



भारतीय चित्रपट

लेखक, रा. रा. धुंडिराज गोंड फाळके.

(भारतीय चित्रपट) प्रवर्तक रा. धुंडिराज गोंड फाळके यांनी, त्यांच्या भयंकर हकीकत लिहून पाठविण्याविषयी केलेली विंगति मान्य करून पाठविलेला उपयुक्त लेख प्रकाशित झाल्या आहे. त्यांत त्यांनी आपणाला ती कल्पना कशी सुचली या गोष्टीबाबत तडित्त चार चित्रपट तयार होईपर्यंत, धंद्याच्या दृष्टीने आलेल्या अनुभवांची उत्कृष्ट माहिती दिली आहे. ती वाचून घेता अजिंतावस्थेप्रत आणण्याच्या कामी रा. फाळके यांना केवढे भयंकर दिव्य करावे लागले हे स्पष्ट दिसते. उद्योगधंदे उभार कारखाने यांच्या अभावाने दारिद्र्यांत खितपत पडलेल्या हिंदुस्थानांत उद्योग करणारा कोणी निपजलाच, तर त्याच्याच देशबंधूंकडून त्याची कशी बोटवण होई, दुसऱ्या आपणाविषारे गृहस्थ लोकांना कसे नाही शकत न, आणि 'स्वतः सैन्यशिवाना जयं दिवत नाही' (Self help is the best help) हे त्वलक्षणां घेऊन परिश्रम करणाऱ्यांक

Appendix 1
Extracts from Phalke's Articles

Excerpts of "*Bharatiya Chitrapat*" ('Indian *chitrapat*'¹) by Dhundiraj Govind Phalke (1917A & B/ 1918A & B). An article in four parts published in *Navyug* ('New Era'), a modernist cultural magazine from Bombay, Nov. and Dec. 1917, Feb. and Sept. 1918

In the following Phalke's original Marathi text is made available in its most authentic form. I initiated a new translation of selected paragraphs of Phalke's "*Bharatiya chitrapat*" from Marathi into English. In order to reduce the interpretative bias in the English translation of 1970 (Phalke 1970A, B, C, D) to the minimum and be as close as possible to Phalke's subjective point of view, I asked assistance in the translation from persons well-acquainted with that period of time, so as to get the historical flavour of the meaning of the words, point out ambiguities and allusions which are plenty and important in the original.

Mohini Varde, Marathi theatre scholar formerly of the University of Mumbai translated most of these portions of Phalke's text; Vijaya Muley (New Delhi and Montreal), filmmaker, film scholar and an activist in the truest sense of the word in the film societies' movement since nearly half a century, assisted me in clearing up last inconsistencies of meaning.

Curiously, it was mainly women² - and in most cases all the wisdom of their age - contributing to my own sensitisation to Phalke's 'world of cinema'. His granddaughter Madhavi Mitra rather casually in our informal talk at Pune in 1995 told me something that became the key to my understanding of Phalke's philosophy of cinema. She said that her grandfather used to speak of that fascinating space and sphere that the cinema constituted as *cinesrishti*, i.e. 'the whole world of cinema'.

¹) *Chitrapat* actually consists of '*chitra*', which can be translated as 'picture', and '*pat*', which has a vast range of meanings according to the context in which it is used: 'a piece of cloth', 'fabric', 'screen', 'a pasteboard for drawing or painting', etc. Generally *pat* denotes rather the material which holds the 'pictures' (including photography and film). But in daily usage *pat* often becomes synonymous with what it holds: the 'film', the 'photograph', etc. Due to these important specifics I refrain from translating the term and use it in the original.

²) The woman filmmaker Reena Mohan's beautiful documentary *Kamlabai* (1991) on the stage actress Kamlabai Gokhale (who was one of the two first females to act in Phalke's second long film in 1914) contributed a lot to my understanding of the historicity of the makers' and the spectators' emotional-moral and psychological involvement in cinema as compared to the stage performances. When I contacted Mohan she was very supportive in many respects. She also made available to me tapes with interviews she made on early Indian cinema and photographs of Kamlabai Gokhale.

Actress Kamlabai Gokhale I met and talked to in Pune thanks to the help of Aruna Damle, herself a scholar of classical music and beyond 60 researching the use of music in Marathi cinema. She was kind enough to translate our conversation from Marathi into English and vice versa, and to explain the findings of her research to me.

Kamlabai Gokhale was in her early 90s when we met; however, with her electrifying body and spoken language she not only opened my eyes, heart and mind to her own point of view vis-à-vis her appearance on the silver screen, respectively on the stage, but also to the cinematic finesse and the humanism of Phalke's early cinema (cf. Act 4).

Mitra, Damle, Gokhale, Muley and Varde agreed with me upon the importance of Phalke's playful and experimental style in the semiotics of his *Navyug* text, and that it should not be overlooked by analysts. Some passages of "*Bharatiya chitrapat*" he wrote like a textbook, others abound in self irony and satire characteristic of the contemporary *prose natak* ('drama'), interspersed with poetics rich in Sanskrit.

When Phalke relates to India, it is noteworthy that he employs different words and paraphrases depending on the context, like *Hindusthan*, *Bharat*, *bharatbhumi* ('land of Bharat'), *matrubhumi* ('motherland'), *rashtra* ('state'), *desh* ('country'), 'this country of commission agents' (denoting Indians), 'this country of slaves' (also denoting Indians), etc. Phalke's context-orientation in his imagination of India contrasts the dogmatism of the different fractions of nationalists. When they denoted India, the word used formed a component intrinsically linked to their specific nationalist politics and to the borders they draw on their imaginary maps of an independent India (cf. Act 4).

Relating to cinema Phalke used a particularly rich vocabulary which includes neologisms that are derived from the performing arts, from photography and the scientific perception of the world: *chitrapat*, *sinema*, 'visual of life', it was 'innocent like a child', a *kalaa* ('art'), *mukanatyakalaa* ('silent dramatic art'), *navnatya* ('new form of drama'), a 'reflection', a 'visual illusion', it was 'held by the *bhumika*' ('role' in the sense of container)-like screen, *chalchitranatyadarshan* ('view of the moving picture drama'), an 'innocent view', *chitrakalaa* ('picture art'), etc.

Already this richness in Phalke's vocabulary on *Bharatiya chitrapat* reflects the complexity and multilayered nature of his "Indian cinema".

1. Phalke's reminiscence of that particular cinematograph show at Bombay's America-India Picture Palace when he was 'initiated' to make films himself:

"In 1910, I saw '*Shri Christ Charitre*' ('Life of Christ') in the America-India Picture Palace in Bombay. I must have seen a number of "*chitrapat*" ('moving pictures') on many occasions before this, having gone along with my friends or family members for entertainment; but that exceptional day, that Saturday at Christmas marked a turning point in my life. It shook me to the core and fomented a revolutionary change. [...]

On the face of the earth there are millions of big and small industries and businesses; can we ever look forward to that auspicious day, when an international business like "*sinema*", which won the fifth position amongst all the industries, will be established by a poor *brahmin* holding a "*palipanchapatri*"³. At the sight of "*Christcharitra*" I had the reverent feeling about Christ as a person [*vyatri*] and the noble incidences in his life, and without being really conscious about it, I went on clapping and in my heart there was this queer feeling, it is difficult to explain what happened; but while this film was in reality [*kare*] unrolling fast in front of my eyes, my 'inner eye' was visualising Bhagwan Shri Krishna, Bhagwan Ramchandra, their Gokul and Ayodhya. Whatever it was, be it so. I was dazed with an inexplicable spell, and bought another ticket and saw the "*chitrapat*" again. This time I felt that the "*kalpana srishti*" ('world of imagination') was becoming the "*pratyaksha srishti*" ('world of reality'). Will this illusion [*abhas*] become real? Would we, the "*bharatputra*" be able to bring the "*bharate chitre*" on the "*pardah*"? The whole night was thus spent in worrying.

Afterwards for two consecutive months I could not rest until I had seen each and every "*chitrapat*" running in any "picture palace" in Mumbai [...] By the grace of God [*ishak-ripa*], I felt it deep in my heart that I will be successful. I found out that the basic prerequisites for producing a "*chitrapat*", such as drawing, "painting", sculpture, "photography", "*natya*", magic [*jadu*], were available with me. Besides, I already possessed gold and silver medals as support to make the work successful and approved." (Phalke 1917A, bold letters by B. S.)

2. The Indian film pioneer's idea of *suchitrapat* ('good picture') consisted of a cinema that was technically flawless, beautiful to look at, morally edifying, and provided a healthy entertainment. It thus contributed to the struggle for a better understanding amongst people and for equality:

"[...] to look beautiful is very essential. 'What is so great about this body and wealth?' [allusion to Kabir's famous saying], though such precious thoughts look very pure, I do not find any value in them, unless they are fit into the set of the very material golden setting! [someone else is asking:] Until now for the current traditional [stage] plays the question of "*swaroop*" ['outer form'] did not arise, then why is it essential for the "*muka nataka*" ['the silent drama']? [Phalke:] Such question has been asked to me by many people. In short, the answer is that the current plays are

³) A *brahmin* who is going around with the "*patri*", the begging bowl, performing *puja* at demand.

only for listening ["*shravya*"] but the "silent dramas" are to be seen ["*drishya*"]⁴ [...] . "The cinema needs real beauty which means it needs a proper "*chitra*"/ picture. Such a scene, which can be said to possess beauty as a picture is very rare in our country [*desh*]. There could be various reasons. There could actually be dozens of reasons like the hot climate, poverty, our mentality to be satisfied with little, "and the world is trivial"⁵. To me the most important reason is, that from childhood we are educated in the dry *Vedanta*, and that we somehow lead our life. As a result all our worldly actions conclude in the attitude 'What will happen, will happen'. If we embrace true *Vedanta*, we will never condemn worldly pleasure; not only that, we will become the genuine "*Karma Yogi*" and the most essential thing, which is detachment, will completely reside in our people" [...].

[...] We must give up a lot of our ignorance in achieving good health and beauty [*saundari*]. Instead we should practise "*suprajajnana shastra*"/ the science of healthy progeny, "*vidyun manasa shastra*"/ science of an 'enlightened' mind, and by means of such "*adhibautik*"/ worldly sciences, our bodies will become "*nivamaya*"/ flawless, peaceful and "*abyangar*"/ faultless, and thus "*sudarshan*"/ the outer beautiful look is very essential! [...] Let us explain this a bit further by means of comparison.

The old dramas which are performed on the "stage", their major part, right from the first word to the last, was of "*shravya*". [...] the voice should be very clear, one might even strengthen it with the help of the phonograph, if this technology is further improved [...]. One can listen to these "acts" with the eyes closed. If the actor can sing and has a sweet voice, then there is no need of beauty [*saundari*]. [...]

Still in the new plays/ cinema the silent actor needs to attract the heart of the audiences [*prekshak*] only with one or two points [...]. The first point is beauty and good figure. The second point is how the sentiments are played out for being seen [*manovikare darshan*, implying the facial expressions]. He must possess these two tools at their best. An actor who has these by nature will be able to get applause. But a "stage" actor, though not possessed with these two tools, will be able to get applause anyway.

All this said [I am not at all belittling] that the "stage" actor has to continuously speak on the stage, his efforts in knowing the script by heart, standing 4-6 hrs.[on the stage], enacting a character [*bhoomika*], to be one with it and with great skill to impress the minds of the audiences [*manavar prekshakanchya*] and convey the sentiments of the dramatists [this is not a small thing to achieve]! This is very difficult and skilful."

(this and all preceding quotes from Phalke 1918A, bold letters and a few corrections by B.S.).

"[...] the dramatists of today created the art of motion pictures, which does not require any literary text at all, and can be understood easily even by children. Thus, in a sense, the exponents of the film art have done a great social service. All the differences of

⁴) It is important here to notice that Phalke chooses the concepts *shravya* and *drishya* from the *natyashastra* (where actually the two combined with *kaviya* make up for a proper *natya*) to support his argument that the cinema and the theatre are essentially different. Usually, the modern reception of Phalke's early cinema relates to the *natyashastra* just for the sake of arguing without giving reasons that Phalke's early "mythologicals" are well in the tradition of the *natyashastra* (Nair 1995 et al.).

⁵) An ironic allusion to Shankaracharya.

caste, language, race have disappeared. All people, "**Hindumusalman** [Indians!], Chini, Japani" are coming together in the cinema houses. The *pardah* [being veiled or sitting behind a curtain] of ladies has disappeared. Men and women have equal rights on the seats in cinema theatres." (Phalke 1918A/ 1970C, 97-98; parts of the translation, annotations and bold letters by B. S.)

3. In the fourth and final part of his *Navyug* article series Phalke summarises his concept of *Bharatiya chitrapat* as follows:

"My humble request to the readers is to allow me to end this series of articles now. With the remaining subjects I will deal when I will live and relax as a pensioner. Presently these articles have achieved their aim. God [*bhagvan*] is holding his umbrella of kindness over me. Expressing my desire that I should serve [*seva*] the 'nation' [*rashtra*] by means of "*sinema*", that "*kalaa*" [art] may improve steadily and become more and more popular, I take leave of the readers.

Suchitrapat yojnaa
sarasa divya punyaa katha
yatharthaa bhava darshane
sahaja daaviti satpathaa
nase sulabh kaarya hain
pari Harikripaa jain ghade
muke madhur bolti
shikhar pangu taisaa chadhe."

"The concept for a good *chitrapat*
 requires a story [*katha*] full of *rasa*, divinity and virtue,
 Giving a real/ accurate view [*darshane*] of existence/ the world [*bhava*],
 effortlessly showing the true path [*satpathaa*].
 This is no easy task,
 but by the grace of God
 the mute will speak in dulcet tones
 and the lame will scale the mountain peak."

(Phalke 1918B, translation by Asha von der Fink, Pushpalata Jagade, Vijay S. Kumar and B. S.)

4. Phalke, the searcher. Ironic in his self references, at the same time he could be bitter and cynical against the colonial state authorities and his Indian male (com-) patriots. In contrast, he unrestrictedly and childlike trusted in his wife Saraswatibai:

"Who am I? Am I that father adding to the thirty crore [300 million] of *Bharatbhumi*'s population ['Bharat's soil'] of slaves [*ghulam*]? Am I the husband of a wife, or a *Bharat-sewak* ['servant of *Bharat*'] who has not paid his dues towards his *Matrubhumi* ['motherland']? 'Am I the sacrificial lamb to the greed of moneylenders?['] [Phalke made a

"special footnote" here]: 'My ambitions and my hopes were shattered, because of the nature of agreement [with the moneylenders] - sometimes I hope to disclose it in detail. We poor needy craftsmen [*karagir*] run after our ambitions as novices, and we tied ourselves, and later one totally fails. Hey, my colleagues, this I would like to tell you for your own happiness and prosperity. I have to tell this. Whether such agreements are lawful or not, may be decided by the court but because I have stumbled, I wish to make my brothers wiser'.

[continued] 'Or am I that impractical fool, who goes after his ambition, and only after his ambition, and who is on the verge of ruining his family?' 'Who am I?' (after pondering for a while) 'Or, this is it! How fine': 'I am nobody, but through God'. 'I do not say this' [but God], nothing belongs to me. 'Happiness or unhappiness is not known to Him', No.1, Shri Dhaneshwar, Jay to Sajidhananda.' 'Enough of this long speech. Oh, **all my fellow countrymen** [*madeshabandava*], the **self-supposed vanguard of scholars**, oh, you, who are **proudly knowing and appreciating the arts**⁶, oh, you, who want to be pragmatic and the **makers of these modern times**, who are in the frontline of **progress**, I pray to all of you with extreme humility, with folded hands, that the sad stories of an ordinary person like me should not disturb you, and let them not interfere in whatever grace you bestow on me. Because, with the blessings of the *navnatyacharya*⁷ **the dramatists who are at the vanguard of the new play**, I must say, I have also achieved something. I established this new *chalchitra mukhanatyakalaa* ['silent dramatic art of moving pictures'] with my limited knowledge of Indian soil for the entertainment of the art lovers, with the help of whatever funds I could make available; kindly treat this *kala* [art] in all its aspects which are so beautiful, and the analysis of its production and its form with sympathy.' (Little worried) 'I am like a person who is harassed with the fire of three types of worries⁸, let my **wife** calm down my worries, **she, the only one who rejuvenates me through her nectarlike and cooling thought.**" (Phalke 1918A, bold letters by B. S.)

5. In the third part of his article series published in February 1918, Phalke presented himself as a dialogic subjectivity in two characters, a 'man' and a 'woman' reflecting on the beauty of a recognitive intersubjectivity and the negative effects brought about by separation, duality and hypocrisies in all spheres of worldly being. To express this in all its shades, Phalke played with the plethora of meanings attributed to *pardah*. In his *cinesrishti* 'good films' would contribute to the liberation from duality:

"[He says] She is one who helps me tremendously to perform my duties of the four "*purushartas*" [manly duties] as one, a part and parcel of my life, not only that, but she is the Goddess in reality of my success. Such is she, my own Prakritipriya ['Beloved Na-

⁶) According to Mohini Varde, Phalke used a lot of Sanskrit in a highly sarcastic manner to actually mock these "learned men".

⁷) Mohini Varde pointed out that Khadilkar was usually addressed as a "*navnatyacharya*".

⁸) Varde explained that in this Marathi proverb the three worries are "wordly", "spiritual", and "natural calamities".

ture'], why is she not coming? *Ariye* ('oh, my wife'), if you are finished with the work please come out on the stage from behind the *pardah* ['curtain'].

Prakritipriya (coming forward): "*Ariyo* ('oh, my husband'), why do you say *pardah*, and work behind the *pardah*? *Pardah! Pardah!!* This *pardah* has only spread duality [*dwaita*] everywhere. For us women the *pardah* ['veil' and a second meaning here is that women are being seated behind transparent 'curtains' to avoid any stranger's look at them, thus in the theatre and the cinema, too, there were "*pardah* seats"], and also for the men in their behaviour and in their thinking there is *pardah*, in speaking and talking there is *pardah*, in state politics there is *pardah*, in patriotism [*deshabhakti*] there is *pardah*, in truth there is *pardah*, inside the house and also at the doorstep *pardah!!* In short, *pardah* is used at the outside to pretend about what is inside, to guard and also to cover up secrets, to guard the plot so that it is not disclosed there is *pardah*, and this *pardah* is indiscriminately used even to hide what looks ugly. Nowadays, the nature of human beings [*manushya*] is becoming more and more hypocritical! I am fed up with all this! Isn't it that with the growing number of *pardahs* simplicity, oneness [with God] and piety are becoming very rare virtues nowadays?

"What you say is all true. This idea of here 'mine' and there 'yours' creates duality. These *pardahs* are giving birth to duality and the idea of 'yours' and 'mine'. Such *pardahs* should disappear from the face of the world, and who will not agree that the "*satyayuga*" ['Age of Truth'] should be established again? Don't you think that the removal of these *pardahs* will be a good thing? I would go even further and say that the word *pardah* itself should be banned. In proper entertainment [*karmanyuk*] and drama there should not be fuss about *pardah*.

[He] (Pretending to listen) "What did you say? It is said that during the "Muslim" [*yavan* actually denoted 'the Greek', i.e. rulers coming from the North-West] rule one banned the *shendis* [little pigtail in the man's neck] of the Aryan's and along with it also the coconut *shendis*. Do you think I am banishing in the same way the *pardahs* which are the root of duality? Do you think this action of mine resembles what was done to the *shendis* in the times of the Muslim rule, do you think it is as stupid, impractical and impossible? Do you say so? Oh, no!

[according to M. Varde all this is written in the form used by the contemporary *natak*] As far as this new form of "*natak*" [the cinema] is concerned - let not anybody blame the *chalchitra* which has established itself after entertaining the learned people continuously for more than two decades.

- "In spite of that, these *chalchitras* require a *pardah*."

- "This is your wrong conception. What you are referring to as *pardah* here is in reality [*vastutha*, Sanskrit] not a *pardah*, but it is the "*bhoomika*" [basic requirement, substratum, basic viewpoint] for my "*abhas drishya*" [visual illusion, illusionary scene, particular vision]. Will you call a "*pratibimba*" [image] which is seen on the surface of the water a *pardah*? Can we call the image in a mirror a *pardah*? In the same way that *pardah* is only supporting/ holding my *chalchitra natyadarshan*. Though this kind of a presentation of *chalchitra* is still in its infancy, the pleasant, flawless, and silent [*mukha*] childlike playfulness of this "*darshan*" ['sight'] has charmed the whole world. Be it so. Enough of this analysis of the whole 'stagecraft'. Let me fulfil the promise that I gave to these scholars who are very fond of the *chitrakalaa*. Come on, let us start it. (Interlude over)." (Phalke 1918A)

6. Phalke's cinema and morality

" [...] I will write about the importance of cinema in foreign countries and its service to industry and education when it is proper. Here I will first refute some irresponsible charges against cinema which are published in newspapers. For example, they say that cinema breeds immorality [*aniti*]. Such allegations made by enemies of the cinema are the outcome of ignorance or viciousness.

Suppose a man comes across a beautiful girl and charms her. He deprives her of virginity and when she is harassed by gossip and asks for assistance, he refuses all responsibility and is not even gentleman enough to give her railway fare to go to Pandharpur. Can such a rascal quote Shakuntala in justification for his behaviour? Are we supposed to learn from Subhadra how to stay incognito in relatives' houses and kidnap their womenfolk? A person has a chaste wife from a noble family and a son, but is attracted towards a modest and loving prostitute. Can this person be considered as an admirer of Mrichakatika? It is not proper to argue thus. On the contrary, it displays a lack of discretion. Those who are susceptible to depravity do not need cinema or theatre to mislead them. There are numerous other factors which lead to immorality [*aniti*]. One must have that kind of disposition.

This is true for all countries and for all times. It is my firm conviction that the main purpose of cinema and theatre is entertainment only. Now, if through such entertainment, one also acquires knowledge, that then is a bonus like the sugar in milk. Anyway, we must first see the prerequisites of making a film." (Phalke 1970B, 94)

7. Phalke and the *swadeshi* movement

"[...] This was the time of the *swadeshi* movement and it was a time when the speeches on *swadeshi* had become abundant. As a result I left my good paid government job and became a freelancer starting an industrial business and profession. At this favourable time I talked to my friends and the *swadeshi* leaders [*swadeshichya pudavyas*] about my dreams and hopes concerning my ideas of *cinesrishti*, the **world of cinema**. Those friends with whom I had a ten years old personal friendship and business relations, too, they also found my ideas like "*chandoba*" ['reaching for the moon'] I became a subject of ridicule for them [...] If under the circumstances described above my factory were to close down, will also my moneylenders be ruined? [Surely not] After all the avenues were closed down, my moneylender, my partner - my profit-sharing partner and moneylender - were not ready to give up even a smallest bit [of their claims]. Had I just left the timber, the iron that was pawned, with the moneylender as it is, would that not have been justified? Oh, Hindusthan! "Phalke is a swindler", "Artists are always such rogues", "It is difficult for Hindusthan to come up [because of these rogues]" - Such curses are always bestowed upon your "*karmayogi putre*" ['the one adhering to *Karma Yoga*']! The world will always pity those striving for money!!

Let it be that way, or this way!! A new "*kalaa*" [art] should be permanently established in "*Hindusthan*", somehow 100-200 labourers and craftsmen like me should be able to survive, **sons of "bharat"** should be able to see "*bharat chitre*", **people of Europe** [*vilayat loka*] should be able to have a **realistic imagination** [*kari kalpana*] of "*Bharatbhoomi*" sitting in their respective homes [*gharbasliya*²], with this conviction I will

not turn away from my duty [*kartavya*], even if I have to give away my life, with this ambition, without the support of a single *paisa* I held on to my factory [*karkana*] keeping my eyes looking up towards the heaven [*akash*]."

[... a little further down in the same part I of the article series, Phalke wrote] "Two solid 'programmes' have been brought before the *bharatputre* in the midst of the war-atmosphere - a new 'Raja Harishchandra' and 'Lanka Dahan' ['The burning of Lanka']. '*Lanka*' '*dahan*' ['burning'] - and also the doubts have been burnt. Cinema theatres are hopeful about *deshi chitrapat* ['films from India']. Advanced contracts are made of my old, my new and future *chitrapat* [...] My brothers [*bandav*] will profusely shower their sympathy on this new "*kalaa*" and give it a fillip, and it will not only make our Hindusthan but the whole world [*jagatas*] enjoy the Hindi craft [*kaushal*], I am sure of this." (Phalke 1917A, bold letters by B. S.).

"[...] *purna swadeshi* [...] totally *swadeshi*!! - Bah, "Hindusthana"! You have already been made a laughing stock, and the press is really helpful in this matter! What else? In the same advertisement [I am reading of] *pardesha* ['that which is made without going to a foreign country'] By reading this sentence a deep respect is created for that person. I dare not to claim this. I went three times abroad [*vilayat*], still I would go for the fourth time, if need be. There is no end to observation, education and improvement. [...] this sentence really obliges the country [*rashtra*]. It is also true. Those staying outside Pune and Mumbai like oilmillers, betelnut sellers, schoolmasters, *patils* and *kulkarnis* will be made proud of deserving "Home rule" and that will strengthen their valour. MontagueSaheb, learn Marathi and see the power of advertisement!! I never use to say 'I', 'I', 'LANKA DAHAN', 'SHRI KRISHNA', these are my humble creations, lakhs [100,000] of viewers point out [at me] and say 'You', 'You', how can I help it! My five years old daughter has been awarded a gold medal, should I stop that?" (Phalke 1918B)

References

- Phalke, Dhundiraj Govind (1917/ 1918), "*Bharatiya Chitrapat*" (Marathi), in: *Navyug*, Bombay Nov. and Dec. 1917, Febr. and Sept. 1918 [translated to English by Narmada S. Shahane in: Phalke Centenary Celebration Committee (1970) (ed.), 87-102, and in: Film Institute of India (1970) (ed.), 21-98]
- (1970A), "Indian Cinema I", in: Phalke Centenary Celebration Committee (1970) (ed.), 87-94 [orig. in: *Navyug*, November 1917]
- (1970B), "Indian Cinema II", in: Phalke Centenary Celebration Committee (1970) (ed.), 94-96 [orig. in: *Navyug*, December 1917]
- (1970C), "Indian Cinema III", in: Phalke Centenary Celebration Committee (1970) (ed.), 96-100 [orig. in *Navyug*, February 1918]