānkām pākam: ciyāmā cāstrikaḷ, sūpparāma cāstrikaḷ, kṣētrakṇār mutaliya uttama vākkēyakārar kruti ratnaṅkaḷ 360*. 3rd ed. Part 4. Bombay.
- Reck, David B.
1983 A musician's tool-kit: a study of five performances by Thirugokarnam Ramachandra Iyer. Ph.D. diss., Wesleyan University, Middletown Conn.
- Reynolds, Holly Baker
1980 The auspicious married woman. In *The powers of Tamil women*, ed. Susan Wadley, 35-60. New York: Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.
- Rudolph, Lloyd I. and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph
[1967] 1984 *The modernity of tradition*. Reprint. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sambamoorthy, P.

- 1952 *Dictionary of south Indian music and musicians volume I (A-F)*. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1959 *Dictionary of south Indian music and musicians volume II (G-K)*. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1971 *Dictionary of south Indian music and musicians volume III (L-N)*. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1973 *South Indian music: Book III*. 7th ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1980 *South Indian music: Book I*. 10th ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1982a *History of Indian music*. 2nd ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1982b *kirtana sāgaram Book IV in Tamil*. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1982c *South Indian music: Book IV*. 5th ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1982d *South Indian music: Book V*. 4th ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1982e *South Indian music: Book VI*. 2nd ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1985a *Great musicians*. 2nd ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1985b *Great composers: Book I*. 4th ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1986 *Indian songs: 1 series*. 6th ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.
- 1987 *South Indian music: Book II*. 10th ed. Madras: The Indian Music Publishing House.

Sambasiva Iyer, Karaikkudi

- 1953 Address. *The Journal of the Music Academy of Madras* 24:9-21.

Sangeet Natak Akademi

- 1984 *Who's who of Indian musicians*. 2nd ed. New Delhi: Sangeet Natak Akademi.

Sankari Ammal, Karaikkudi

- 1987 Interview with author, Dec. 26, Kumbakkonam, Tamilnadu.

Seetha, S.

- 1979 Some notable vainikas of the Tanjore samsthanam. *The Journal of the Music Academy Madras* 50:105-113.

Sethuraman, S. [es. ceturāman]

- 1952 *vaiṇika mahā vītvān pirammaṣṛi kārāikkūṭi sāmpaciva ayyar avarkaḷ*. In *Silver Jubilee conference souvenir of the Music Academy*, 54-60. Madras: The Music Academy.

Shankar, Vidya

- 1969 *kamakaṅkaḷ*. *The Journal of the Music Academy Madras* 40:89-97.

- 1979 *Shyama Sastry's compositions*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Madras: Smt. Vidya Shankar Gitalaya, Jayanth Printers and Binders.
- 1983 *The art and science of Carnatic music*. Madras: The Music Academy Madras.
- Shapiro, Meyer
- 1962 Style. In *Anthropology today: Selections*, ed. Sol Tax, 278-303. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press. (First published in *Anthropology today*, ed. Alfred L Kroeber, 287-312. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953.)
- Shekar, Gayatri Chandra
- 1984-1985 Doreswamy Iyengar and his 3-D's: devotion, diligence, and deep humility. *Sruti*, 14 (Dec.-Jan.), 17-27.
- Singer, Milton
- [1972] 1980 *When a great tradition modernizes: An anthropological approach to Indian civilization*. Reprint. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Slawek, Steven M.
- 1987 Innovation, competition, and allegiance in the evolution of the Maihar gharānā. Paper read at 32nd meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology, Nov. 5, at Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Srinivasan, Pia
- 1980 Notes to *Musik für vina südindien*. Museum Collection Berlin (West) M C 8 [ISBN 3-12-17596 0-4].
- Srinivasan, T. R.
- 1988-1989 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan: Holding a mirror to the master. *Sruti*, 51/52 (Dec.-Jan.):33-35.
- Srinivasan, T. R. and P. C. Jayaraman
- 1988-1989 The Karaikkudi veena brothers and ten generations of the Tanjavur Tradition. *Sruti*, 51/52 (Dec.-Jan.): 19-29
- Sruti*
- 1988-1989a A reluctant recipient of awards. 51/52 (Dec.-Jan.): 31.
- 1988-1989b Between the frets. 51/52 (Dec.-Jan.): 38.
- 1988-1989c Features of the Karaikkudi bani. 51/52 (Dec.-Jan.): 30.
- 1988-1989d From the fretwork of two to a network of many. 51/52 (Dec.-Jan.): 33.
- 1988-1989e Karaikkudi Subramanian: Reflections in a pool of memories. 51/52 (Dec.-Jan.): 37.
- Steward, Julian H.
- [1955] 1973 *Theory of culture change: The methodology of multilinear evolution*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Stutley, Margaret and James Stutley
 1977 *Harper's dictionary of Hinduism: Its mythology, folklore, philosophy, literature, and history.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Subba Rao, B.
 [1956] 1980-[1966] 1985
Raganidhi: A comparative study of Hindustani and Karnatak ragas.
 4 vols. Madras: The Music Academy.
- Subramanian, K.S.
 1970's Interview by David Reck. Tape recording.
 1977 The study of vina style: an introduction. M.A. Thesis, Wesleyan University, Conn.
 1985 An introduction to the vina. *Asian Music* 16(2): 7-82.
 1986 South Indian vina tradition and individual style. Ph.D. diss., Wesleyan University, Conn.
- Subramanian, T. R.
 1985 Recording of concert. Madurai, Tamilnadu, south India, July 13.
- Truscott, Harold
 1958 Style in music. *The Musical Review* 19:211-21.
- University of Madras
 1982 *Tamil lexicon.* 6 vols. Madras: University of Madras.
- Varadan, Padma
 1981 The challenging technique of veena play. *The Journal of the Music Academy Madras* 52:79-88.
- Viswanathan, T.
 1974 Raga alapana in south Indian music. Ph.D. diss., Wesleyan University, Conn.
 1977 The analysis of rāga ālāpana in south Indian music. *Asian Music* 9(1): 13-71.
- Wade, Bonnie
 1979 *Music in India: The Classical Traditions.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
 1984a *Khyāl: Creativity within North India's classical music tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
 1984b Performance practice in Indian classical music. In *Performance practice: Ethnomusicological perspectives*, ed. Gerard Béhague, 13-52. Contributions in Intercultural and Comparative Studies, no. 12. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Wadley, Susan, ed.
 1980 *The powers of Tamil women.* New York: Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.

White, Emmons E.

1971 *Appreciating India's music: An introduction, with an emphasis on the music of south India.* Boston: Crescendo Publishing Company.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig

[1953] 1973 *Philosophical investigations: The english text of the third edition.* Trans. G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wolf, Richard Kent

1988a Indicators of change. Paper read at spring meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology, 13 March, Bowling Green Ohio.

1988b The maintenance of tradition in Karaikkudi *vinā* playing. Paper read at 17th Annual Conference on South Asia, 4 November, at the University of Wisconsin--Madison.

Index

- ālāpana*, 15
bhairavi rāga, 172-79
 conciseness of, 94
 contour of, 179-80
 contrapuntal accompaniment in, 195-95
 inserting passages of, 168-170
kalyāṇi rāga, 179-80, 183, 186, 188, 202
kāmbhōji rāga, 181-82
 modeled after composition, 183
 use of guru's material in formation of, 172-82
 "alaṭṭuvāpōṭi," 155-57, 161
 Archives, University of Illinois, 129
 Balachander, S., 34n., 72, 100-101
 Balance, 42, 188
 Balasubramaniam [also Balasubramanyam], G. N., 7, 71n. 74, 213
 Borrowing, 36, 70, 75-77, 149, 192, 205, 213
 "caraṇampava karuṇāmmayi," 132-36
 Catlin, Amy
 comment on Dhanammal, 94
 doctoral thesis of, 15
 Chitti Babu, 70, 97, 149, 199
ciṭṭasvara-s, characteristics of, 55
 composed by Lakshmi Ammal, 168-69
 rendition of, 145-46
 use outside of original composition, 171
 Classification, 219-20
 Compartmentalization. *See also* Religion, purity.
 of borrowed material, 74, 76, 194-95
 of changes, 127
 of musical forms, 78
 of teaching, learning, and playing, 211-12
 Compatibility, 75, 76, 77, 192-94
 Composing, 130-31
 ciṭṭasvara-s (as stylistic value), 56, 130
 new texts, 23
 relationship with performance, 47, 63
 Compositions, 43-44
 basic versions, 152
 change in structure of, 122, 124, 126, 127, 144
 combination of variants in, 124
 function of, 109, 127-28, 168-69, 217
 interpretation of, 130, 135
 linking passages in, 122, 125, 126
 omitted from Sambasiva Iyer's repertoire, 91-92, 150
 Concerts
 length of, 77, 200
 planning of, 200
 Current trends, 171
 Dandapani Iyer, 100
 Das, Venkataramana, 97
dēvadāsi, 79, 79n.
 Devi, Rukmini, 80, 130, 204, 209
 Dhanammal style, 31n., 71, 72, 93-95
 See also T. Viswanathan.
 "dinamaṇivamsa," 135
 Doraiswamy Iyengar, Mysore, 31n., 95-96. *See also* Style, musical, Mysore.
 "eduṭṇanilacitē," 163-65
 "ēlanīdayarādu," 126-27
 "ēmiṇṇēsitē," 141-43, 161
 "entavēḍukondu," 47-53, 143, 157-60
 "ētāvunarā," 136-37, 183, 186n.
 Family, role of in musicianship, 28, 208-12
 Folk song, adapted for classical, 43, 43n. 53, 98, 201
gamaka-s
 choice of and technique, 30, 33, 139
 complicated, 143, 144, 46
 contributing to *saṅgati* architecture, 139-40, 141, 146
 found in different compositions, 141, 143
 in initial exercises, 39
 interchangeability of, 121, 139, 147

- gamaka-s* (continued)
oscillations in, 88,89,145-46,187-88
ravai, 177n.,181,187
replacement of in compositions, 139-47,156
speed of, 65,121
"sustained from above," 121,122, 144,145,146
Gimmicks, 36,47,77,99,200,202
gōṭuvādyam, 35
Harmony, 36,192-97
Hindustani music, 205,215
Improvisation, 172-190
embellishment of phrase ideas, 172-82
models of/for, 166-67,172,182-85
setting up in advance, 78
Industrialization, 203-4,210-11
Innovations
legitimacy of, 209-10
organological, 44
patterns of, 44,54,63,154,167-68,171,178,178n.,218
"*inta chalamu*," 111
"*inta caukasēya*," 111
Invented tradition, 11
"*jagadānandakā*," 183-85
kalpana svara
models of/for, 183-85
Kalyanakrishna Bhagavatar, M. A., 99
Kalyanakrishna Bhagavatar, M. K., 99
"*kanugōṇṭini*," 53-54,157-60
Karaikkudi, 20
Karaikkudi brothers. See Subbarama Iyer; Sambasiva Iyer; and Karaikkudi style.
Karaikkudi style, See also Style; Teaching.
compositions in, 43,109,111,115, 126-28,129-130,137,154
descriptions of Karaikkudi brothers, 21,27,66
diversity in. See Style, variability in.
emblems of. See markers of.
fingerings as marker of, 149
functional aspects, 198-99
gamaka-s as markers of, 144,162,181
markers of, 36-37,39,47,54,56, 63-79,217,218
"note"-s as markers of, 73
performers in, 4-5,17-19. See also individual entries for performers
prayōga-s as markers of, 162
saṅgati-s as markers of, 162
Krishna, Balamurali, 71n.74,213
Krishnamurthy, Kaloore, 72,136
kṛiti-s
structure of, 15,22
taught to beginners, 26
Kubler, George, 217n.
Lakshmi Ammal, Karaikkudi, 2,3,4,27
characteristic *gamaka* of, 180,201
cittasvara-s created by, 168-69
saṅgati-s created by, 165-67
training, 80,92
personal style, 87-90,121,143-46,150-51,155-59,162,164-65,171,172-82
teaching by, 110-12,211
Mahalingam, T. R.
conception of style, 8-9
version of "*edutanilacitē*," 165
Mahavaidyanatha Iyer, 46
Menon, Narayana, 100
Modernization, 81,94,192-97,208
Musical Institutions
effect on style, 105,114,208,216
effect on teaching, 203-7
Kalakshetra, 130,151,204,209
"Karaikkudi School," 113,206-7
Music Academy of Madras, 37,67, 106n.,108,116
sabha-s, 104-5,197,198-99
Muttu Iyer, Karaikkudi, 92n.85
"*nāmorālakiñci*," 141-43
Narayanawamy, K. S., 100
Neuman, Daniel, 9-11
niraval svara, model for, 166
"*padavinī*," 115-128,154
Padmanabhan, Raajeswari
characteristic gestures of, 186-88
compositions by, 130
personal style of, 148,171,172-79,185-90
training of, 27-29, 38
teaching by, 109-10

- Patronage, 105,197-98,203
- Performance
 body motion in, 63,77,105,200,218
 composition and, 63
 consistency in structure, 90,131-136
 context of, 23,43,90,104-105,198-203
 during *pūjā*, 85-86
 precision in, 47,63,65
 Raajeswari Padmanabhan's first, 29
 Ranganayaki Rajagopalan's first, 27,86
 rendition, 138-90
 sameness of rendition, 114-115, 120,126,212
 speed of rendition, 200-202
 variability, 3,90,111-112,119-27,138,155,172,212
- Persian music, 111n.97
- Pitchumani Iyer, 100
- Practicing
 as end in itself, 86,90,104
 time of, 98
- prayōga-s*
 contributing to *saṅgati* architecture, 147-49,151
 inserting into *saṅgati*, 157
 replacement of, 123, 147-51
viśeṣa, 144
- Public opinion, 24, 77-78,103,105, 129,169,198-203. See also Performance
- Radio, 105,116,129,134,199n.,212-15,216
- rāga-s*
 choice of, 77
- Rajagopalan, Ranganayaki
 characteristic *gamaka* of, 180, 187,201
 personal style of, 70,89,145,149, 170-71,186,187,189
 teaching by, 108-9
 training of, 24-27
- "*rāmabāṇa*," 23-24,150-51,198
- "*rāmacāndram bhāvayāmi*," 145
- Ramachandran, V., 164
- Ramanathan, M. D., 199
- Ramani, N., 199
- Reck, David
 comment on characteristic "*Ka-raikkudi*" phrase, 144
 doctoral thesis of, 14,15
- Recordings, 105,129-30,132,135, 138,152,195-96,212-15,216
 context influencing music, 182
- Religion
bhakti, 22,45-46,104,120,121, 122,128
 devotional attitude, 62,64,74,77
pūjā, 26,45-46,84,85,86,103,216
 purity, 21-22,24,73,74,81,197
 ritual, 86,104
śakti, 79-87,91
 symbols of, 20-21,23,106
 temple performance, 20,80
 values, 82,103-106
 worship of the goddess, 24,25,85-87,106
- Repertoire, 114-138
 centrality in, 127
 dropping, 128
 new, 129-138
 "old," 114-129
 term for, 13
- Rhythm
 accent, 145,156,157
 changes in, 127
 emphasis on aspects of, 39,66,67-70,93
 delineation of *tāla*, 68, 68n.
dvi-tāla-avadhāna, 67,69
mridaṅgam jati-s, 70
- sāhitya*
 drawn from classic works, 78
 importance of knowing meaning of, 22-23,43,104,127-28,205-6,208
 meaning in performance, 123,159-60,193,206
 plucking in accordance with, 33, 104,120,121,134
- Sambasiva Iyer, Karaikkudi, 20
 anecdotes about, 21,23,78,115n.99
 attitudes about music, 22-24, 130,151
ciṭṭasvara-s of, 54-63,130
 conception of style, 9
 dates, 2,18
 innovations, 44-63

- Sambasiva Iyer (*continued*)
 "note"-s by, 73,112,193-95,201, 217
 parable used by, 24,216
 personal style of, 90,91,92
 personality of, 21,91
 statements about training, 37-38
 teaching Raajeswari Padmanabhan, 28
 worship of the goddess, 85-87
 "sāmininnē," 140,161-62
saṅgati-s, 46-54
 adding, 44,76,136-38,154-68,165-67
 developing, 76,126,136-38,152
 balance in, 46,155
 based on general idea, 163-65
 borrowing, 76,213
 choice of and technique, 30
 conservation of, 123,124,126
 extension of principle, 157-59, 163
 found in other compositions, 161-62
 incremental development of, 157-59
 performance of, 79
 preserving, 131-36,137
 replacing, 44,151-54
 in *varṇa*-s, 140
 Sangameswara Sastri, 97-98
 Sankara Sastri, Emani, 70,97,98, 100,101
 "śaṅkarinī," 169-70
 Santhanam, Maharajapuram, 135,214
 "sarasaśāmadāna," 165-66,192-93
 "sarasiṛuhā," 144,147-50,152-54, 166-67,183
sāvēri, 23-24
 Schools. *See* Style; Musical institutions.
 Sivan, Papanasam, 56
 Sivanandam, K. P., 100
 Style, musical. *See also* Terms for musical style; Teaching; Technique.
 Andhra Pradesh, 20,97-99
 authority in, 10-11. *See also* legitimacy in.
 basic lessons as models for, 87-90,185
 change in, 92,197-215. *See also* development; variation.
 characterization of, 208
ciṭṭasvara-s as markers of, 56,62
 development, 114,126,152
 domains of, 65,218
 feminine, 98,99,101
 of *guru* present in disciple, 92
 homogeneity in, 205
khyāl gharāna-s, 9
 legitimacy in, 209-211,218. *See also* authority.
 lineage in, 10,11,12,13,209
 masculine, 93,98,101
 musical products in, 204,214,216
 Mysore, 39n.,95-96 *See also* Doraiswamy Iyengar.
 non-musical aspects of, 8,9,11, 12-13, 20-21,24,216
 repetition as an aspect of personal, 186-88
 tempo as a marker of, 34,65-67, 120
 terminology as a marker of personal, 29n.
 transmission of. *See* Teaching.
 Trivandrum, 99-100
 use of rhythm as marker of, 67-70
 variability in, 3,4,27,40,78,87, 90,93,111-13,130-31,189-90,204, 210,214,219
 Subbalakshmi, M. S., 100
 Subbarama Iyer, Karaikkudi, 20
 anecdotes about, 23
 ciṭṭasvara-s of, 54
 compositions of, 78,130,131
 dates, 2,18
 personal style of, 90-91,92,150, 155
 personality of, 21,91
 Subramania Iyer, Desamangalam, 99-100
 Subramanian, K. S., 106,108,190-91
 doctoral thesis of, 14,15,95
 learning with Sambasiva Iyer, 24, 81,85
 Suryanarayana, R. K., 54n.64,96
svara-s
 interpretation of, 115,124,144
 models, 140-1,155,161
 Symbols, musical (general), 73,83, 84-85,183,183n.,217

- Syncretism, 75
- Talking. *see* verbalization
- tāna* phrases, 35
- tānam*, 90, 98, 186, 188, 189
- Teaching
- of beginning lessons, 25, 27, 38-40, 41, 68, 87-90, 108, 109, 112, 113, 217
 - changes in, 203-7, 211
 - emphasis on *tāla*, 68
 - of foreign students, 3
 - gurukula vāsa*, 12, 27, 37-38, 41n. 51, 197, 203-4, 207
 - harsh method of, 26
 - indirect means of, 24, 42, 109
 - learning new pieces, 76, 131-38, 213-14
 - manner of, 40-43, 108-114
 - order of lessons, 25-26, 37-38, 111
 - responsibility in, 109, 110, 113
 - singing, 26, 29
 - time schedules for, 207, 216
- Technique, *vinā* playing, 29-37.
- aluttam*, 29-30, 94, 135, 190-91, 199, 205, 218, 219
 - choices of and change, 190-197
 - continuity, 169, 189, 191, 205, 216-17. *See also* vocal quality.
 - "double oscillation *echapée*," 88, 89
 - fingering, 135, 149, 219
 - grip, 29, 30
 - hammer-on, 31, 72, 121, 142, 147, 153
 - harmonics, 191-92
 - instrumental quality, 29, 35-37, 95, 96, 169, 191
 - jāru* (glissando), 95
 - left hand finger plucks, 143, 146
 - phrase articulation, 34, 99
 - piṭippu*, 29-30
 - plucking, 29, 33, 35, 89, 93, 98, 101, 191, 205
 - pratyāhata*, 31, 32
 - prescriptive rules, 31
 - pull-off, 121, 142, 147, 153
 - rare in the Karaikkudi style, 70-73
 - sparkling *sphurita*, 32-33, 48, 71, 94, 121, 147, 153, 156
 - sphurita*, 29, 31-32, 71
 - spreading of fingers, 29, 30-31
 - string deflection, 34, 72, 95, 97, 101
 - style boundedness of, 75, 95
 - "sustained from above," *see gamaka*
 - "touch," 87-88, 135
 - tribhinna*, 36, 95, 192-93
 - vibrato, 70, 71, 71n., 95, 99
 - vocal quality, 29, 33-35. *See also* continuity.
- Technology. *See also* Modernization
- household, 210-11
 - microphones, 96, 198-99
- Terms for musical style
- bāj*, 6, 11-12
 - bāṇi*, 10. *See also* *pāṇi*
 - gharāna*, 6, 9-11
 - palakkam*, 6, 7-8
 - pāṇi*, 6, 7, 8-9, 13
 - paramparā*, 12, 13
 - pāthāntara*, 12, 13
 - vali*, 7
- Texture, 143
- Theory, 105, 106-8
- changing to conform with, 106, 150
- Tyagarajan, T. M., 4, 106, 107, 132, 134, 135
- Vaidyanatha Bhagavatar, Chembai, 47-50, 143, 163-64
- "*valacivacci*," 161-62
 - "*vanajāsana*," 111, 206
- Verbalization about music, 6, 22, 26, 37, 41, 42, 75, 87, 106-8, 128
- technique, 31
- vinā*. *See also* Technique.
- accompanying the voice, 97
 - in iconography, 84
 - idiomatic aspects, 47, 49, 54, 157-58
 - innovations on the, 44-46, 76
 - materials used for construction of, 96
 - playing posture, 20, 63-65, 97-98
 - power associated with the, 80
 - strings of the, 65, 70, 75-76, 97, 98, 199
 - "*viribhōṇi*," 154-55
- Virtuosity, 200-202
- Viswanathan, T.
- doctoral thesis of, 14-15
 - playing style of, 66, 94, 210n.

Vocal music

akāra, 35

briga, 34

idiomatic aspects, 158

models, 34, 34n., 42

singing, 34, 90

style, 94

Wade, Bonnie, 9

Western music, 36, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76,
77, 99, 192-97

Women

femininity, 84

in the Karaikkudi style, 81

learning music, 82-83, 208

marriage, 82

performers, 80, 82, 203

restrictions on, 79

role in development of class, 81-
83