Colonialism, Nationalism and the "Quest6ion of Englsih" in Early Modern Kannada Literature

Tharakeshwar V.B.

July 2002

Department of English
School of Humanities,
University of Hyderabad,
Hyderabad - 500 046.

Date: 28.07.2002

This is to certify that I, Tharakeshwar V.B., have carried out the research embodied in the present thesis for the full period prescribed under the Ph.D. Ordinances of the University.

1 declare to the best of my knowledge that no part of this thesis was earlier submitted for the award of research degree of any University.

(Signature of the candidate)
Name: Tharakeshwar V.B.
Enrolment No. 95HEPH01

Signature of the Supervisors:

1. Tejaswini Niranjana

2. S Padikkal
29/07/02

1/8/02
Head,
Department of English

1/8/02
Dean,
School of Humanities

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is an outcome of generous help and support from various people, groups and institutions. My thanks are due to -

- My parents who were willing to sponsor this research project, when I had neither the fellowship nor the job. just because "1 am their son".

- The Department of English, University of Hyderabad which gave me the opportunity to conduct this research project towards the Ph.D. degree.

- My research supervisors, Dr. Tejaswini Niranjana and Dr. Shivaram Padikkal. who gave me the academic freedom that is very necessary for any research project and also for strengthening my arguments with their insightful suggestions and comments; the shortcomings in the argument are however mine.

- The present Head of the Department Prof. K. Narayana Chandran, former Heads: Prof. Sudhakar Marathe and Prof. Mohan G. Ramanan. and other faculty members for their cooperation. Not to forget the office staff Murthy garu. Prasadgaru. Nagarajgaru. Chary and Suresh.

- All my friends at the University' of Hyderabad, who made my stay at Hyderabad a memorable one: the list is endless, starting from individuals like Gangesh and Madhukar who pulled me towards Hyderabad to Babu Yogesh. Ramesh. Gurram, Sudarshan, Maithreyi. Radhika. Santosh. Boru. Prashanth. Prasanna. Rajesh. Dana. Sridhar. Vani. Deepti; and student groups based on various issues identities. It is not possible to list all the names here, but I thank each one of them.

- Kannada University-Hampi for allowing me to take up research projects that are related to my Ph.D. and also for granting me three months study-leave to complete this dissertation. I can't forget my colleagues who were eager to see my dissertation and to their wives (Banu. Bhagya. Shakuntala. Jyoti) who constantly took care of me when 1 was busy with writing/typing and was not able to cook for **myself.**

- The Indira Gandhi Memorial Library of University of Hyderabad, the Library of Kannada University-Hampi and the Library of Centre for the Study of Culture and Society, Bangalore.

- The Rethinking "Crisis" in English Studies group, which also helped me immensely, especially Nikhila. Shashikala and Srinivasaiah who took up the painstaking work of proof reading and offered their comments on earlier drafts.

- Various professional associations institutions such as IACL.ALS and the Universities which provided the space in the form of seminars and conferences to share my research with others in the field: and also to the scholars who commented on my papers in these seminars conferences.

- Nikhila's family who helped me to take printouts whenever I was in need of it.

- Sudha Padikkal and Tirumal for hosting me in all my Hyderabad visits.

Contents

A Note on Translation and Transliteration

All translations from Kannada into English are mine, unless otherwise mentioned. While transliterating from Kannada I have followed my ears rather than any standard format, except in those cases where there is already an accepted transliteration available. In the case of names of authors, if authors themselves have spelt their name in a particular way. I have followed that spelling.

A Note on Citation of Names of Kannada Authors in Works Cited

While citing Kannada authors. I have used their first name as in Kannada first name is the common name. Only if the second name is also commonly known, 1 have used the second name.

1

Introduction

The present study looks at the cultural transactions of the colonial period with reference to early modern Kannada literature, focusing on the writings and translations of B.M. Srikantia (1884-1946), popularly known as *Kannadada Kanva* (The Kama of Kannada), and the *Acharya Purusha* (The chief spiritual guide) of modern Kannada literature. This study tries to trace the development of nationalist thought in the context of Kannada literature and its relation to colonial discourse.

In this introductory chapter. I shall try to place the issue I have taken up for research in the context of postcolonial studies that informs the English discipline today. Then 1 have touched upon the issues that I have taken up to examine in this study - the issues of colonialism, nationalism and the question of "English". The main hypothesis of my study is to pinpoint the peculiarities of the nationalist discourse and its politics in the context of Kannada literature and to argue that in Princely Mysore/Kannada context we witness both pan-Indian and Kannada nationalism.

I

Since the publication of Edward Said"s *Orientalism* (1978) which exposes the complicity of orientalist discourse with colonial rule and the nexus of knowledge/power, there have been an increasing number of studies on our colonial past. One of the strands of these studies on colonial discourse took up the critical examination of the discipline of English at the end of the 1980s. *Masks of Conquest* (Vishwanthan. 1989) exposed the complicity of the language/discipline in the colonial project. Seminars were organized first in Delhi (late 1980s and early 90s), later in Hyderabad (mid 1990s), Bangalore (late 1990s)

and other places to address the uneasiness of the teachers of English with the discipline. A part of the deliberations and proceedings of these seminars have been published and widely discussed. Some of these publications include *Rethinking English: Essays in History. Literature and Language* (Joshi. 1991). *Lie of the Land: English Literary Studies in India* (Sunder Rajan, 1992). edited *Provocations* (Ramanan, et.al.,) and *Subject to Change* (Tharu, 1998).

If English education or in general, English (both literature and language) is part of the colonial discourse. then to which discourse do modern literatures in regional languages or translations from English into regional languages. which were born out of a zeal that came with the stud) of English literature in schools and colleges. belong to? Can we say that the modern regional language literatures and translations are derivative of the colonial discourse? If they are not. then we need to explore in what way they are different from the colonial discourse and what is the politics of this difference. By extension. this leads us to the question whether there was a scope for the native elite to maneuver the colonial discourse. And also to one more crucial issue: what is the relation between English education and the native elite in the context of colonialism?

The question can also be framed in the following way: If what was taught in the schools and colleges during the colonial period was colonial discourse. and it was a move to colonize the natives. then what was the outcome of it? Did the native elite who was educated in English get inscribed into the subject position of the discourse of colonial education or did some other discourse emanate from the mediation of the native English educated elite?

These questions have led to the analysis of the nationalist discourse in India. One of the earliest studies on nationalist thinkers like Iswarchandra Vidyasagar. Bankimchandra Chatterjee. Aurobindo and M.K. Gandhi is *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism* (Nandy, 1988 (1983)). But the pioneering study in analyzing the structure of nationalist discourse is *Nationalist*

Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse? (Chatterjee, 1986). In this book, Partha Chatterjee analyses cultural nationalism and traces the development of nationalist thought in India. After looking at the western liberal doctrines of nationalism and Marxist discussions of nationalism in general and in India in particular, he says that there is a seeming contradiction in Indian nationalism. According to him nationalism "produced a discourse in which even as it challenged the colonial claim to political domination, it also accepted the very intellectual premise of 'modernity' on which colonial domination was based" (Chatterjee. 1986: 30). The liberal and Marxist doctrines of nationalism do not explain this "contradiction"', according to Chatterjee.

He employs the categories, 'thematic' and 'problematic. to explain this seeming contradiction in nationalist thought. He tries to

> separate the claims of an ideology, i.e. its identification of historical possibilities and the practical or programmatic forms of its realization, from its justificatory structures. i.e. the nature of the evidence it presents in support of those claims, the rules of inference it relies on to logically relate a statement of the evidence to a structure of arguments, the set of epistemological principles, and finally the set of ethical principles it appeals to in order to assert that those claims are morally justified.

He calls the former as problematic and the latter its thematic.

> The thematic, in other words, refers to an epistemological as well as ethical system which provides a framework of elements and rules for establishing relations between elements: the problematic, on the other hand, consists of concrete statements about possibilities justified by reference to the thematic.

His contention is that

> the problematic in nationalist thought is exactly the reverse of that of Orientalism. That is to say, the 'object' in nationalist thought is still the Oriental, who retains the essentialist character depicted in

> Orientalist discourse. Only he is not passive, non-participating. He is seen to possess a 'subjectivity' which he can himself 'make'. In other words while his relationship to himself and to others is 'posed, understood and defined' by others, i.e., by an objective scientific consciousness, by Knowledge, by Reason, those relationships are not acted by others. His subjectivity, he thinks, is active, autonomous and sovereign (Chatterjee, 1986: 38).

Chatterjee is trying to show that at the level of the thematic the nationalist thought is adopting the same essentialist conceptions of 'the East' and 'the West', the "typology created by a transcendent studying subject, and hence the same 'objectifying' procedures of knowledge constructed in the post-enlightenment age of western science"". His central concern is to explore the "relation between the content of nationalist discourse and the kind of politics which nationalism conducts"". He says that

> It is part of the ideological content of nationalism, which takes as its adversary a contrary discourse- the discourse of colonialism. Pitting itself against the reality of colonial rule - which appears before it as an existent, almost palpable, historical truth - nationalism seeks to assert the feasibility of entirely political possibilities. These are its political claims which colonialist discourse haughtily denies (Chatterjee, 1986: 40).

Thus both colonial discourse and the national discourse share a similar epistemology of the post-enlightenment world (the thematic) but the arguments, which are derived from it, are different, as the politics of both the discourses are different. One seeks to produce a problematic that justifies its colonial rule; the other produces a problematic that questions the colonial rule. Further, Chatterjee tells us that the relation between nationalist discourse and the forms of modern western thought is not a simple relation of correspondence, or even of derivation. First of all nationalist thought is selective about what it takes from western

thought. He asserts that it is indeed deliberately and necessarily selective. as its politics is to oppose the colonial rule and reject the immediate political implications of colonial thought so that it can argue in favor of political possibilities which colonialist thought refuses to admit. Chatterjee's hypothesis is that a nationalist discourse is "'a different discourse, yet one that is dominated by another (colonial discourse)".

Then, using Gramsci's concept of 'passive revolution' he tries to show how through an historical process nationalist discourse constitutes itself. Gramsci. while trying to trace the ascendancy of bourgeois nationalists through a passive revolution in Italy identifies three moments of the process: The first is objective structure. 'independent of human will' that is conducive to claim hegemony. The second is relation of political forces, 'the degree of homogeneity. self-awareness and organization attained by various classes". The third is that of the relation of military forces.

Chatterjee uses certain nationalists texts from India. to be precise. that of Bankim Chandra - a Bengali writer of the colonial period, Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. by giving ideological unity to the diverse strands of nationalist thought. using the theoretical characterization based on Gramsci's notion of passive revolution. He traces the historical constitution of this unity in terms of certain stages. which he calls as moments, "each having a specific form of combination of the thematic and the problematic and each bearing certain historical possibilities in terms of the relation of 'subjective forces'".

i) The moment of departure: Here nationalism accepts the essential cultural difference between East and West. It asserts the superiority of the West in its material culture like science, technology. and the love of progress. But the East is seen as superior in the spiritual aspect of culture. Nationalism seeks to bridge this gap through modernization and by cultural synthesis. Chatterjee demonstrates this through the analysis of the writings of

Bankim Chandra. As this stage comprises an elitist program, it cannot mobilize the masses, who are essential for a capitalist transformation i.e.. for a passive revolution.

ii) The moment of manoeuvre: It combines the war of movement and the war of position and historically consolidates the nation by decrying the 'modern', the preparation for expanded capitalist production, by resorting to an ideology of anti-capitalism. This moment is illustrated by a discussion of Gandhi's thought.

iii) The moment of arrival: This is when nationalist thought attains its fullest development. Here it seeks to actualize itself in the unified life of the state and glosses over all earlier contradictions. This moment is illustrated by a study of the writings of Jawaharlal Nehru.

Chatterjee argues that 'passive revolution' is the general form of the transition from colonial to post-colonial national states in the 20th century. He further claims that his theoretical framework is not just applicable to Indian nationalism but also to nationalist thought in all colonial countries (Chatterjee. 1986: 50). In his later work *The Nation and Its Fragments* (1994) he reiterates this position:

> (A)nti colonial nationalism creates its own domain of sovereignty within colonial society well before it begins its political battle with the imperial power. It does this by dividing the work of social institutions and practices into two domains the material and the spiritual. The material is the domain of the 'outside' of the economy and of statecraft, of science and technology, a domain where the west had proved its superiority... The spiritual on the other hand is an 'inner" domain bearing the 'essential" mark of cultural identity...This formula is. I think, a fundamental feature of anti-colonial nationalisms in Asia and Africa (Chatterjee, 1994: 6).

Partha Chatterjee's framework is indeed useful to analyze the nationalist discourse and pinpoint how in terms of problematic it is different from the colonial discourse. Also his analysis of nationalist discourse and women's question seems to hold good for the nationalist discourse in Princely Mysore/ Kannada context. But the main problem is that in Princely Mysore we find other factors apart from a pan-Indian nationalist discourse. Prominent among these factors were the discourse of Kannada nationalism, loyalty towards the Maharaja of Princely Mysore and the Backward Class movement. These factors seem to have added to the complexity of the nationalist situation in Princely Mysore.

Partha Chatterjee clearly indicates that at the level of the problematic, we can relate the politics of a discourse to social classes and their interests:

> It is there (in the terrain of politics) that we can connect the ideology to its 'social bases', relate its theoretical claims to the state of the social structure and its dynamics, to the 'interests' of various social classes, their opposition as well as their coming together (Chatterjee. 1986:40-41).

In the case of the nationalist discourse, he traces the political claims of the nationalist discourse to the upper caste English educated elite group (the group that had newly emerged in the colonial period). But if there are multiple contradictory streams in a discourse which seem to be opposing each other at the level of problematic, how do we account for it? Partha Chatterjee, through his selection of texts and by giving a unity to the diverse strands of nationalist thought, escapes from this problem. He also divides the differences in the problematic of the nationalist thought into three phases, which share a relation of gradual evolution. He allows the possibility of change in the problematic if the historical forces change: "As historical conditions change so are new political possibilities thought out; the problematic undergoes a transformation within the

same structure of discourse" (Chatterjee. 1986: 41). But if we find different problematics within the same historical juncture how do we look at it?

What I am trying to suggest here is that if a particular historical bloc. the English educated elite, can change the colonial discourse into a nationalist one by changing the problematic to suit its needs. then isn't it possible for another social class to change the colonial discourse into some other discourse by changing the problematic to suit its interests? My argument here is in the context of Princely Mysore where the historic specificities allowed a different kind of formulation of nationalist discourse. 1 shall talk about the specificity of the Princely Mysore /Kannada context little later.

Political scientist G. Aloysius in his study *Nationalism Without a Nation in India* (1998) has argued that there was not one historical bloc in India during the colonial period. but two historical blocs. which were antagonistic to each other. For him. the elite bloc constitutes nationalism and the subaltern mass constitutes nation. Because these two blocs were antagonistic in nature. Aloysius says. the nation failed to emerge in India (Aloysius. 1998). Here Aloysius seems to be operating with an ideal notion of nation. which would encompass all the people social classes of that nation. But Aloysius's point that there was no single historical bloc and the interaction between various historical blocs was antagonistic is well taken in the light of the various discourses that were prevailing during the colonial period and competing to be hegemonic discourses.

Here we can stretch Chatterjee's theory of nationalist discourse a little bit to account for the existence of different historical blocs in India during the colonial period. The different social classes had different perceptions of nation and national movement. It is not that the nationalist elite did not make any attempt to have alliances or obtain the loyalty of these classes; the nationalist elite class did make an attempt and was also successful to some extent. But the question is that

of exploring the relationship between the colonial discourse, the nationalist discourse and various competing discourses.

My hypothesis here is that Karnataka, to be precise, Princely Mysore had a different socio-political setting during the colonial period. This point is discernible more easily at the outset in the sphere of politics. As I have taken up Kannada literature for analysis the problem of identifying a corresponding political entity for Kannada literature crops up. There was no corresponding single political entity for Kannada. The Kannada speaking regions of the colonial period were under various political/administrative regimes. Karnataka as a political entity materialized only in 1956, with the reorganization of states in India. But the formation of Kannada/Karnataka identity can be traced back to the late 19th century. Then Princely Mysore, a major Kannada-speaking region was under the indirect colonial rule, with the Maharaja, a Dewan, a Resident appointed by the British, a Representative Assembly and a Legislative council. Bellary and Mangalore were under the direct colonial rule of Madras Presidency. Kanvar. Dharwad, Belgaum and Bijapur were under the direct rule of Bombay presidency. Bidar, Gulbarga and Raichur were under the rule of the Nizam of Hyderabad. Apart from these regions there were several other princely states, a total of twenty in number. Each of these regions had its own historical and political peculiarity and it is very difficult to combine them in any analysis. So I have limited myself to Princely Mysore in this study, though I am looking at Kannada literature that emerged even in the other regions. Whenever it is necessary to make a comparison with other regions I have done so. though the central focus is on Kannada literature and/in Princely Mysore.

James Manor, a political scientist who has worked on the socio-political changes during the colonial period in Princely Mysore, clearly states that given the enormous differences between the political systems established in British India and that of the princely states, any comparison between the two becomes difficult. He also warns that even a comparison between Mysore and other princely states is

difficult as the parallels are imperfect (Manor. 1977: 56). S. Chandrashekar, a historian of the nationalist struggle in South India, is not satisfied with the existing histories of colonial south India since most of them concentrate only on the Madras presidency, neglecting other regions. He suggests that the princely state of Mysore should be studied separately (Chandrashekar, 1985: 2).

If we analyze present day India's territory in terms of its political system during the colonial period, one-third of it comprised princely states ruled by Indian Kings, and constituted what Gandhi called "'Indian India" as opposed to British India. Princely Mysore was hailed as a benevolent modern state. Gandhi went to the extent of calling it a Rama Rajya. S. Chandrashekar argues that the people of Mysore never thought that they were colonized (Chandrashekar, 1995: 266). If that was the case. then how did the issue of colonialism and nationalism come up at all? We don"t see any major political events in Princely Mysore in the early part of 20th century. Only in the 1930s and 1940s were there some signs of Congress presence. In Mysore. Congress was explicitly dubbed as a Brahminical Party and was looked upon with suspicion by the people belonging to backward castes and dominant non-brahmin castes.[2] These groups were mobilizing on the issue of entering the new institutions that were coming up in Princely Mysore with the modernization process. They spearheaded a backward caste movement which demanded reservation of jobs for the members of backward castes. Heeding to their demand, the Maharaja set up a committee headed by Miller. The Miller's committee recommended reservation to these backward castes in Government jobs. The Maharaja implemented the recommendations of the committee. But the Dewan who was unhappy with the reservation of jobs resigned from his position. The upper-caste groups, unhappy with the recommendations of Miller's Committee Report. seem to have veered towards the Congress party. But the official position of the Congress on Princely Mysore was that it was an Indian state. So, there was a difference of opinion between the Congress members from Princely Mysore and the national Congress body. The backward castes were with the Maharaja, and were opposing the Congress. But in

1937, both the groups, the Congress and Praja Samyukta Paksha (the party headed by backward castes), came together, and with this the Congress gained some ground in Princely Mysore. Only in the 1940s did the demand for responsible government, which was against the rule of Maharaja, arise in Princely Mysore and this can be read as an explicit statement about the indirect colonial rule. Thus the political events in Princely Mysore were entirely different from that of British India.

In this study. I am trying to see whether there exists any difference in the development of nationalist thought, if we look at cultural nationalism in Princely Mysore. My main focus is on early modern Kannada literature, specifically. B.M. Srikantia as he has been seen as the one who brought "renaissance" in Kannada literature.[3] The emergence of modem Kannada literature is a result of the coming into contact of two different cultures at a particular historical juncture. When two cultures come into contact, and one of them is the culture of the dominant power and the other is a culture of the people subjugated by that power, the meeting takes place on an uneven plane. When they meet on an uneven ground, the kind of negotiations that takes place will be symptomatic of the power struggle that happens between the historical forces that partake in it. At this point, it is apt to explain what 1 mean by culture and what 1 mean by meeting of cultures. I use culture in the following sense - a signifying system that helps the members of a particular group to make sense of the world that is around them. The signifying system doesn't operate through abstract principles or get passed on to the new generation as an abstract rule to understand the world around it. It is embedded in our daily practices and activities and sometimes it also takes the form of textual representation which again gets passed on to other members. And culture is not a finished product but a process, w hich keeps on changing, as our perception of the world needs to change. New elements do erupt in a culture either within it due to the dynamics of its own processes or when it comes into contact with other cultures. According to Homi Bhabha, culture for its survival has to be always transnational and translational in a colonial and postcolonial context. When there

is a challenge from the hegemonic culture, the hegemonized culture tries to expand its boundaries to include new elements. The new elements enter either by being transnational, that is new elements from other cultures travel across the boundaries of a nation, or by being translational, that is new elements from other cultures travel across linguistic boundaries.[4]

Travel and translation are two important means of transaction between cultures. These are the two means through which a culture changes itself to face new challenges to create new subject positions and signifying systems for its members, appropriate to the changing circumstances. Thus travel writing and translations offer good sites to explore the cultural transactions of the colonial period. But in this stud), as 1 have focused on B.M. Srikantia, who has not written about travel. I focus only on the site of translation to look at the cultural transactions of the colonial period to explore the issue of nationalism. colonialism and modernity.

Translation is one of the crucial sites on which the encounter of cultures is easily discernible. Talal Asad. in fact calls the study of culture in ethnography as translation of culture. as the ethnographer. who hails from a different culture employs the categories of his/her culture to understand the culture of others (Asad. 1990). So other cultural elements get represented through the cultural elements of one's own culture. This was the case with the orientalists who took up the task of producing a body of knowledge on India.[5] This creation of a body of knowledge is, as Tejaswini Niranjana has pointed out. also the process of the formation of "colonial subjects" and this formation depends on their representation in colonial discourse. which is a project of translation (Niranjana. 1992). Hence for her the notion of translation does not just indicate an "interlingual process" but indicates the problematic of representation and reality-authorized by traditional theories of translation, and also the problematic opened up by the poststnicturalist critique of the theories, thus making translation always "more" than what is represented (Niranjana. 1992: 8). She has also pointed out

how through the project of translation. colonialism acquired a discursive power by subordinating the native texts to Eurocentric cultural narratives.

Veena Naregal in her study of the language politics during the colonial period in western India says that the colonizer tried to solve the "philosophical and cultural discontinuities between eighteenth century Europe and South Asia" by viewing it "as a 'mere' linguistic problem". For them the "potent technique of translation would iron out the cultural unfamiliarity" and "would place English as the new normative classical language against which the native vernaculars could be redefined and modernized" (Naregal. 2000b: 44). She further says that

> To be fully effective. ways had to be devised for these discourses [English education] to be disseminated as a hegemonic programme of 'useful' learning among the natives. And if colonial discourse was to acquire a hegemonic influence. it needed to render itself more generally accessible: and this then brought up the question of its translation into the vernacular (Naregal. 2001b: 61. words in parenthesis are mine).

This process of translation of the colonial discourse into the vernacular resulted in the standardization of language and normalization of language forms, which in turn led to the emergence of vernacular language-based identities. Thus colonial subject formation and language-based identities are a product of English education. and as the above scholars have argued. are intrinsically related to the project of translation. Hence. the question of "English" during the colonial period doesn"t just refer to language alone but signifies colonial subject formation. language-based identities. dissemination of both colonial discourse and nationalist discourse through the project of translation. English also signifies, as Tejaswini Niranjana has pointed out. the subordination of native texts to Euro-centric cultural narratives.

In order to probe the question of "English" in Kannada literature I have looked at the translations of the colonial period. Here I have used the term translation to describe the entire process of cultural transaction in the colonial period, including the process of "othering" and of constructing a "self by the orientalist and nationalist discourses.

Following Partha Chatterjee, the social class which changed the problematic of the colonial discourse to suit the interests of its class and created the nationalist discourse is referred to in this study as the "nationalist elite". This social class, to be precise, comprised of upper caste, English educated men who were oriented towards constructing a "nationalist self. This was a very small class of intellectuals, exclusively endowed with the skills of translation and mediation. This class, the nationalist elite, acquired significance because as Veena Naregal puts it, language was "a site in the construction of state-society relations" and this "relation between the English sphere and the vernacular publics" offered a vital space to "the hegemonic efforts of this intellegentsia..." (Naregal, 2001b, 104). But the employment of the term "nationalist elite" would lead to a certain ambiguity in the context of Princely Mysore, where we find two kinds of nationalism, one is Kannada and the other, Pan-Indian. Where there is no ambiguity I have used the term nationalist elite to refer to the group that was mediating between English and Kannada, otherwise I have used the term Kannada nationalist elite in specific instances.

In the chapter following this Introduction, "Translating Tragedy: Politics of Genre and the Nationalist Elite" 1 have tried to show, by analyzing the debate around the absence of the genre of tragedy in Sanskrit literature as well as the attempts to translate tragedy into Kannada, how the Kannada nationalist elite operated with a notion of culture that was pan-Indian and participated in the construction of a pan-Indian tradition and 'self'.

In Chapter Three, "Translating Nationalism: The Politics of Language and Community", by taking up the issue of the use of different varieties of Kannada for different genres by Srikantia as an entry point, I have looked at the process of imagining a Kannada community. I have called this chapter "Translating Nationalism*" not only because the entry point of the chapter is the issue surrounding the kind of language used for translation but also because language is the crucial site on which the project of translation - that of imagining national communities - takes place.

In Chapter Four. "Translating Englishness: *English Geetagalu* as a Canonical Text". I have tried to examine the characteristics of the dominant discourse of the colonial period in Princely Mysore. I have taken *English Geetagalu* as a representative of the discourse that was prevalent in Mysore and I have also addressed the question as to why *English Geetagalu* became a canonical text.

In Chapter Five. "Translation in Translation: Colonialism and Caste in the Princely State". 1 have explored the question of configuration of modernity and caste in Princely Mysore by looking at two|moments *tyf* translation in Princely Mysore. By analyzing the debate around the notion of translation, I have also tried to show how it is necessary to go beyond the binaries of colonialism and nationalism. East and West and so on to address the politics of discourse.

In the concluding chapter. I offer a few tentative remarks on the relationship between Kannada nationalism and pan-Indian nationalism.

2

Translating Tragedy: Politics of Genre and the Nationalist Elite

One of the crucial areas of colonial encounter between English and Kannada, or for that matter between English and any Indian language, is what I would call "Genre Politics". In this encounter, where cultures meet on an unequal plane, development/emergence of literary genres gets associated with the development of civilization. The presence or absence of a genre becomes the measuring rod for development or backwardness of a civilization. The Indian language literatures were constantly evaluated by comparing it with western/English literature. Even classical/high literatures were not spared. Talking about the impact of English education on vernacular literatures Veena Naregal argues:

> The introduction of English as part of the colonial literate regime saw it being invested with several 'high' functions: it was the language of an alien government and a new political arrangement. But it also represented the cultural and intellectual repertoire against which the native languages including the erstwhile 'cultivated' languages like Sanskrit and Persian, were now measured (Naregal. 2001b: 9).

The debate around the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit drama tradition in India is the result of such a politics. The debate on this issue is quite interesting in terms of understanding the cultural politics of that period.

The present chapter tries to place the debate around the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit drama in a situation where both cultures were trying to reinvent their tradition that would allow their cultures to claim to be a highly developed and modern civilization. The native intellectual with English education, perceived a certain kind of "lacuna" by comparing his literature with that of the colonizer and

then in order to overcome that "lacuna" he devised various arguments apart from translating and creating those genres in his culture. This chapter. by looking at the spurt of translation of Greek tragedies into Kannada during this century, tries to locate this "genre politics". In fact the development of new genres like fiction, new poems, plays and so on is also due to such cultural encounter between English and Kannada. In such encounters translation of these genres form part of the negotiation that a culture engages with the other culture. Talking about the emergence of novel in India. Padikkal explains that the "transfer of literary-genres" was not a simple process and can be read as "part of a tale of resistances". His argument is that even if the genre is borrowed from the West. as it "unfolds in the Indian context" it acquires a unique nature of its own. making it impossible for us to call the emergence of these genres as "merely imitative or **derivative".** He further claims that the emergence of new genres like novel has to be placed against the backdrop of nationalism as "the novel is an inextricable part of this process (construction of its own narrative by nationalism)" (Padikkal. 1993: 221-222). Then he goes on to examine the emergence of novel as part of the nationalist discourse and its politics. In the case of translation of tragedy as a genre into Kannada, 1 have tried to place the debate around this absence of tragedy as part of orientalist discourse and nationalist discourse. Though the debate is around the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit, it takes place around translations into Kannada. 1 have tried to show here that the Kannada elite is engaging himself with a negotiation of the hegemonic colonial discourse by taking the side of Sanskrit and considering it as "our" (tradition). The implications of this debate will be discussed in the concluding chapter.

B.M. Srikantia has authored three tragedies *Gadaayuddham Katakam* (1926). *Aswatthaaman* (1929) and *Paarasikaru* (1935). He was the first one to translate Greek tragedies into Kannada. though there were many Elizabethan tragedies already translated into Kannada. He also has written an article " A Tragic Ravana" on the characterization of Ravana in Nagachandra's *Pampa Ramayana*, a 12 century poet He has been instrumental in bringing out as a general editor

and has written introductions to books like *Greekara Tatvashastra Saara Sangraha* (A Summary of Greek Philosophy) (1941) by K.R. Srinivasaiangar. *Socrates* (1931) a translation from Tamil by C. Rajagopalachari, *Samskrita Naataka* (1937) by A.R.Krishnashastry, *Antigone* (1938) a translation of the Greek play by K.V. Raghavachar. Many of the books (either related to the issue or translations of Greek tragedy), which were published later, are dedicated to him (see Raghavachar. 1973:vii). His first two plays are not direct translations of Greek tragedies, in the sense that only the genre is taken from Greek culture and the story line is taken from "Indian" sources. So. it would be interesting to know the reasons behind such a prolific discussion on the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit theatre tradition and for the curious mixture of Greek and "Indian" cultures in translating tragedy.

In section one of this chapter. I shall try to trace the equation between development /emergence of genres and civilization in the 19th century in England. In section two I shall attempt to offer a summary of the discussion by the Orientalists on Sanskrit drama and the absence of tragedy. In the third I will try to trace the way the nationalist intellectual negotiated what he perceived as the "lacuna" in his literature (Sanskrit and Kannada). In the fourth I shall closely look at B.M. Srikantia's translations of tragedies and allied writings in the context of the debate discussed in the earlier sections. In the final section, I will offer some tentative remarks on the construction of traditions based on the analysis of the debate on the absence of tragedy in early 20th century Kannada literature.

I

Aristotle's *Poetics* was one of the western classical texts that caught the imagination of the English educated elite in the colonial period. In this section I will first look at Aristotle's *Poetics* to see what might have drawn the English educated elite's attention towards translating Greek tragedies. Then I will try to

place this act of translation in the context of transformation of the idea of tragedy during the 19th century in the modern west. 1 would not claim that my own reading of Aristotle's *Poetics* is far from the reading of 19th century.

Aristotle's *Poetics* seems to be an important text during the colonial period in India for students of English literature. Today we read *Poetics* as a finished text and with fixed meanings. But looking at Aristotle's *Poetics*, as a text is difficult, as there are several doubts around its authorship, date, content and meanings. It is not clear whether Aristotle wrote it or his pupil compiled it out of the class notes given by him. But scholars have opined that the content is Aristotle's, who ever has written it down. It is opined that the 12th and 20th chapters of the current version are interpolations. It is also said that *Poetics* was just the first part of a much larger text. Many of his opinions in the text are not argued and substantiated enough and look like judgements made in haste. The meanings of many concepts used in it are neither clear nor elaborate. This has lead to several interpretations of them. Each translation of *Poetics* into English differs considerably. But in spite of all these problems it has become a canonical text and has caught the imagination of the writers as a first available critical text in the West and since colonization, also in India. It is no exaggeration if I say that Aristotle became the icon for Western culture and Shakespeare for English culture during colonial days.[6]

Aristotle in his *Poetics* attempts to classify the existing literature available during his time into various categories. He lists out the criteria for the classification in the first section of the first chapter itself *(The division per genus et differentiam)* (Aristotle, 1989:51).[7] He classifies art (varieties of mimesis, according to him) on the basis of

1. The Media used:
   a) those which do not use speech like music, dance etc.. and
   b) those which do use speech (i.e.. the poetic kind)
2. The Differences of Objects (objects are people doing things)

a) good (e.g. tragedy)
b) bad (e.g. comedy)

3. The Differences of Mode (the mode of representation of the objects, i.e., narrative style) (Aristotle, 1989: 51-53).

After elaborating each of these criteria, he classifies literature into various genres and says that each one is completely developed and is a species on its own. Then he takes up each one of them for further elaboration to prove his point (Aristotle, 1989: 54-57). Though he examines the origin and development of epic, tragedy and comedy, more space is devoted to the genre: tragedy. At the end he makes a comparative analysis of epic and tragedy, their differences and similarities. After defending Epic and especially Homer's *Iliad* in particular, he turns to address the contention of the opponents of tragedy:

> Tragedy has everything that epic has (it can even use its [the epic's] metre), and moreover has a considerable addition in the music and the spectacle, which produce pleasure in a most vividly perceptible way.... Moreover, it has vividness when read as well as when performed.... Again it takes less space to attain the end of its mimesis: this is an advantage because what comes thick and fast gives more pleasure than something diluted by a large admixture of time - think, for instance, of the effect if someone put Sophocles" *Oedipus* into as many lines as the *Iliad*.... Again the mimesis of the epic poets is less unified, as we can see from the fact that any epic mimesis provides matter for several tragedies.... If tragedy is superior in all these respects and also in artistic effectiveness (for these arts should produce not just any pleasure, but the one we have discussed), it would obviously be superior to epic as it is more successful in attaining what it aims at (Aristotle. 1989: 89).

In *Poetics* he not only classifies art and literature into different species/genres and draws attention to their formal and non-formal features, he also traces the development of various genres. Here he places tragedy as a genre above the epic.

Aristotle's *Poetics* was further elaborated to suit the needs of 19th century, which was obsessed with the theory of evolution. This shift in the theory of tragedy can be traced back to a certain kind of thinking that was happening in the context of modernity in Europe. Commenting on Hegel and Nietzsche in his *Modern Tragedy,* Raymond Williams in a passing note says that the resemblance of the development of the idea of tragedy with the development of the idea of evolution happened in the 19th century. He further says:

> What had been, and was to become again, an historical process - the growth of new and higher distinguishable forms - was overridden, in the second half of the century (19th), by a total vision of the cruel and indifferent but also immensely fertile 'law of nature and lifeXWilliams, 1977:39).

Commenting on Nietzsche's imagery of forms as living organisms he notes:

> (It) is clearly related to this development, and the opposed views of historical crisis and metaphysical crisis. which so deeply affected the tragic argument, are in this sense parts of the same movement of mind, of which evolutionary theory itself is perhaps only a symptom (Williams, 1977: 39).

Now 1 shall give an example from the mid 20th century to show how this evolutionary theory continues to influence the Kannada writers. Balasubramanyam. who translated Aristotle's *Poetics* into Kannada in 1959 has to say this on *Poetics:*

> Aristotle has applied the principle of Biology to literature. that to understand the structure (anatomy?) and nature of an animal we have to study its birth, growth and have the knowledge of its complete structure along with observing its present condition (Balasubramanyam, 1991:9).

In the above passage Aristotle's *Poetics* is given a modern reading. The knowledge of evolution theory informs the interpretation of *Poetics* and the knowledge of biological principles is ascribed to Aristotle. Thus *Poetics* gets reconfigured in interpretations and translations after the 19 century.

We have to remember here that it is not just the association of the growth of tragedy with evolution theory in the 19th century that trickled down to the nationalist elite in India. There were several other factors in operation and it is essential to examine them. This shift in perception of literature and aesthetics is part of a larger project that was underway in the 19th century. The project was invention of western tradition for/by the colonizer. Let us look at the relation between the shift in theory of tragedy and the invention of Western tradition.

We know that Orientalism is not just about the construction of the East and Indology is not just about the construction of India, and are part of a discourse that was fashioning the 'self and the 'other' by inventing traditions. Refashioning the idea of tragedy in the 19th century was also part of such construction of traditions.

Eric Hobsbawm writes in his introduction to The *Invention of Tradition* that the 'traditions' that claim or appear to be old are quite often quite recent in origin and sometimes invented. Here he is using the word invented in a broad sense that includes both traditions actually invented, constructed and instituted and those emerging in a less easily traceable manner (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1992:1). Raymond Williams in *Modern Tragedy* though doesn't say that traditions are inventions, he says that "a tradition is not the past, but an interpretation of the past: a selection and valuation of ancestors, rather than a neutral record" (Williams, 1977:16).

If traditions are invented as Hobsbawm says or if it is an interpretation of the past through slection and valuation as Williams suggests then we need to ask what are

the compulsions behind such inventions or interpretations. Further Williams notes that "(the) present, at any time, is a factor in the selection and valuation (of tradition)" (Williams, 1977: 16). What was that present that made the British invent a tradition in the 19th century? Elsewhere in the same book Raymond Williams answers this thus: "In the suffering and confusion of our century, there has been great pressure to take a body of work from the past and use it as a way of rejecting the present" (Emphasis added, Williams. 1977: 45).

How do we understand "our" in the preceding statement of Williams? As 19th and 20th centurions as the immediate context suggests? Or as the British of the 19th century (if we assume that Williams is addressing the readers who are British)? If this is indeed the case, then it would be important to ask what suffering and confusion did the British undergo in that century. Raymond Williams only suggests that this is something related to the belief that they had in the 19th century that 'we (the British) lack a certain kind of belief or rule that we had once". He does not elaborate on it. However, he counters this belief and while doing so he provides a clue to understanding the 19th century discussion on tragic theory: "Through it (tragic theory) the shape and set of a particular culture is often deeply realised" (Williams, 1977: 45). If the British were 'realizing the shape and set of a particular culture in 19th century' it could be read as they were trying to construct their culture in a particular shape during that period. But Williams ignores the question of the "Other" for this kind of fashioning of the Self and the politics of this fashioning in the context of imperialism? *Post-Orientalism* reading of Williams would suggest that the British by reshaping the tragic theory in 19th century, were trying to construct a tradition and through it imaging their culture in a way that would suit the politics of that culture.[8] The politics of such a construction was not as simple as addressing 'the confusion and crisis of our century", but also one of colonial domination. Let me explain it further. Challenge posed by modernity might have been the cause of such construction of tradition in the West, but at the same time, the growth and expansion of capitalism led these cultures to expand their territory through imperialism. And this in turn made

Western cultures encounter other cultures of the world. This cultural encounter combined with colonial domination presented the need for them to fix the boundaries of "their" own culture and "others"". This construction of tradition and imaging culture in a particular way helped them to claim supremacy over the colonized cultures and they in that process produced orientalist discourse to construct a tradition for the colonized cultures. I will take up the question of how they constructed the tradition of Sanskrit literature/theatre in the Indian context a little later after examining their own construction of tradition through reshaping tragic theory.

The important point that we have to keep in mind while analyzing tragic theory in 19th century is that modern tragic theory and modern tragedy are two distinct things. Modern tragic theory as Raymond Williams suggests is "rooted in very-much the same structure of ideas as modem tragedy itself; yet one of the paradoxical effects is modern tragic theory's denial that modern tragedy is possible, after almost a century of important and continuous and insistent tragic art". Modern tragic theory does not include modern tragic experiences or ordinary suffering as tragedy proper at all. This is evident in even in Hegel. Raymond Williams describes well the effect of such an exclusionary politics:

> There is the exclusion, already evident in the language of Hegel, of ordinary suffering, and this is surely the unconscious attachment of significant suffering to (social) nobility. But there is also the related and deeper exclusion of all that suffering which is part of our social and political world, and its actual human relations. The real key, to the modern separation of tragedy from 'mere suffering', is the separation of ethical control and, more critically, human agency, from our understanding of social and political life (Williams, 1977: 48-49).

What Williams is suggesting here is that this exclusion of ordinary suffering and attaching significance to the suffering of nobility is an attribute of modern tragic

theory. He also demonstrates it by examining the notion of tragedy that was in operation in pre-Elizabethan age, Neo-classical age, Romantic age etc. in England. The modern tragic drama, unlike modern tragic theory that excludes and refuses to call modern tragedies proper tragedies, focuses on ordinary suffering. And Williams 's book is mainly about modern tragic drama.

Another important attribute of the modern tragic theory is that it limits tragedy to certain cultures and periods. Raymond Williams says that Hegel rejected the moral scheme of dramas, i.e., the triumph of good over bad that had been called poetic justice, as the triumph of ordinary morality that did not have any tragedy, and instead called it social drama. Hegel's definition of tragedy is "'centred on a conflict of ethical substance and as such he limits this kind of conflict to certain cultures and periods" (Williams, 1977: 32-33). If we relate this move from Hegel to his ideas about history of India in his *The Philosophy of History* (Hegel. 1991: 139-172). it is not difficult to identify the sources of the unease that the nationalist elite had with the orientalist discourse on the issue of absence of tragedy in Sanskrit theatre. I would not venture into identifying the sources here but will narrow down my analysis to the history of Sanskrit literature/theatre by western writers, after summarizing the above argument in the next few lines.

Let me list out the important features of the invented western tradition of the 19th century with reference to tragedy:

- Tragedy, represents the best in the evolution of genres and civilization
- Its resolution of conflict is of the highest order
- Modern tragic theory limits tragedy to certain cultures and periods

These formulations of the 19th century in the West that formed part of the construction of tradition coupled with other such reformulations happening in the context of modernity and colonialism must have created a sense of unease in the nationalist elite regarding the absence of such a genre in their culture/literature.

II

With the emergence of Orientalist studies certain texts became canonized and came to acquire a kind of pan-Indian significance by getting translated into English from Sanskrit; these translations became a site on which both Orientalists and nationalists pitched their arguments. One such text is Bharata's *Natya Shastra*. *Natya Shastra* is one of the ancient texts available in Sanskrit. It is a treatise on acting and theatre. There are several manuscripts available and each differs slightly. After initial remarks on translations from Sanskrit into English, I will briefly trace the debate on this text that might have fuelled a certain kind of competition in terms of emergence of poetics and its equation with the development of a civilization. not only in the nationalist elite but also in the colonizer.

From the early days of colonialism. colonial authorities. scholars and missionaries were interested in Sanskrit and its literature. But there was a problem with regard to their learning Sanskrit because the Brahmins were not ready to teach Sanskrit language to foreigners. the *Mlecchas*. 1 shall come back to this point little later. Perceiving Sanskrit literature as treasure. especially the Vedas. which were supposed to be the oldest texts available on earth. the)' wanted to explore it. As said earlier, initially the Brahmins who were in possession of the Sanskrit language and manuscripts of Sanskrit texts did not teach them Sanskrit and even refused to part with the texts. when the British desired to make copies of it or read it. They were so eager to get hold of these texts but the Brahmins who were in possession of these texts were uncooperative. When the British got a copy of a manuscript their joy knew no bounds.[9]

Here is an incident quoted by Horace Wilson in his book that illustrates the eagerness of the British to access Sanskrit and the reluctance of the Brahmins to part with it. Colonel Dow in the preface to his book *History of Hindustan,* published in 1768. prints a few verses as specimens of the Vedas. But thev were

not from the Vedas, but verses taken from a work on rhetoric. A Brahmin Pandit, who had rejected the solicitations of Englishmen for instruction in Sanskrit, even after the influence and persuasion of Governor General Warren Hastings, had supplied these to Dow as Vedas. Such was the demand for Sanskrit texts and learning from the Englishmen, and the "subversion" of their desire by Brahmins taking advantage of the Englishmen's ignorance (Wilson, 1984b: 306-307).

There is one more incident quoted by Wilson about the ignorance of Europeans in matters of Sanskrit literature. Mr. Ellis of Madras Civil Services at Pondicherry discovered a few compositions in verse and described it in the 14th volume of the *Asiatic Researches*. Among them was the original of a work whose translation had been printed in Europe, in 1778, at Yverdon as "L'Ezour Vedam traduit du Sanscretan Par un Brame". The original had been brought from Pondicherry, and presented to Voltaire, who, transferring it to the Royal Library, expressed his belief that it was the most precious gift for which the West would be indebted to the East! But in reality Christian missionaries in South India had composed that text in refutation of Hinduism. They had used the language not of the Vedas but of the Puranas with extraordinary felicity.

In spite of the difficulty of learning Sanskrit or procuring Sanskrit texts, the translations from Sanskrit into European languages had started from the beginning of the 18th century itself. The reason for this interest in translation of Sanskrit texts, as William Carey puts it in the preface to one of his books, was:

> The Asiatic Society and the College of Fort William, being desirous of promoting the knowledge of literature of India, and, at the same time, of disclosing to the learned in Europe the same stories which lie hid in the ancient languages of India, have accepted a proposal which has been made to them by the brethren of the Mission of Srirampore, of translating successively the principal works to be found in the Sanskrit language, particularly those held sacred by the

> Hindus, or those which may be most illustrative of their history, or their religion, including also the principal works of science...(as quoted in Muttanna, 1987: 141).[10]

The intentions are clear: to produce a body of knowledge about the history of Hindus and their religion and science. As suggested by Said in his *Orientalism* and a host of other writers this production of knowledge was part of the Britishers' effort to contain and control the colonial subjects (See Vishwanathan, 1990 and Niranjana, 1992).

I.M. Muttanna in his book on the service of foreign scholars to India informs us that, Auquetil Deperron, a young French scholar got hold of a Sanskrit manuscript in Paris and with the help of a servant of the East India Company, he learnt Sanskrit and understood the content. Later he translated the Upanishads from Persian language, not directly from Sanskrit, into Latin and Greek. These translations were published around a hundred years later in 1802. Abraham Roger, a Dutch-German missionary who died in 1651, had translated Bhartru Hari and an interpretation of the Vedas. It is said that approximately around 2,000 books had been translated into various European languages by 1799 (Muttanna, 1987). But these were the individual efforts of a few missionaries mostly out of curiosity or interest. With Warren Hastings" ascendance to the post of Governor General of India, an active support was given to such activities. He created an atmosphere conducive to translate old treatises in Sanskrit into English. He wrote a preface to Charles Wilkins' translation of *Bhagavad Geeta* into English in 1783 (published in England in 1785). He was also instrumental in establishing the Royal Society of Bengal along with people like William Jones and Charles Wilkins in 1784. William Jones is famous for his translation of *Abhijnana Shakuntala* into Latin in 1789 and then into English in 1790. Later this Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal became just the Royal Asiatic Society by dropping "of Bengal" from its name. It had several branches: Bombay (1804, established by James Mackintosh), Madras (1822, by John Newbolt), Paris (1822, by B.G.

Babington) and England (1823, by Colebrooke). It also came out with a journal called *Asiatic Researches* meant for Research and Literature about Asia. It published for some time another journal called *The Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal.* In 1823 H.T. Colebrooke and Charles Wilkins together established a "Translation Committee" to translate texts from Sanskrit, Persian and other languages. Colebrooke was the Chairperson of this committee. The British king George IV, Duke of Clarence, Duke of Cambridge. Lord William Bentinck, Robert Peel and others were patrons of this committee. King George IV announced two gold medals as awards for translations every year. A fund called "Oriental Translation Fund" was created in 1827 to help in publishing translations.

With the success of the translation of Kalidasa's plays into English, there was an interest in texts related to plays. This led these scholars to Bharata's *Natya Shastra.* William Jones mentions Bharata's *Sana Shastra* in the preface of the first translated play of Sanskrit *Ahhijnana Shakuntala* in 1790.

Prof. Horace Hayman Wilson was the one who worked extensively on Sanskrit theatre. His two volume book *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus* was published in 1827 in which he translated many Sanskrit plays into English. H.H. Wilson was in India for nearly three decades. He translated many texts from Sanskrit into English. He knew, apart from English, German, French, Latin. Persian. Bengali. Oriya and also quite a bit of Tamil and Kannada. He served as the Secretary of Royal Asiatic Society for a long period. He returned to England in 1833 to become the Boden Professor of Sanskrit. He compiled and published a Sanskrit-English dictionary in 1819. He wrote a Sanskrit grammar based on Panini in 1841. He also wrote *A Comparative Sanskrit Grammar* in 1844. He translated the *Rgveda* into English with explanations as well as the original text. After James Mill he continued and wrote the History of British India till 1835. He wTote a critique of James Mill"s voluminous series on Indian History accusing him of writing a history of India without coming to India. He had also translated

Vishnu Purana, and *Valmiki Ramayana* into English. People like Max Mueller and Monier Williams studied Sanskrit with him at Oxford.

The debate around *Natya Shastra* begins actually with Horace Wilson. For them it was astonishing that the Hindus had plays as far back as in the BC era, while the European nations gave rise to dramatic literature only in the 14th and 15th century. Wilson in his voluminous work on Hindu theatre says: "The nations of Europe possessed no dramatic literature before the fourteenth or fifteenth century, at which period the Hindu drama had passed into its decline" (Wilson, 1984a: xi). [11] So they had to rely on Greek culture to understand Sanskrit theatre. Often they compare *Satya Shastra* with Aristotle's *Poetics* and Sanskrit plays with Greek tragedies. For example see the following passage, again by Wilson: "Hindu dramatists have little regard for the unities of time and space: and if by unity of action be meant singleness of incident, they exhibit an equal disdain for such a restriction" (Wilson, 1984a: xii). If this is what Wilson wrote in 1827, things had not changed even after a century, when another Sanskrit scholar A.B. Keith wrote *The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development and Practice* in 1923. He has a separate chapter "Aristotle and the Indian Theory of Poetics" in this book. I will quote a passage from the book just to illustrate the point that though Aristotle was the yardstick for measuring Indian theatre for nearly two centuries, the conclusions they reached are different:

> The unity of action is fully recognized in the (Natya) *Shastra*[12], and the rule which insists that the events described in an Act shall not exceed in duration a day has a certain similarity to the unity of time in Aristotle, and is much more significant than such agreement as there is as to **unity** of place (Keith, 1992: 355).

Aristotle is the yardstick but the perceptions are different.

Another debate that has been carried out vigorously as I said earlier is about the antiquity *of Natya Shastra* and Sanskrit theatre. The date has been variously put

from 3rd century BC to 4th century AD. 1 am not going to summarize the debate here, as my intention is not to fix the date of *Natya Shastra*. What I am trying to point out here is that claiming antiquity for *Natya Shasira* by comparing it with *Poetics* or establishing that the Greek tradition is much older than the Sanskrit tradition can be seen as a part of the politics of construction of tradition for the Orientalists.

One more factor that has dogged their mind was the origin of Greek god Dionysos and his similarity with Shiva, the Indian god. who is also closely associated with the origin of drama according to the mythical origin of Sanskrit drama. It is said that Dionysos came from Asia Minor to Greece. And this fact coupled with his similarities with Siva made them ponder over the issue at length.

Let me now consider the debates on the absence of Tragedy in Sanskrit drama tradition. In his momentous work *Orientalism* Said talks about the formation of orientalist discourse existing even in pre-colonial days. But when we look at the British scholarship on India, it is possible to distinguish various stages. especially within the colonial era between early days. when the British had not actually brought the whole of India under their rule. and the days of their complete administrative hegemony. 1 don't think Said would disallow this kind of a periodization. This historical periodization would also account for the spatial differences that existed even in the days of complete administrative hegemony. I think it is necessary for us to find various threads in the discourse of Orientalism, both on the time scale and on the spatial map in order to understand the politics of that discourse.

If we look at the initial remarks on the absence of tragedy by the Orientalist scholars this would become clear. As I said earlier Wilson is the first one to talk about the absence of tragedy in the Sanskrit drama tradition. Let me quote a few lines from his work:

> Another important difference from the classical drama and from that of most countries is the total absence of the distinction between Tragedy and Comedy. The Hindu plays confine themselves neither to the "crimes nor to the absurdities of mankind;" neither "to the momentous changes, nor lighter vicissitudes of life;" neither "to the terrors of distress nor the gaieties of prosperity." In this respect they may be classed with much of the Spanish or English drama to which, as Schlegel observes, "the terms Tragedy and Comedy are wholly inapplicable, in the sense in which they were employed by the ancients." (Wilson. 1984a: xxvi).

If we look at the above quotation, it is clear that Wilson is classifying Sanskrit plays along with some of the European plays by quoting Schlegel on Spanish and English drama. Not only that he also takes the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit to pinpoint the flaw in the theory that Tragedy precedes Comedy. See the following lines:

> The Hindus, in fact, have no Tragedy; a defect that subverts the theory that Traged> necessarily preceded Comedy, because in the infancy of society the stronger passions predominated, and it was not till social intercourse was complicated and refined, that the follies and frivolities of mankind afforded material for satire. The theory is evidently more ingenious than just, for a considerable advance in refinement must have been made before plays were at all, and the days of Aeschylus were not those of the fierce and fiery emotions he delineates. In truth however the individual and social organization of the native India is unfavorable to the development of towering passion; and whatever poets or philosophers may have insinuated to the contrary, there is no

> doubt that the regions of physical equability have ever been, and still are. those of moral extremes. (Wilson, 1984a: xxvi).

The above passage certainly indicates that Wilson shows that genres need not necessarily evolve one after another, but he considers the fact of absence of tragedy in Sanskrit drama a defect. He places his explanation in the larger social context. when he says that individuals and social organizations of native India were unfavorable to the development of towering passion, which is necessary for a tragedy. But he doesn"t elaborate further and leaves it at that. However a little later in his writing. he gives another argument for the absence of tragedy to show that it was consciously omitted from Sanskrit tradition and has nothing to do with the evolution of a society:

> The absence of tragic catastrophe in the Hindu dramas is not merely an unconscious omission; such catastrophe is prohibited by a positive rule. and the death of either hero or the heroine is never to be announced. ... Attention to bienseance is carried even to a further extent. and a number of interdictions are peculiar to the system of the Hindus. The excepted topics of a serious nature are. hostile defiance. solemn imprecations. exile. degradation. and national calamity: whilst those of a less grave. or comic character. are biting. scratching. kissing. eating. sleeping. the bath. unction. and the marriage ceremony (Wilson. 1984a: xxvi-xxvii).

Here he says the tragic scenes are omitted consciously by the dictum in *Natya Shastra* for the reason that death should not be shown on the stage, which is later picked up by many Indian scholars to explain the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit drama tradition. So Wilson is not operating with the notion of an evolutionary theory of genres in his explanation of the absence of tragedy in the Sanskrit tradition.

Now let me take up A.B. Keith's explanation of the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit tradition. which appeared in 1923 during the days of complete British control over

most of the Indian territory. Keith's argument appears to be the final word on the origin of Sanskrit theatre and also on *Natya Shastra* and the Greek influence on it as most of the later scholars agree with him. By Keith's time, it was well established that *Natya Shastra* appeared after Aristotle and there was the question of whether there was any influence of Aristotle on *Natya Shastra.* In his book *The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development, Theory and Practice,* while comparing *Poetics* and *Natya Shastra.* Keith says that though it is not possible to take the existing evidence as conclusive proof of borrowing (from *Poetics),* we can say that the Indian genius has recast what was borrowed (in the *Natya Shastra)* so that the traces of indebtedness cannot be found (Keith. 1992: 356).

Weber was the first one to talk about the possible influence of Greek drama on Sanskrit. But Pischel repudiated it in 1875. Windisch made an elaborate effort to trace the extent of the influence. which he believed he could establish in 1882. Levi was skeptical about the influence theory in 1890. But Keith dismisses the skepticism of Levi and asserts that there are several similarities between the two and Greek tragedy is older than the two. so there must have been the influence of the older one on the latter. He doesn"t discount indigenous forms giving rise to Sanskrit theatre, but at the same time asserts the influence theory though there is not much evidence, by taking recourse to the theory that "India has a strange genius for converting what it borrows and assimilating it" (Keith. 1992: 68).

The absence of tragedy, on which both Western scholars of Sanskrit drama as well as their Indian counterparts have written much, was an anomaly to the influence of Greek drama on Sanskrit drama. If Greek drama had influenced the origin and growth of Sanskrit drama. then why is the supreme form of Greek drama i.e. tragedy, absent in Sanskrit tradition? Scholars had to explain the exception to the rule of tragedy preceding comedy (i.e. comedy existing without being preceded by tragedy in Sanskrit drama tradition) and also why Greek drama failed to infuse tragedy into the Sanskrit dramatic tradition. After talking about the origin of

tragedy being the primitive passion play enacted to remember the incarnation of a divine spirit who is dead, Keith tries to explain the absence of tragedy thus:

> The primitive Indian play differs in one essential from this suggested origin of tragedy; the victory lies. as we have seen, with Krsna. with the Vaicya, not with the dark Kansa, the black Cudra (Sudra). We have therefore not sorrow, though there is death and the fact that the Sanskrit drama insists on a happy ending is unquestionably most effectively explained if it be brought into connexion with the fact of the origin of drama in a passion play whose end was happiness through death. not grief (Keith. 1992: 38).

Keith also falls back on the proscription of *Natya Shastra* about showing death on stage. With the discovery of Bhasa's plays in 1912. which appeared under the editorship of T. Ganapati Shastri. there arose a need to explain the non-conformity of Bhasa to the *Natya Shastra's* proscription. Thus Keith. who wrote in 1923, was forced to comment on it:

> This view has received a remarkable measure of confirmation from the discovery of the plays of Bhasa: that dramatist does not conform to the rule of the later theory that there must be no slaying on the stage. but he most assuredly conforms to the principle of the Kansavadha that the slaying is to be of an enemy of god: the Urubhanga. which has erroneously been treated as tragedy is. on the contrary. the depicting of the deplorable fate of an enemy of Krsna. and we have from Bhasa himself the Balacarita which describes the death of several monsters at Krsna's hands. and finally Kansa himself (Keith, 1992: 38).

Keith is right in pointing out the objective of the Sanskrit plays, which does not allow for a tragedy. But if he had gone slightly ahead to probe the reasons behind "the objectives of Sanskrit drama that does not allow for a tragedy, it would have Wen more interesting. Literary forms have distinct relationship with their content and the worldview contained in it. It would be very interesting to relate the absence of tragedy to the philosophy behind it.

By looking at the Orientalists scholars on Sanskrit drama, it is clear that there was a certain kind of unease about Sanskrit literature, as it is supposed to be the among the oldest literatures on earth. In the case of Bharata's *Natya Shastra* and the genre of tragedy also, this unease seems to have given rise to a certain kind of reworking of tradition to claim antiquity. The Orientalists did not rest till they fixed the dates of *Natya Shastra* and Sanskrit plays as later than the Greek ones and went on to speculate that in fact the former were influenced by the latter.

III

Let me now move on to the perception of lack with regard to the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit literature and its negotiation by the Indian scholars. In this section. I will mainly look at the discussions that were carried out by the Kannada literati. It would be interesting to see how Sanskrit scholars have dealt with this. but due to my own linguistic inadequacy I will not venture into that area.

P.V. Kane. a Sanskrit scholar has begun his *History of Sanskrit Poetics,* published in 1937, with *Natya Shastra.* But as his aim was to tease out a poetics rather than to understand Sanskrit drama, he does not talk about the absence of tragedy. He also safely sticks to the beginning years of Christian era as the date of *Natya Shastra's* origin (Kane, 1987: 43). At around the same time as Kane. similar debates were happening around tragedy in Kannada too. It is the publication of Keith's book and Kane's that might have triggered the debate.

It seems that B.M. Srikantia was the first one to initiate the debate. As tragedy was non-existent in Sanskrit there was not even a term for it in that language. So while talking about it. B.M. Srikantia was forced to invent a new term for it There are several words used by different people for tragedy in their discussions like *Duranta Naataka*. *Dukhantha Naataka*, *Vishadanta Nataka*. *Gambira Nataka*. *Aviddha Naataka*, etc. But *Rudra Naalaka,* the one used by B.M. Srikantia has come to prevail over other terms. Speaking about his choice of the word Rudra Naataka for tragedy in a lecture delivered to the Mysore Prantha Samithi in 1941. while explaining the birth of tragic drama in Greek, he says:

> To show the secret of the cycle of the nature of birth. death and eternity was the main purpose of enacting tragedy. Dionysos was the god of all these and people of Greece used to worship him through a song called Dithyramb. this later developed into drama. Rudra (the god Shiva). the god of goodness. a cure to all earthly ailments, the one who is born out of poison. the precursor of theatre and other arts. is similar to Dionysos in many respects. so 1 thought of it as accurate to name tragedy in Rudra's name as Rudra Naataka (Srikantia. 1983: 325).

As 1 mentioned in the beginning of the chapter it is not only that the name given by Srikantia to tragedy is more popular than others. but also several works related to the subject are also directly or indirectly linked to him. Now I will look at a few Kannada works related to the subject before going into the analysis of Srikantia's works on the subject.

Apart from Srikantia"s, one of the early works on the subject is *Samskrita Nataka* (Sanskrit Drama) by A.R. Krishna Shastri (1890-1968). published in 1937. It has a preface by Srikantia. A.R. Krishna Shastri was a Kannada professor at Mysore University. He was the first editor of *Prabuddha Karnataka*. the scholarly magazine devoted to research on Kannada culture and literature started in 1919.

He was also instrumental in establishing the Karnataka Sangha at Central College Bangalore in 1918. He has translated Sharatchandra Chakravarthy's *Swami Shishya Samvada* and *Naga Mahashaya* and Rabindranath Tagore's *Nibhanda Mala* from Bengali into Kannada. *Samskrita Sataka* appeared as a part of Mysore **University** Kannada Book Series of which B.M. Srikantia was the General Editor. It was a textbook for B.A. students during those days and had a great influence on that generation in terms of shaping their literary sensibilities (Krishnamurthy, 1971:76).

A.R. Krishna Shastri's book *Samskrita Nataka* has an acknowledgement in which the European Scholars who have worked on Sanskrit Literature have been mentioned first. He is very much impressed by their interest in ancient Indian literature and the way they have researched it But he is quick to add that while determining the date and authorship he has consulted their works but has not taken their theories as ultimate, instead he has used his own judgement to pick "right things" from them (Krishna Shastri. 1937: xviii). Interestingly this selective use of the orientalist writings by the Kannada literati to prove the antiquity of Sanskrit literary tradition is part of the negotiation of the unease that they had about the orientalist construction of the antiquity of Sanskrit literature. It clearly shows that these researches were the site of construction of traditions for both Orientalists as well as nationalists. This trend of selective use of orientalist discourse for nationalist use continued even as recently as in the late 20th century. For example. a Kannada book on Sanskrit literature published in 1985. *Bharatiya Nataka Parampare* picks up the arguments of the scholars who put the date of *Natya Shastra* as 2nd century BC and mentions the others at the end who put it around 3rd century AD (Narasimha Murthy. 1985: 88). Krishna Shastri. while explaining the origin of Sanskrit drama. often compares and contrasts it with Greek tragedies much like Orientalists (Krishna Shastri, 1937: 8). While answering the question as to why Sanskrit literature did not give rise to writers who deviated from tradition, like Shakespeare had from the Greek notion of drama. he savs that if the writers and actors of Sanskrit drama had lesser faith in

tradition and instead had a sense of questioning and individuality, then even Sanskrit literature would have had the plays that we see in English (Krishna Shastri, 1937: 8-9). It is not very clear from this statement whether he is looking down upon English plays, which violated the classical norms of theatre or regretting that Sanskrit plays succumbed to the classical norms. In this book he does not account for absence of tragedy in Sanskrit literature, though as I said earlier he compares and contrasts it with Greek literature. But the scholars whom he mentions with great respect in the acknowledgements have spent much ink on the subject in their writings on Sanskrit drama.

Srikantia in his preface to the same book, addressing theatre lovers, says that it is a must for them to be acquainted with three theatre traditions of the world: Sanskrit. Greek and English. Then he introduces the first two briefly but not the third one. He says that as Greek drama originated first, the question of its influence on Sanskrit drama arises quite naturally in the mind of researchers. But he treats it as an inconclusive debate unlike western scholars whom we examined earlier in this chapter. He says Krishna Shastri touches upon the debate in his book (Krishna Shastri. 1937: vi). While discussing Matter. Fable. Myth. Purpose. Aim of the play. Krishna Shastri talks about the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit drama. He opines that "We can assume that tragedy existed in Sanskrit theatre earlier and later on was proscribed (by our Shastra)" (Krishna Shastri. 1937: xiii). This argument seems to be somewhat similar to the argument put forth by some European scholars that because the *Natya Shastra* proscribes showing death on the stage, we don't find tragedy in Sanskrit. Both these arguments rest on the assumption that *Natya Shastra* was a prescriptive text and was followed assiduously by writers of plays. They wouldn't think of the *Natya Shastra* as a compilation of certain common features of the plays that existed during that period and which could contain interpolations added over time by others. It is clever on the part of Srikantia to assume that if it proscribes showing death on the stage then, the showing of death must have existed earlier. This argument is

based on the premise that showing death was the same as tragedy. This confusion pervades other arguments too.

It is not that understanding of only Sanskrit drama took place in comparison with Greek drama. The understanding and construction of many other cultural elements that went into the construction of tradition also invariably happened in comparison with Greek tradition. For example. T.N. Srikantia wrote a history of Sanskrit poetics in Kannada called *Bharatiya Kavya Mimamse*. It is interesting to note that P.V. Kane who worked on a similar project has called his work *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. while T.N. Srikantia titled his project as History of Indian Poetics. This equation of Indian with Sanskrit is worth investigating further. Is it that Kannada. which lacked an explicit tradition of its own in terms of poetics. tried to make Sanskrit tradition its own by equating Indian with Sanskrit?[13] It is not that this happened only in regional language projects. Orientalists too often equated Indian. Sanskrit and Hindu in their writings. By the time Srikantia wrote his book. P.V. Kane"s book on Sanskrit poetics had appeared and we find references to it in Srikantia's work. Even S.K. De's book *Sanskrit Poetics* had appeared which also Srikantia alludes to in his work. But in spite of that he chose to name his project as Indian poetics indicating that he hardly made any distinction between the two. I will defer the analysis of this discussion to the concluding chapter.

In the first chapter of the book itself. T. N. Srikantia tries to ponder over the question if we consider Vedas and epics. why we did lack an explicit theory of poetics although Sanskrit literature is much older than literatures of other nations. But he quickly consoles himself by claiming that though it developed later. Sanskrit poetics is not far behind any other poetic traditions in terms of vastness and philosophy (Srikantia. 1983: 4-5).

T.N. Srikantia also discusses the issue of *Natya Shastra*'s date. He gives the same reasons as that of Kane and Keith to say that it cannot be later than 3rd century

AD. But while concluding, he invokes M. Ghosh who dates it back to 2nd century BC and then quotes Kane who says that it cannot be later than 3rd century AD (Srikantia, 1983: 11). As it is a treatise on poetics, he doesn't take up the question of absence of tragedy in Sanskrit tradition.

The fascination with Greek tradition for the Kannada literati is quite interesting. Let me here touch upon an article written by Govinda Pai in 1929. In an archaeological excavation in 1897 in Egypt, researchers found many papyri. In one of them there was a small Greek farce in which many non-Greek sentences and words were found. Its English translation by B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt appeared in 1903. An article published in the Archaeological report (1926-27) of the Mysore Government claiming that in the farce, the narration is set in Malpe, a place near Udupi in Karnataka and the alien language in the play is Kannada. Govinda Pai mentions that S. Srikantia wrote an article in the Mythic Society journal about the same. [14] But S. Srikantia in his article says that the alien words in the play could be either Kannada or Tamil. Govinda Pai writes in *Prabuddha Karnataka* refuting this argument and tries to prove that the alien language in the play is indeed Kannada. He makes a very elaborate analysis of the words that appear in the farce and tries to establish that they are Kannada. This exercise by Govinda Pai and others assumes importance in the context that the oldest Kannada writing is available only in 6th century AD. If the date of the farce is earlier than 6th century AD and if it is true that the words that appear in the farce are Kannada, then it would have far-reaching implications for the history of the Kannada language itself. I will come back to this question of constructing a Kannada tradition in another chapter where I will focus directly on it. I referred to this debate here to show the kind of influence the Greek tradition had on the Kannada literary scenario during the colonial days, though it might be used at the end to establish the antiquity of Kannada language by Govinda Pai.

Kannada literature responded to Greek tragedy in many ways. I have already mentioned the preface written by B.M. Srikantia to A.R. Krishna Shastri"s

Samskriia Nataka in which he claims that tragedies did exist in Sanskrit and were later proscribed by Shastras (such as the *Natya Shaslra).* This was one way of coming out of the unease created by the "absence" of tragedy in "their" culture. In this argument the notion "absence" itself is questioned by saying that the genre did exist prior to the *Natya Shastra.*

Another way of negotiating with the perception of lack of tragedy in Sanskrit literature was to claim that our epics and even dramas are full of tragic elements. One of the writers asks if the *Ramayana* especially the case of Sita isn't a tragedy. D.R. Bendre. in his article on "Karuna and Raudra rasa in *Shakuntala"* argues that *Shakuntala* is a tragedy. He examines the play scene-by-scene to prove his point. But he is quick to point out that the notion of tragedy we had is different from that of Greek tradition. He says:

> If we had the same concept of tragedy as that of the Greek, then the play *(Shakuntala)* would have ended in the fifth act itself. Then the son (Bharata. Shakuntala-Dushyantha's son) wouldn't have got the blessings to become a Chakravarthi. Or Shakuntala would have to become an Amazon to take revenge on Dushyantha. Or she would die in the Apsara pit. Or both Dushyantha and Shakuntala would have to die to make the play a grand tragedy (Bendre, 1974: 684).

After stating that "our" notion of tragedy is different from the Greek notion of tragedy, he goes on to answer the question why it is so:

> According to Greek imagination, the gods are like troubling boys who give pain to us and enjoy it. "As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods: they kill us for their sport". But in our tradition gods test people and after testing they become happy with the endurance of the people to put up with troubles and pain (Bendre, 1974: 684).

Bendre is not the only one to put forth the argument of two different philosophies. A few others have also pointed it out. But none of them has pointed out what was the difference.

P.B. Acharya makes a similar argument in the 1970s. He uses the word "tragicomedy" to refer to the works of Kalidasa and Bhavabhuti and compares them with tragicomedies of Shakespeare. Wilson in his book of 1827, talking about the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit. points out that the Sanskrit plays are like English dramas, romantic in nature. This kind of comparison between Kalidasa and Shakespeare was always made during the colonial period. Kalidasa was often referred to as the Shakespeare of India. One of the Kannada writers has gone to the extent of declaring Shakespeare as Kalidasa of England. But Acharya is aware of the problem of using the term tragicomedy. coined in English literary criticism. to refer to Sanskrit plays. He says:

> The application of term 'tragicomedy' to any species of drama in Sanskrit seems at the outset a misnomer, because of the non-existence in Sanskrit of a term which can even remotely suggest the signification of this appellation. and of the complete absence of tragedy in the field of Sanskrit drama. If by tragicomedy we mean a play with a tragic theme which. as a result of certain changes either in the situation or in the character. suddenly takes a turn from its seemingly inevitable tragic end to come to a happy close. we have Sanskrit plays. in which the protagonists pass through suffering and misfortunes. to be rewarded in the end with joy and happiness (Acharya. 1978: 7).

He perceives the problem of applying terms originating in the West to Sanskrit drama. He identifies the absence of tragedy in either Sanskrit drama or in poetics and quickly adds that it is not difficult to explain the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit drama. But. for that. one should know the essential spirit of Hindu religion and philosophy. He explains it thus:

> (The) important tenets of the Hindu religion are the theory of Karma and the belief that death is but a beginning of another life, and man, or rather the soul of man. passes through a cycle of births and deaths. The reward or punishment for the good or evil he does in this life comes to him not necessarily in this life, it may visit him

> in his future lives also. If he is happy in this life. it is because of his virtuous deeds in his previous lives, and similarly if he suffers, the cause must be his misdeeds in his previous existences. He has no reason to complain of his sorrows or misfortunes for which he alone is responsible either in this life or in the previous ones. He should suffer in a spirit of forbearance and avoid doing evil so that he may be free from suffering at least in his future lives (Acharya, 1978:7-8).

Thus he clearly attributes the reason for not having a tragic end in Sanskrit drama to the philosophy of Karma theory and to the notion of re-birth that exist in it. Bendre whom we examined earlier puts the blame of causing tragedies in Greek drama onto Greek gods who cause trouble to people, and assigns the credit for not having tragedy in Sanskrit traditions to the benevolent gods who come and set right things at the end.

If we examine the above arguments about the philosophy of Sanskrit dramas along w ith the mythical story about the origin of Sanskrit drama. it would reveal certain interesting things. The story narrated in Bharata`s *Natya Shastra* says the following about the origin of drama. With the end of *Krita yuga* and in the beginning of *Treta yuga* the religious people (Brahmins) went to Brahma the god, with Indra and complained to him about the anti-religious activities of Sudras who were not ready to listen to them.[15] In their complaint they said the Sudras have become materialists and are indulging in the pursuit of individual interests. So in order to instruct Sudras about the proper way of life and to make them submit to a certain order. Brahma created a fifth Veda called *Natyaveda* i.e., drama. The four Vedas that already existed were in Sanskrit and Sudras were not supposed to either listen to or learn them. They were the jealous possession of the Brahmins. To accomplish this task Brahma took from the *Rg\'eda* the element of recitation. from the *Samaveda* song, from the *Yajurveda* the mimetic art. and from the *Atharvaveda* sentiment. Shiva. another god contributed to it the *Tandava* dance. which expresses violent emotion. Parvathi, Shiva's wife. contributed the tender

and voluptuous *Lasya*. The god Vishnu invented dramatic styles. The sage Bharata was entrusted with the responsibility of taking this to earth in the form of *Natya Shastra*.

If we read this origin myth about Sanskrit drama a little polemically, we can say that Sanskrit drama originated in order to control Sudras who were not listening to Brahmins. and to monitor their activities and behaviour by indoctrinating them with Karma philosophy which would kill any initiative on the part of the Sudras to change their fate. compelling them to endure the pain till the time of god"s arrival or til! the next birth. The above authors, whom I have quoted. claim that the world-view of Indians as well as Sanskrit plays is shaped by Karma theory. This would mean that. both, the myth about the origin and the themes of the Sanskrit stories are meant to induct Sudras into a brahminical order. This might imply that the absence of Tragedy in Sanskrit reveals the hierarchy of communities and the oppressive varna structure that existed in India.[16]

But in the face of certain other facts the above interpretation of the origin myth seems to be suffering from an intentional fallacy. First of all Sanskrit was a minority language and jealously guarded by Brahmins. All the four Vedas were in Sanskrit because of which the Sudras couldn't read them. Thus the need to create a fifth Veda arose. If the fifth Veda is also in Sanskrit. as in the case of Sanskrit plays. then the intention of its creation is not going to be translated into reality. If it has to achieve its purpose of indoctrinating Sudras with Karma theory. it has to be in the language of the Sudras or Sudras have to be taught Sanskrit. If Sudras are taught Sanskrit then there is no need for the fifth Veda!

It is not that the Sanskrit drama was entirely in Sanskrit. Different languages were employed in Sanskrit drama for different characters. The protagonist and other main male characters would use Sanskrit. but the women and inferior characters use various modifications of that language/dialects that are comprehended under the name Prakrit. According to the technical experts. as Wilson (1827) tells us.

the different dialects employed are these: The heroine and the principal female characters speak Sauraseni; attendants on royal persons speak Magadhi; servants. Rajputs (warriors) and traders Arddha - half or mixed Magadhi. The *vidushaka* (jester) speaks Prachi, or eastern dialect; rogues use Avantika, or the language of Ougein; and intriguers that of the Dekhan or Peninsula. The dialect of Bahlika is spoken by the people of the north. and Dravida by the people of the Coromandel Coast. Thus different communities and within communities, different strata of people use different languages.

The work of the Western Orientalists on Sanskrit drama. which is also accepted by Indian scholars. shows that in comparison to Greek drama we find very few Sanskrit plays. Wilson mentions the names of around 60 plays in his book. Many of the titles are obtained from allusions to them in other sources. According to him. only 28 among them are available (Wilson. 1984a: lxx-lxxi). Writing a century later in 1937 Krishna Shastri mentions around 600 plays in his book. He also says that many of them are not available and are alluded to in other Sanskrit treatises. Many of the titles he has given are written in the 17th and 18th centuries and even as late as 1887. and one is a translation of Shakespeare's play into Sanskrit (Krishna Shastri. 1937: 274-294). The number of plays that have appeared in the past few centuries seem to be more than the available texts from the golden age to which the scholars allude. Invariably all scholarly books on Sanskrit theatre talk about the decline of Sanskrit drama after 10th -12th centuries. In terms of number surely post 16th century must have been the golden age.

Sanskrit theatre couldn't have achieved the objective that comes out in the mythical story about its origin not only because of the number of plays and the limited reach of the language but also because of other factors. Scholars like Keith opine that drama requires cultivated people as its audience. *Sangitaratnakara* gives elaborate details about rules to be observed while performing drama at the court of the patron. who normally, is a king. So the play

used to get enacted in the court of a king which also restricted its reach (Keith. 1992:369-371).

Just because its reach was limited it is not that we cannot say that it doesn't reveal the hierarchical structure of the society or caste or Varna system. If we examine the content of the play it clearly demonstrates that the Sanskrit plays adhered to the rules of the Caste system. It is also evident in the choice of language and diction for characters. If it were performed in the Court before a king, who is a Kshatriya. it would have performed the role of spreading the discourse of Karma theory to him also. Exploring the relation between religion and the state in ancient India through the contents of Sanskrit texts warrants a close reading of the texts and is not the objective of my study. So I would now move from this to the point which we were discussing - that of nationalist elite interpreting old texts - to tease out tragic elements or reinterpreting the characters in old texts as tragic, as part of their negotiation with the perception of lack of tragedy in Sanskrit literature.

IV

B.M. Srikantia wrote an English article in *The Mysore University Magazine* in 1923 called "A Tragic Ravana". It was a (re) interpretation of the character Ravana in Nagachandra's (popularly known as Abhinava Pampa[17]) *Pampa Ramayana* written around the close of 10th century. In order to fish out a tragic hero from Kannada tradition B.M. Srikantia tries to (re) interpret the character of Ravana in the epic. In the beginning of the essay itself he says that the characters of Rama and Ravana are cast in terms of good and evil. He says:

> (A)ll have conspired to stamp on the imagination of India a repulsive Ravana. the terrible Rakshasa. the mighty. Asura, ten-headed monster, cruel Devil. incarnation of the wicked principle. enemy of Gods and men. harasser of saints and sages, destroyers of

> sacrifices. violator of women - all have but one name to give him "Ravana thy name is Evil" (Srikantia. 1983: 793).

Then he asks us to compare this with the characterization of Rama -"Charming boy, obedient son, loving brother, loyal husband, chivalrous prince, fearless warrior, merciful enemy, lover of truth. soul of sacrifice. beloved by subject, beloved by all... perfect man. Nay is he not perfect God" (Srikantia, 1983: 793). He says all this is "edifying. impressive. sublime undoubtedly. Black against white. evil against good. monstrosity against beauty. a simple law of contrast, the very trick of the early artist and primitive preacher of morals" (Emphasis added. Srikantia, 1983: 793). He says this is the characterization of Ravana as an antithesis of Rama by Valmiki. the first poet of India, who wept for a shot bird.[18] All other writers who followed Valmiki have worked with this imagination of good and evil, which Srikantia calls as simple, primitive preaching of morals. He calls this imagination an orthodox one. Later he says "a modern imagination feels that a different treatment (of Ravana) is possible, perhaps better, more impressive, more appealing. He calls for a revision of this character called Ravana: "Could not some independent poetic imagination look at it from some other point of view: remove the childish. clarify the beautiful, direct the sympathy. with more critical. psychological and balanced poetic vision?" (Emphasis added. Srikantia. 1983: 795). Then he takes on Tulsi Das: "The Great Hindi poet has quite a book to spare to dilate on a Saint Crow. Kaka Bhusandi (not the Kakasura who worried Sita). who lives through the ages, eternally singing 'Ram.' 'Ram,' at whose feet even Siva and Garuda go to learn the Mahatmya of Rama! And he has no imagination to spend on poor Ravana, 'filthy and sensual monster" as he dubs him" (words in parentheses are the author's). The choice of words by B.M. Srikantia clearly shows that he is taking the side of modernity in the debate modernity v/s tradition played out in the context of colonialism.[19] He comes to the conclusion that poor Ravana is "wronged - aesthetically - as the fair Briton of Heine said of Shylock the Jew". He quickly adds that Shakespeare knows "'no black and white saints and devils... Even puritanical Milton has sympathy and

insight into Satan who, in spite of his pride and unconquerable will, remembers his life in heaven and pines for lost virtue, pities the poor victims and his own misled, ruined followers". He reminds us about what has been said about Milton that "Milton set out to justify God, and ended by making Satan his hero". Then he declares:

> Such a sympathetic treatment of Ravana is perhaps idle to expect in the ancient and the medieval Hindu atmosphere of India. From an independent and critical writer, however, such a thing was possible: indeed it has been done. Not quite with the Freedom of Western poet perhaps, yet sufficiently distinct to arrest the attention and to refresh the imagination of a reader who longs for a new, a tragic Ravana (Emphasis added. Srikantia. 1983: 795-96).

Here Srikantia tries to compare the ancient writers of Kannada with Milton. He says that the Kannada writers are weighed down by the burden of tradition and are incapable of a fresh imagination. He contrasts Milton's treatment of Satan with that of Ravana in Kannada and calls the treatment of **"evil"** in Kannada literature as simplistic and primitive. There is no scope for new imagination when moral preaching takes precedence over literary imagination. New sensibility exists in English literature and there is freedom for the Poet there according to Srikantia. Then though he singles out Nagachandra"s treatment of Ravana as an example of sympathetic treatment, he says that even that is no match to the freedom that a western poet enjoys. Srikantia relates a sympathetic treatment of **"evil"** to the imagination of a poet, which is not burdened by the tradition or morality of a culture. For him the freedom to rise above one's cultural morality or tradition is possible only in the West, where tradition allows freedom for an individual to transform or perceive the downfall of "evil" as tragic. By looking at Srikantia's introduction to the characterization of Ravana by Nagachandra. discussed above. we can conclude that he is trying to equate suppression of creativity with tradition

(both ancient and medieval) and equates the West with the freedom that allows for a tragic treatment of "evil".

Then he introduces Nagachandra as someone "who has left the beaten track and as though he was in deliberate opposition to Brahmin version, re-handled the character of the great antagonist of Sri Rama in a more natural and sympathetic spirit". Then he wonders: "Considering the weight of tradition, and the tastes of his audience, one may be permitted to wonder how he came to do it. He writes as if he were Ravana's court minstrel". As answer to it he explores the reasons in the form of rhetorical questions:

> Was it his independent Jaina point of view, or Jaina tradition preserving a human Ravana. not a mere hateful idea? Was it a desire to revise and correct Valmiki and his echoes. leaving God out of the picture and so the Devil. and insisting that destruction of sacrifices is not exactly a sin. and the man who did it had probably something in him? Was it a more refined. romantic and rational idea of the marvellous and the sublime. a taste that recoiled from cannibals, monkeys. mountain bridges and burning tails? Or, a deeper grip on the art of preaching and illustrating the Law of Karma: in human environment. the characters, whatever supernatural powers they might acquire by Tapas, remaining actual men and women: and so appealing like humanity to us: making us feel 'There but for the grace of God. go I' - or 'What he can, I can?"

Finally he says:

> So his poetic eye was purged of convention and dogma and the hard, cold, age-hewn rock of colossal Ravana put on flesh and flushed with warm blood. breathing. And so has Abhinava Pampa, one of our great poets in Kannada. given us a new

> romantic Ravana to contemplate, as a relief from the mechanical classical type (Emphasis added. Srikantia. 1983: 797-98).

Again as said earlier he minces no words in valorizing the western, modern, tragic type against conventional, classical tradition and dogma, which he calls mechanical. In concluding the introductory section of his essay he says that though Nagachandra also believed in the law of Karma and might have had a deeper grip on it, he was able to humanize it. In the above passage we can also see western poetic diction, which had a great influence on him. In the next section of his essay he demonstrates his interpretation of the character of Ravana in *Pampa Ramayana*. He concludes the essay by saying "The Highest has a large heart and understands tragedies. Ravana the shattered man, fell; but his spirit, having paid the supreme penalty of sin. has risen and dwelt in the imagination of men like Nagachandra - men who can divine a grief and sympathise" (Srikantia. 1983: 814). The whole exercise is to employ Western poetics, especially that of Greek Tragedy, to prove that Ravana in *Pampa Ramayana* is a tragic character. The concluding passage, quoted above, equates "the Highest" with "understanding of tragedies" and this demonstrates how B.M. Srikantia had come to accept that tragedy is a supreme form in the evolution of literature.

It is not only B.M. Srikantia who tried to interpret the character of Ravana in terms of a tragic hero; D.V. Gundappa. another Kannada writer who was also engaged in political activism, does this too. D.V. Gundappa was one of the key players in a movement which demanded responsible government in Princely Mysore. He was the first one to render a Shakespeare's play without any changes, that is. what we would call a direct translation, not an adaptation, into Kannada. Writing an introduction to his translation *Macbeth* in 1936. he calls it a tragedy and explains the notions of Greek tragedy and Shakespearean tragedy. While introducing the translated play, he says the Kannada word normally used for tragedy in Kannada is Rudra Nataka. He completely endorses this word coined by B.M. Srikantia, and says Roudra (terror/fury) is the rasa that gets invoked in

tragedy, and it also indirectly provokes Karuna (compassion) rasa in the audience; so it is natural that the tragedy is called Rudra Nataka in Kannada. As an example he immediately quotes the story of the *Ramayana*. He says "the result of Rama"s Roudra is the killing of Ravana; its function is to instill the fear of demons; the cry of Mandodari evokes pity for the people of Lanka. Thus the Roudra rasa causes fear and pity" (Gundappa, 1976: 6-7). Then he further elaborates by quoting certain passages from *Srimadramayana*. But at the end of that section he mentions that though the irony of fate touches our heart through the world of Vyasa Maharshi (the author of epic *Mahabharata)*. and shades of it can be seen also in Bhagavan Valmiki, we don't have a playwright who is famous for scripting tragedy. He adds that Aeschylus. Sophocles and Euripides in Ancient Greece and Shakespeare in England have excelled in the art of tragic rasa (Gundappa. 1976: 9).

Gundappa. unlike B.M. Srikantia. does not criticize tradition nor does he valorize the West. though he accepts the superiority of the Western writer in tragedy. So instead of a Ramayana written by a Jaina poet, he takes up Valmiki's *Ramayana* to claim that catharsis happens through it. and it evokes and purges pity and fear. It is interesting to note that he completely equates the Indian theory of Rasa with western poetical categories. This translated play was shown to B.M. Srikantia before its publication and he had corrected the manuscript.

B.M. Srikantia in his article "A Tragic Ravana" had said that modern readers are awaiting the fair treatment of Ravana. This dream was fulfilled for Kannada speakers in 1949. K.V. Puttappa popularly known as Kuvempu. wrote *Sri Ramayana Darshanam* an epic in 1949 (Kuvempu. 1990). Critics opine that though Kuvempu retains the essential framework of Valmiki in penning Ravana. he has developed Ravana's character in such a manner as to make him progressively redeem himself, until at last no taint is left in him (Prabhu Shankara. 1986: 96-102). Again Kuvempu interprets Ravana as a tragic hero (villain?) though he is not the protagonist of the epic. It is not in this alone that Kuvempu

has tried to reinterpret characters from old epics/stories. even in some of his plays he has done the same. *Smashana Kurukshetra* (Kurukshetra - the graveyard) published in 1931 is also recognized by some critics as one of the first independent tragedies of Kannada drama (Venkatachala Shastri, 1989: 117). Kuvempu himself in his introduction to the play calls it a tragedy of war. *Sudra Tapasvi* written in 1944 is also the reworking of a story line from Ramayana. It shows the killing of a Sudra. who was doing penance. by Rama in order to uphold hierarchical Varnashrama Dhanna.[20] In *Beral-ge-Koral* (Head for Thumb) published in 1947. the story of Ekalavya from Mahabharata is reworked. and Ekalavya is shown as a tragic hero.

In 1946. Govinda Pai has also written a play on Ekalavya. reworking the character of Ekalavya in accordance with Greek tragic heroes. Mela. the Kannada equivalent of chorus is also added to the play. But in the play the reason for the fate of Ekalavya is not Hamartia but the discriminatory attitude perpetuated by the caste hierarchy. Even in Kuvempu`s play this comes out very clearly. Here we see that the nationalist elite who wrote tragedies using the form from Greek drama and content from Indian mythology in order to negotiate with the perception of lack of tragedy in Kannada theatre and to prove that Kannada literature had tragic material/characters/elements to uphold tradition. also exposed the tyrannical elements of tradition and the caste/varna hierarchies.

T.P. Kailasam. who wrote plays with a social theme in Kannada. chose to rewrite themes and characters from mythology in English[21]. Though he has written many plays in Kannada and English. three of his English plays are worth mentioning in the context of our discussion of the reworking of mythological characters in terms of tragedy. *The Purpose* subtitled "A playlet of Ekalavya" is a reworking of the character of Ekalavya. It ends with Ekalavva asking Drona. after giving his right thumb as gurudakshina (teacher's fee). as demanded by Drona. "Forgive me Gurujee! I did not know what 1 was doing! But yet... how could you! How could you! How could you (demand my right thumb, now I cannot use my skill in

archery)!" (Kailasam. 1987: 715). This does not end in the protagonist. Ekalavya's death, but ends in his anguish at Drona for claiming his right thumb just to remove him from contending with Arjuna. Drona's student, in archery. When this half-written play was read out to C.R. Reddy.[22] he asked Kailasam "Well what becomes of Ekalavya then?' Kailasam narrated the whole story till Ekalavya meets his end at the hands of Krishna. Then Kailasam was struck by it and wTOte a sequel to it. naming it *Fulfilment.* Thus the play, which originally did not end in death, was made to end in death in the sequel. *The Brahmin's Curse* is a play where he depicts the tragic story of Karna. The title of the play itself suggests that it is not fate but caste hierarchy that is the cause for Karna's tragic fate. Another play published in his name called *Keechaka* was not written by him.[23] It seems that he narrated it to B.S. Rama Rao. who recollected the narration and reconstructed it in 1958. This play about Keechaka depicts Keechaka, the one who lusts after Draupadi and meets his death in the hands of Bheema her husband. as a noble man and due to his lust for Draupadi, his only misdeed. and the design of fate. he dies.

C.K. Venkataramaiah. a more popular writer of the day and also the official translator of Mysore State. wrote a play called *Mandodari* in 1931. This play reworks the character of Ravana and that of Mandodari. The critics opine that the characterization of Ravana is significant in terms of his tragic death. The plays of Samsa (the pen name of the playwright Swami Venkatadri) are also characterized by critics as tragic plays. But these plays are more akin to the Shakespearean model of tragedy rather than the Greek one. His first play *Sugunagambira* was written in 1919. This play and also his other plays like *Vigada Vikramaraya* (1925), which are termed as tragic. are historical plays that depict palace intrigues of the princely state of Mysore.[24]

It is not that the bringing of the form from Greek tragedy and story line from *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana*. as part of negotiation with the perception of lack of tragedy in Sanskrit literature by the nationalist elite, fitted each other perfectly.

Both have to change in the process and this has given rise to a lot of debate mainly on using Indian mythology to suit the needs of the form. The debate over form and content in literature is already a well-established one and I will not touch upon it here. In this section I will narrate the debate on and around the translations of B.M. Srikantia.

Srikantia wrote *Gadaayuddham Natakam* in 1925. It was staged on December 23rd the same year and was published in 1926. It is a reworking of a scene from Ranna's epic *Sahasa Bheema Vijaya.* Ranna wrote his epic in the 10th century and he was one of the trio of Jaina poets of the period. the other two being Pampa and Ponna. Ranna was a court poet of Satyasraya. the Chalukyan emperor. He has wTitten two epics much in the tradition of writing one religious and another secular work. *Ajitapurana* is a religious text pertaining to Jainism. *Gadayuddham* or *Sahasa Bheema Vijaya* is a secular text. The concluding portion of the Mahabharata is the theme of this work in champu form (prose mixed with poetic stanzas). It is said that *Pampabharatha* in general and the 13th Aswasa (canto) in particular inspired Ranna and influenced his work (Mugali, 1975: 31). In this epic Ranna raised his patron Satyasraya to the status of the hero of his poem. In his excessive loyalty to his king. Ranna has attributed the genealogy of his patron to Bheema. B.M. Srikantia had a great fascination for this epic. Time and again he has spoken about it appreciatively (Srikantia. 1983: 344 and 499). apart from reworking it into a play. Srikantia was of the opinion that though we don't have tragedies in our drama traditions we have enough material in our other genres with which tragedies could be produced. In his article "Rudra Nataka" he takes up the question of absence of tragedy and analyzes it:

> Why in the culture of Bharata`s land don"t we find this noble, gTeat literature (of tragedy)? ... If we carefully examine our culture. then we find that the experience of tragedy, eternity in death and the knowledge that the sad man has a devatamsha

> (aspect of god). are there in our culture. There is enough of it; we can even lend it to whole world (Srikantia, 1983: 326).

Then he gives examples to prove his point. He rhetorically asks if Sita's life a happy one. lsn"t the Mahabharata tragic? Is it that Karna, Duryodhana and others are just bad men - what about their self-respect, commitment? Aren't their deaths tragic? He goes on to **give** many such examples.

He found in Ranna his first tragic hero - Duryodhana. He had a ready material. as critics say, he culled his tragic character out of 576 verses of Ranna. His effort **was** to place these selected verses in the mouths of different characters and to give the shape of a play to it. B.M. Srikantia in this process of editing an epic into a tragedy replaced certain verses and interchanged the verses between different characters. some times splitting the **verse** into two to construct dialogues. All the changes that he has made in the text are intended to make Duryodhana into a tragic hero and *Gadaayuddham*,a tragedv

As I said earlier Ranna equated Bheema with his patron Raja Satyasraya. So the character of Bheema is depicted in a good light, though Ranna has his sympathies for Duryodhana. But in casting Duryodhana as hero. B.M. Srikantia drops certain references and passages, which present Bheema in a favourable light. In the poem. before defying Dharmaraya. Bheema bows to him. There is no such grace in Bheema in the play. In the epic. as Duryodhana emerges from the Vaishamapayana Lake. Bheema admires his courage. but the Bheema of the play displays no such magnanimity. In the former. Bheema calls Duryodhana "*manadanna*" (one to whom his honour is his treasure): in the play there is no such tribute. Seshagiri Rao says that "(t)he changes were obviously meant to lower Bheema and strengthen our admiration and pity for Duryodhana" (Seshagiri Rao. 1984: 81).[25] L.S. Seshagiri Rao also says that the vision of Ranna had penetrated the material. which he had borrowed from the *Mahabharata*, but B.M. Srikantia's borrowing of verses from Ranna and just changing them in order to

make Duryodhana a tragic hero has failed in achieving its objective. Further Seshagiri Rao says that the "ghastly scene of Bheema drinking Duryodhana's blood" is repulsive but "while doing so he (Bheema) lists the latter's misdeeds one after another - the attempt to burn the Pandavas, the attempt to poison Bheema, the deception in the game of dice, and the humiliation of Draupadi". Seshagiri Rao says that it is not possible to see Duryodhana as one "vanquished by providence", "since this panorama of the King's crimes comes just before his fall"'. He further substantiates his charge saying that "Duryodhana does not stand before us as a great man with many admirable qualities whose one weakness or failing led him to a single wrong choice or crime and who, thereafter, was driven from crime to crime with no freedom of choice. What we see is a persistent assertion of wickedness; consistently brushing aside all opportunities of self-redemption" and points out that "in the last scene there is no evidence of self-knowledge, no illumination vouchsafed to him before his death". Seshagiri Rao concludes that Ranna's vision clashes with Srikantia's and what we have is a profoundly moving sequence of five scenes (Seshagiri Rao, 1984: 82-83). This problem is also pointed out by M. Ramachandra (1985).

At the end of the fight. Dharmaraya the elder brother of Bheema tells Bheema that "killing a brother is a great sin". And he tells Krishna that "these people are out of their senses due to their victory" and points out to him three ghastly creatures dancing on Bheema"s head (Srikantia, 1983: 176). Thus Srikantia puts the stamp of Dharmaraya's authority for his interpretation of Bheema. It is also noted that the use of three *maruls* (something similar to the witches in *Macbeth)* is due to the influence of Shakespeare though it is found in the epic too (Ramachandra, 1985: 48).

K.D. Kurthakoti. an important Kannada critic, writing in 1992 opines that there is no doubt about the feet that the theme of *Gadaayuddham* appears at the surface level to be like that of Greek tragedy. But within that theme there are certain principles that pull the play in opposite directions. Ashwaththama (son of Drona)

who comes at the end of the play after the death of Duryodhana says. "The life that suffered most is at peace now. Let you be gone to a better place" (Srikantia, 1983: 179). Kurthakoti says that Ashwaththama saying it in the context of the play is improbable as the play shows otherwise. His contention is that the loss and pain suffered by the Pandavas is great and it is improbable that Ashwaththama would say this about Duryodhana (Kurthakoti. 1992: 14). He further says the scene in which the ghastly creatures fly on Bheema is deviant and horrible and this conception doesn't hold good even in Greek tragedy. He concludes that bringing Greek consciousness to a Mahabharata story has not yielded any desired results (Kurthakoti. 1992: 14). I don't know what Kurthakoti assumes in his conclusion as the "desired results". If the intention of B.M. Srikantia is to show that there are tragic elements and substance in our epics, and that our poets have not just created black and white characters but also characters with flesh and blood, to negotiate with the perception of lack of tragedies in "our" literary tradition, then it has yielded the desired results. Other critics, though pointing out the flaws and mismatches between either Ranna and Srikantia in their treatment, or Greek tragic form and Srikantia's play, have lauded Srikantia for making such an attempt in Kannada literature (Venkatachala Shastri. 1989; S.V. Ranganna. 1972: Ramachandra, 1985: Seshagiri Rao. 1984 and Geethaacharya. 1985). But the point is not to say whether what Srikantia did is great or not, it was just the beginning in creative form to negotiate with the sense of unease that was created in the nationalist elite by English education.

In the last scene *of Gadaayuddham*, Ashwaththama comes and meets Duryodhana and goes back vowing to bring the heads of the five Pandavas. He comes back with five heads. They were not the heads of the Pandav as but of their children. Duryodhana chides him for killing those innocent children and tells him to repent in an appropriate manner, as killing children is a sin. This must have resonated for a long time in B.M. Srikantia's mind. When he set out to translate Sophocles" *Ajax* into Kannada he used Ashwaththama's story. Unlike *Gadaayuddham*, which had a source text in Kannada, *Ashwaththaman* had no source text in Kannada. He

took the story of Ashwaththama generally from the Mahabharata and used it to translate *Ajax*. *Ashwaththaman* came out in 1929, three years after *Gadaayuddham*.

Srikantia found a close similarity between Homer's Ajax and Vyasa's Ashwaththama in terms of character and career. He equated Shiva with Athene, Krishna with Odysseus, Bhargavi[26] with Tecmessa, Bheema with Agamemnon, Ekalavya with Teucer. and Rudrashakthi[27] with Ajax's son. Ashwaththama in order to avenge the death of his patron Duryodhana and fulfil the word he had given to him. goes to kill the Pandavas. But on Krishna's advice they had gone to some other place. Thinking that the Pandavas are in the camp, Ashwaththama kills the sleeping Upa-Pandavas. When the play opens Krishna is trying to trace the person who is responsible for the killings of the Upa-Pandavas. The story-ends with Ashwaththama killing himself on the sword given to him by Abhimanyu. Not only have the names of the characters been indianized. even the setting has been completely changed. The battlefield is Kurukshetra. The interesting thing in the play is that Drona hails from Banavasi of Karnataka. When the war takes place. Ekalavya is also there in the battlefield with his hunters to help his teacher. These hunters form the chorus of the play. narrating it and also taking part in it. Many critics hail the introduction of the chorus and its use.

The chorus on hearing the news of the self-slaughter of Ashwaththama plunges into sorrow. Then the chorus recalls the pleasures of Banavasi and broods over their fate in the land of Kurukshetra. The influence of Pampa, whom B.M. Srikantia admired a lot can be seen here. In his 10th century epic *Vikramarjuna Vijaya*. Pampa describes Banavasi. and his description came to stay in the 20th century as the description of Karnataka of the past. While bidding adieu Ashwaththama remembers two things: one is his favourite Banavasi, the motherland. and the other is his son Rudrashakthi. One of the critics goes to the extent of admiring this as an aspect of patriotism on the part of Ashwaththama (Srikantia S. 1984: 122-23).

This play when it appeared on the Kannada scene created a lot of furore and was widely criticized. But later it went on to become one of the canonical texts to be emulated for many. S. V. Ranganna. a theatre scholar, tells us:

> Like Corneille's *Le Cid*. like Victor Hugo's *Hernani* it gave rise to attacks and animadversions. logic-chopping disputes. and immoderate heat and acerbity. The orthodox felt outraged and shocked; one section of it denounced the self-slaughter of Ashwaththama. who according to its belief was one of the immortals. It may be stated in passing that later superstitious tradition had exalted him into that rank. Another section fell foul of Srikantia`s degrading Lord Krishna into a **cowardly** and sly human being (Ranganna S.V.. 1972: 40).

These were the two issues that came up during that time and have been much debated issues on Srikantia till today.

In order to fuse the story of Ashwaththama and Ajax. Srikantia has changed both. New characters get added in Kannada. which are not there in Greek. The main change as said in the above passage cited by Ranganna. is of showing the death of the one who is supposed to have no death but is eternal. i.e.. Ashwaththama. as dead at the end. Many critics have tried to defend him on this account. saying that it is to bring in newness and it was the necessity of the day. Some others have tried to defend him in the name of freedom of creativity. On the whole *Ashwaththaman* is a play that is appreciated by many in spite of the above two reservations. G.S. Amur another important critic identifies the difference between the reworking of Jaina poets and B.M. Srikantia:

> There were precedents for such changes in the work of Jaina poets like Nagachandra. but the Jaina experiments had the support of

> Jaina theology and ethics while his (Srikantia's) own drew inspiration from an alien world-view which had yet to be naturalized on the Indian soil. It is possible to say *Ashwaththaman* came much before its time (Amur, 1984: 137).

Whether *Ashwaththaman* came much before its time or at an appropriate time is a matter of debate akin to the debate of what would have happened if colonialism had not come to India. But indulging in such speculative interrogations would not yield any results. It seems Srikantia also was in two minds on this issue of killing Ashwaththama in the play. Dharwadakar quotes two incidents about this and one of them is:

> One of my friends reported that while giving a speech in Bagalkot. Srikantia exclaimed 'I didn't get a son of that kind as I killed Chiranjeevi Ashwaththama in the play' (Dharwadakar. **1984:73).**

If the report of the friend of Dharwadakar is true then it means that Srikantia might have had second thoughts after writing the play. Dharwadakar narrates another incident that happened in Dharwad:

> Srikantia explained the trauma he underwent after writing the play *Ashwaththaman* at a public meeting held in Dharwad. He accepted that in order to give a thick description of tragicness of Ashwaththama 's end. he displaced Ashwaththama from Chiranjeevi throne by making him the victim of Yama (Death-god). After writing the play, for this injustice done to Ashwaththama's character, he is said to have suffered from viral fever for two months as repentance and after the repentance fever, he came out of that sorrow (Dharwadakar. 1984: 73).

But Srikantia's later writings never manifest any such feeling of repentance. Whether Srikantia repented for the changes he made or not, the others who followed him never repented in changing things while translating. It is not that changes were made for the first time by Srikantia to suit either form or vision of the play. Before him we have a history of literary adaptations in Kannada from English in which many changes were made; like in *Ramavarma - Leelavathi.* a translation of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet,* gods miraculously come at the end to give life to the dead lovers by sprinkling holy water on them. It is interesting to look at why certain changes get accepted and certain other changes do not. It will be worth investigating as to who objects to changes and when objections to changes come about, a matter which is outside the scope of the present chapter.

In spite of the debate generated over fusing Ajax and Ashwaththama. *Ashwaththaman* was considered a perfect tragedy unlike earlier attempts. This could be due to the following reasons. In terms of plot and its development he had *Ajax* in front of him. He was able to use the chorus effectively. The Greek story was replaced by the story of Ashwaththama. which was modified to suit the tragic vision. though it created a lot of debate. Even Kurthakoti who is not happy with the kind of experiments B.M. Srikantia made to cull out tragic elements from past literature and fuse them with an alien genre. accepts that the kind of cultural exchange that has happened in writing *Ashwaththaman* is creative (Kurthakoti. 1992: 17). Seshagiri Rao in his article "In search of a Tragedy" opines that "in *Ashwaththaman,* Shri (Srikantia) gained a tragic vision and found a perfect form to match. The search for tragedy was over. Kannada literature was enriched w ith a new form. and a great play" (Seshagiri Rao. 1984: 91).

Let me now tease out two arguments from the above two paragraphs as an entry point for the discussion of Srikantia's third play *Paarasikaru.*

1. Srikantia repented after writing *Ashwaththaman* for making Chiranjeevi Ashwaththama slay himself.

2. In writing *Ashwaththaman* a creative cultural exchange had taken place and Srikantia's search for Tragedy was over.

It is in the light of the above two points that we have to look at his third play *Paarasikaru* published in 1935. This is one of the least discussed among his plays. Unlike his earlier attempts of trying to look for a tragic matter/element/character in Kannada tradition as in *Gadaayuddhamm* or trying to look for an equivalent in "our" culture for the Greek play as in *Ashwaththaman, Paarasikaru* was translated as it is: only the language was changed. *Paarasikaru* was a translation of Aeschylus"s *Persae.* It is one of the lesser-known plays of Aeschylus. Why Srikantia chose to translate this instead of a better known play is a question that has haunted many critics. just as the question of why he chose lesser-known poems to translate into Kannada in *English Geethegalu.* Ranganna narrates the first staging of this play:

> Professor Srikantia also ill-selected the date for the first night of his *Paarasikaru:* it was during the Diamond Jubilee of the Central College. As we had feared. the festive-minded youthful audience hissed during the play and booed the actors. What could they make of names like Arthaspis, Pegasthagone, Pharandakes. Mithrighates and Xerxes. and how could they stand the unending crying and moaning? I do not think that many readers of books have been happy over it either (Ranganna. 1972: 42-3).

It is clear from Ranganna's account of the first staging of the play that this translation by B.M. Srikantia was not received favorably: neither did it draw the attention of literary circles nor was it appreciated on the stage. Why is it so? Is it because it was a direct translation without changing into Indian settings as Ranganna opines? Or is it because it is a lesser-known play of Aeschylus? If the answers to the above questions are yes. then the question that begs to be answered is why Srikantia chose this play and decided to translate it literally. without any

attempt to Indianize as he had done in his earlier attempts. Is it because as Seshagiri Rao says, his search for a tragedy was over with *Ashwaththaman*? So now there was no need to prove the point again. Or did he feel that there was no point in searching for a tragedy in "our" tradition? Or was he afraid of making changes and drawing the wrath of people as had happened in the earlier two instances? Or as Dharwadakar's above comment indicates, was he afraid that he would have to face the consequences (of the divine) for making changes and have to repent again? 1 shall argue that the answers to none of these questions could be a definitive yes. because his speech on Rudra Nataka at Mysore Prantha Samiti in 1941. cited earlier, shows no evidence whatsoever to substantiate the above statements. It completely reaffirms the earlier position taken by Srikantia. In this speech after wondering why there is no tragedy in "our" tradition he asks rhetorically:

> What is wrong if now we stage, write or translate (tragedy)? Don"t you think a new radiation. a new experience. a new joy emerges out of tragedy? ... If we don't see death on the stage and instead hear it from a messenger. isn't it then also inauspicious? Isn't it great to convert the inauspicious into the auspicious: Don't our people know this secret? If we are afraid to see death. then where is the stove that doesn't cook? Or the house without death? The lesson that Buddha taught to Kisa Goutami has to be learnt by our rigid doctrinaires... All literature is not sweet; there is some bitter medicine also. Fear of tragedy is like fear of children towards dark - only in the dark do we see pole stars (Srikantia. 1983: 326-27).

We don't have any evidence to say that his earlier stand regarding tragedy has changed by the time of his speech in 1941. But it seems that the sense of unease about the perceived lack of tragedy that might have worked in him earlier, which

compelled him to look for tragic forms in Kannada literature is no more. Just look at the following passage where he calls for the translation of tragedies:

> Our life is a tragedy in many a sense; our community life is also a tragedy in many a sense; let us, those who have experienced tragedy see it from the eyes of poets and experience it like that. Let us fill this void through translations: those who are blessed with creativity can fill it through their writings and give us "tragedy" (Srikantia, 1983: 327).

It is not that he now thought that there is no tragic element or tragic hero in "'our" culture but there was no point in proving it as it was a well-accepted fact by then. So there was no problem in attempting direct translations from Greek.

There is one more question that comes up here, that which is related to the notion of translation. All translations from English or European languages through English during the colonial period from mid 19th century were translations that modified the text to suit nationalist politics. Thus Shakespeare had to wait till 1936 to get a direct translation of his work. D.V. Gundappa was the first one to translate Shakespeare's *Macbeth* without any changes into Kannada in 1936. the same year as that of the publication of *Paarasikaru*. Was it that the notion of being faithful to the original while translating was gaining currency among them? Or a theory Bhashanthara Vairy speaks about gained the upper hand, that only by showing the alien as alien we can keep our cultures intact?[28] It could well be both.

V

In 1992, K.D. Kurthakoti while commenting on B.M. Srikantia's article "A Tragic Ravana" asks:

> Aren't many of "our" Sanskrit plays are tragedies in the sense of Aristotle? If someone says that they are not, then what is the problem? Nothing. ... If absence of tragedy becomes a lacuna, then there will be a hiatus in our perception of the tradition of our Kannada literature. 'Old Kannada literature is great, but why is there no tragedy in it?' This is not a question that requires an answer. We cannot lie that we have it. If we agree that we don't have it. then we have to humbly put our head down. Even now when we don't have the courage to ask why- there should be tragedy in Kannada, we can't expect that there was any in 1941. Then the accepted notion was to receive light and air from any direction (Kurthakoti, 1992: 6).

By 1992, Kannada critics seem to have come out of their perception of lack which they had felt since coming in touch with the Greek dramatic tradition and the orientalist discourse on Sanskrit literature. Now Kurthakoti says if there are no tragedies in Kannada we don't have to perceive it as a lacuna. He says that perceiving lacuna in our tradition would create a hiatus between our tradition and us. He is also aware of the fact that during the colonial period that generation had little "courage" to ask back the question "'why should there be tragedy in Sanskrit literature". He is also aware of the fact that "this courage" wouldn't have come to people like B.M. Srikantia during the colonial period. However it is not simply a matter of "courage" as Kurthakoti suggests but the question of standing outside the subjectivity shaped by the colonial and nationalist discourses.

Is it that B.M. Srikantia and others who perceived a lacuna in Sanskrit/Kannada literature for not having tragedy had a disjuncture in their perception of tradition? If we go back to the definition of tradition by Raymond Williams, quoted in the first section of this chapter that "tradition is not the past, but an interpretation of the past: a selection and valuation of ancestors, rather than a natural record", we can say that the kind of tradition that people like B.M. Srikantia imagined is also a

particular construction of tradition and what today Kurthakoti perceives as tradition is also another construction of tradition. Both constructions provide interpretations of the past. What we need to look at is the present that informs their construction. It is beyond the purview of this chapter to look at the present that works behind the comments of Kurthakoti. I will just limit myself to say that the Kannada literary critic of today is working with a certain notion of post-colonial consciousness that tries to free itself of the pressures of colonial construction.

What is the colonial consciousness that informed B.M. Srikantia in his rereading of Nagachandra's Ravana? What is his construction of Ashwaththama, Duryodhana? He himself claims, as I have shown, in my analyses that they are tragic characters. We also know that a certain kind of equation between tragedy and the modern appeared; an overlapping occurred in his writings. I am using the word tragedy here to mean what Raymond Williams pointed out as modern tragic theory. A classical literary genre combined with modern tragic theory informs the construction of tradition by writers like B.M. Srikantia

Is it that B.M. Srikantia debunked tradition in the name of tragedy? The answer to the question is both yes and no. If we look at his other works like *Kannada Saahityada Charitre* (A History of Kannada Literature) written in 1947. it would give a different kind of picture of the politics of his construction of tradition. The relationship of the nationalist elite in Kannada, of which B.M. Srikantia is a part, with the construction of an Indian/Kannada tradition that colluded with the orientalist construction was very complex and changing over time.

His career from tragedy writer/editor in *Gadaayuddhamm*, to tragedy transformer in *Ashwaththaman* to translator in *Paarasikaru* indicates that his own strategies changed over time. In the beginning of his negotiation with the sense of unease for not having tragedies in "our" tradition. B.M. Srikantia tried to show that, by rewriting Ranna"s epic into a tragic play *Gadaayuddhamm*, the tragic

element/substance/character existed in Kannada literature. He didn't hesitate to pick up a quarrel on the issue of characterization of Ravana with the likes of Valmiki and Tulsidas. In *Ashwaththaman* too he not only took the liberty to change the story of his "own" tradition as he did in *Gadaayuddhamm* but also took the liberty of changing the original while translating it into an available Indian story. But in his last play *Paarasikaru*, he neither tried to show that there is any tragic material existing in India nor did he try to change the Greek play. B.M. Srikantia tried to find tragic character in Ranna's *Pampa Ramayana*, but D.V. Gundappa tried to show tragic element in the original Valmiki *Ramayana* itself. B.M. Srikantia in his comments finds fault with Valmiki while D.V. Gundappa showers praises on him for his characterization of Ravana. Not only over time did the strategies of negotiating with the perceived lacuna in "our" literatures change, but also different strategies were employed by different people.

Sanskrit Drama, especially the absence of tragedy, becomes a site on which various construction of traditions struggle for their hegemony. Orientalists also created their "Other" traditions through their scholarship: this too was not free of any uneasiness on their part. As shown in the first section, for the Orientalists too, there was a certain kind of unease that Sanskrit drama could be older than "ours". The notion of "our" culture/tradition for the British also oscillates between the "English" and the "West", where "West" stands for Greco-Roman culture. The nationalist elite tries to rework the orientalist construction of their tradition to suit nationalist politics. If that is not possible then they try to negotiate with it through various strategies. "Genre politics" thus becomes one of the important sites on which this drama gets enacted.

- Orientalists in their pursuit of knowledge of the Orient constructed traditions for their Others, i.e., the Orientals and in that process they recasted their own tradition.
- Though the nationalist elite accepted many a premise of the Orientalist construction, they sought to modify them to suit nationalist politics.

- When the nationalist elite were unable to change certain aspects of the colonial discourse, it caused unease in them, which pushed them to negotiate with it in various ways.
- Genre politics is one area where this drama – of western construction of Sanskrit tradition, nationalist elite's acceptance of the same and attempts to negotiate with it - was played out.
- The negotiation carried out by the nationalist elite with the orientalist discourse was not a uniform one. Different individuals/groups/communities have tried to negotiate with it in different ways. Their strategies of negotiation have changed over time.

3

Translating Nationalism: The Politics of Language and Community

M. Gopalakrishna Adiga. the pioneer of the Navya (modernist) movement in Kannada literature. in a poem written on the occasion of the birth centenary of B.M. Srikantia. asks him a question at the end of the poem:

> Oh revered Acharya. the one who paved the way for several decades.
> Tell me why Hosagannada (new Kannada) is only for Lyrics;
> For tragedy: for the noble and elaborate, it is Halegannada (old Kannada);
> Why this addiction to nasal letters and consonants?
> Why this shift to high ornamental rhetoric: vain boasting?
> Tell me Guru why did you initiate it?
> (Adiga. 1986:45).

It is a common understanding that B.M. Srikantia was one of the pioneers in initiating the use of the modern Kannada by abandoning old Kannada in the writing of poetry. His *English Geethagalu*, which has been a landmark since its publication, bears witness to this fact. *English Geethagalu* is a collection of translation of English poems into Kannada published in 1923, which served as a model for the use of language in writing poetry in Kannada.[29] But Srikantia, who championed the use of new standardized and modernized language for lyrics, adopted old Kannada while translating Greek tragedy into Kannada. In the above poem. Gopalakrishna Adiga asks the famous writer why this dichotomy surfaced in his work. Hardly anyone in the Kannada literary circle has taken up the investigation of this apparent dichotomy. Kurthakoti mentions Adiga's poetry in his analysis of Srikantia's poetry but doesn't probe the issue. He just says that "Srikantia is no longer alive to answer this question, it is we. who have to answer

this question". He clarifies that "we" refers to the people who continue to perpetuate this tradition of using new Kannada for lyrics and old Kannada for certain other genres like tragedy (Kurthakoti. 1992: 19-20). But he doesn't elaborate on this further nor does he analyze the issue. It is worth investigating into the context and views of B.M. Srikantia on the use of different kinds of Kannada for different genres.

For this, we need to look at the kind of ferment in which language was recast by the English educated Kannada elite and also how the process of recasting of language, in turn, gave them a certain kind of subjectivity. Language is one of the crucial areas where the politics of culture is more discernible than in any other field, because the relationship between language and nationalism is intricate and deep. During colonial period the construction of traditions and contestations of the same took place. In this chapter I shall explore some of the issues related to the politics of language in the context of Kannada and Princely Mysore. The relationship between language and Colonialism, and language and nationalism, is a much-debated issue in the field of post-colonial studies. I won't elaborate on the relationship between colonialism and English. as it is a well-researched area by now. I would mainly focus on the question of nationalism and language in the first section of this chapter.

In the second section I will look at construction of the history of Kannada literature. language and Princely Mysore in the colonial context. The category. *Princely Mysore,* had an interesting relationship with that of Karnataka. which was just emerging in the process of the above-mentioned construction of histories. So in this section 1 will touch upon the construction of Kannada / Karnataka. which was an overall result of other such processes of construction. The third section will deal with the standardization of Kannada language and B.M. Srikantia's views of on it. 1 will further try to link his views on modernization/ standardization of Kannada with his use of different kinds of Kannada in his translation.

1

The relationship between nationalism and language has not been an important area of discussion in the standard histories of Indian nationalism, though they mention the problem the nationalists faced in deciding on an official language/s for the nation. But in Europe, as Benedict Anderson in his *Imagined Communities* (1991) says, language played an important role in carving out nations. which he calls imagined communities. Let me here briefly present the views of Benedict Anderson regarding language and nationalism. While talking about the origins of national consciousness he says: "(T)he factors involved (in making the nation popular) are obviously complex and various. But a strong case can be made for the primacy of capitalism" *(Anderson, 1991:* 37). He identifies "development of print as commodity" i.e. print-capitalism, as the key factor in generating the new idea. Initially, the rich capitalists published Latin books and their market was literate Europe, "a wide but thin stratum of Latin-readers". Once this market was saturated. the print capitalists turned towards publications in vernaculars. Anderson identifies three factors that helped this "revolutionary vernacularizing thrust of capitalism": 1. Change in the position of Latin - During medieval times Latin was just a language used in the church. But with the publication of ancient Latin literature and its dissemination among the European intelligentsia. it became a repository of sophisticated stylistic achievement of the ancients. With this it was removed from the everyday use and acquired the status of an "esoteric arcane language" and went out of ecclesiastical and everyday life. 2. Impact of Reformation.– Reformation itself was aided by print capitalism. Anderson claims that Martin Luther was the first best selling author. and was soon followed by others. This "coalition between Protestantism and print-capitalism, exploiting cheap popular editions" created large new reading publics. which included people who knew no Latin. 3. Use of vernaculars as instruments of administrative centralization by certain monarchs also helped in eroding the sacred imagined community. But Anderson is quick to add that "nothing suggests

that any deep-seated ideological, let alone proto-national, impulses underlie this vernacularization" *(Anderson, 1991:* 41). He adds that this use of vernaculars in administration predated both print and religious upheaval, and it is different from the conscious politics of language employed in the 19th century for linguistic nationalisms. He further says that the above three factors were responsible only for dethronement of Latin and thus helped in a "negative sense". In a positive sense, he says "what made the new communities imaginable was half-fortuitous, but explosive interaction between a system of production and productive relations (capitalism), a technology of communications (print) and the fatality of human linguistic diversity" (Anderson, 1991: 39-43). Not all-vernaculars and dialects developed into print languages. Those dialects that were capable of "being assembled, within definite limits, into print languages (were) far fewer in number". And these fewer print-languages laid the bases of national consciousness in three distinct ways:

1. These print languages "created unified fields of exchange and communication below Latin and abo\e spoken vernaculars". With that a certain kind of comprehension became possible between various kinds of speakers existing in a language. Thus the speakers of a language, who were connected through print, formed "the embryo of the nationally imagined community" "in their secular, particular, visible invisibility".
2. Print-capitalism gave a new fixity to language. This helped in the long run to build the image of antiquity that is so central to the subjective idea of the nation.
3. Print-capitalism created languages of power, of a kind different from the older administrative vernaculars. Certain dialects inevitably were 'closer' to each print-language and dominated their final forms. Anderson calls this process of marginalization of certain people who speak a language that is not near to the standard form of a new print-language as an "unconscious process resulting from the explosive interaction between capitalism, technology and human linguistic diversity" (Anderson: 1991: 44-45).

Speaking about the cultural roots of nationalism, Anderson points out that the slow and uneven decline of three inter-linked certainties (idea of a particular script language offering privileged access to ontological truth; the belief that society was naturally organized around and under high centres - monarchs; and a conception of temporality in which cosmology and history were indistinguishable) happened first in Western Europe, later elsewhere, under the impact of economic change. discoveries (social and scientific), and the development of increasingly rapid communications, and drove a harsh wedge between cosmology and history" *(Anderson, 1991:* 36). In the above observation. Anderson hints at the decline of the old order, that led to the imagination of a new order i.e., nation, which first happened in Western Europe and later in other places under the impact of economic change, among other factors. He doesn't elaborate on this factor after that. It might be possible that he is referring to colonialism. which played a pivotal role in displacing the old order in the colonies. Many scholars have pointed out that it is colonialism that has been instrumental in developing national consciousness in India. But at the same time scholars like Partha Chatterjee have pointed out that the nationalist discourse in India is not a derivative of the colonial discourse. Chatterjee has also shown that the application of theories of nationalism obtained by analyzing western nationalism would be inappropriate in the Indian context.[30] But again when it comes to the question of language-based nationalisms and its relation to colonialism in the Indian context we hardly have any studies. The studies that have been carried out on the relationship between native languages and colonialism or on native languages and nationalism do not look at the imagined communities that are formed on the basis of language. Even if they look at it, then it is from the point of view of Indian nationalism or from a pan-Indian perspective.[31]

Though we need a different theoretical framework to understand the relationship between language and nationalism in India than that of Anderson's, we cannot totally ignore the insights offered by Anderson's analysis.

Sudipta Kaviraj has tried to develop Anderson's model to analyze the question of language and nationalism in the Indian context.[32] In traditional society, according to him, the elite carried on discussions in Sanskrit, which was jealousy guarde by the Brahmins through institutional arrangements and caste prohibition. The other castes used vernaculars and numerous dialects in their daily existence. The elite was bilingual. Due to this the scale of possible collective action or consultation became asymmetric between the elite and the subaltern groups. He puts Sanskrit at the top of his model. which he calls as elite discourse and which "could range across the entire subcontinent". The discourse of the subordinate groups remained within the closed boundaries of their vernacular dialects. "Thus, while conservatism and reaction could be subcontinental in spread. dissent was condemned to be mostly local". He says that only those dissents that implemented the elite discourse itself against its ideological structures could succeed. But during medieval times certain alterations occurred in this model of Sanskrit being above the vernaculars'dialects. However, he is quick to point out that these changes did not bring any significant change in the linguistic economy. The castes that used literacy in administrative services extended their skill in the new languages of power i.e.. Arabic and Persian. But these did not "seem to have threatened the privilege of Sanskrit". Hindu society tried to eject Muslim State out of the circle of Hindu social practice. This resulted in a sharp hiatus between the political power of the State and the social dominance inside Hindu communities. The conversion to Islam that took place during this period also helped certain groups to escape the caste oppression. Kaviraj says that though this gave rise to frantic traditionalism. there were other types of exchanges that took place with Islamic culture. He identifies the Bhakti doctrine as a result of this kind of religious exchange. In order to prove his hypothesis that religious developments have an intimate relation to the story of languages that he is narrating he dwells on the literature of the Bhakti movement. He says that during this period the vernacular languages saw a gradual development and produced

literature by slowly separating from the high Sanskrit tradition. This development was very gradual and subtle. Kaviraj has characterized this development thus:

> (V)ernacular literatures (Bhakti literature) and poetic traditions began an undeclared revolution. Within the formal terms of continuity with classical traditions in terms of narratives, forms and texts. these 'translations" in vernaculars were hardly passive cultural creations; and they gradually produced an alternative literature which told the same stories with subtle alternative emphases to alternative audience (Kaviraj. 1989: 35).

This tradition is now called *dusri parampara* or second tradition by critics like Namwar Singh. Here Kaviraj seems to be using emerging vernacular literatures of the medieval period and Bhakti literature interchangeably. The new literatures that were emerging in vernacular languages were based on certain well known Sanskrit texts. but they were reinterpreted to usher in a new religion. As Kaviraj further says: "Bhakti literature in its celebrated translations used the general sanction of free retelling to interpret a new religion into existence". Bhakti movements favored lower language. and as the vernaculars were touched by religiosity. they gained a new dignity. But he cautions immediately that this "extrication" was yet incomplete and the Sanskrit tradition still enjoyed the position of being a norm. He also says. "despite the beginnings of distinctive vernacular literature. people's identity must have been primarily determined by their belonging to a religious sect rather than the one of common speech".

He very clearly points out here that language-based identities and a community based on such identities were imagined only during the colonial period not in the medieval period. The kind of community they had during the pre-colonial period was very fuzzy. not the one which they inhabit today, either based on nation or language, which is an enumerated one. The shift from deriving their identity out

of a fuzzy community to an enumerated one happened when these vernacular literatures were fully formed in colonial times. He argues:

> Establishment of colonial power created a different structure of culture by a combination of deliberate policy and unintended consequences. ...Colonial administrations could hardly dispense with one essential prerequisite of effective rule: intelligibility of this world to the rulers themselves. ...colonialism introduced into this social world entirely unfamiliar processes and institutions drawn from the enormous cognitive apparatus that rationalism had by this time created in the West by which alone the colonisers could make this world cognitively and practically-tractable. ...one particular aspect of modernity the colonial state did introduce with effectiveness - the modern imperative of setting up social connections on an unprecedentedly large scale (Kaviraj. 1989:41-43).

After outlining the changes that were brought about by colonialism. Kaviraj turns to the emergence of Bengali identity. He says that the efforts of European missionaries in fashioning printed alphabet and standardization of language gave rise to the emergence of a Bengali identity. This identity got conferred not only on those who could read high literature but also on illiterates who were not able to read high literature. A standard Bengali language was evolved in this process of collaboration between missionaries. administrators and the prime beneficiaries of colonial social transformation. viz., the social elite of Calcutta. The earlier model of Sanskrit on top followed by vernaculars below changed now. Sanskrit was displaced by English and became an archaic language. The internal economy of the Bengali language itself became distinctly more hierarchical. Bengali which was in "cultural contestation" with English and Sanskrit "sought to appropriate vocabulary from both in order to make it the vehicle of serious literature, of high discussion and of science". "This new standardized. modernized Bengali became

distanced from the Bengali spoken on streets by Bengalis, though a distinct group emerged in Calcutta who would speak this kind of language". Thus language became a marker of social differentiation.

But nonetheless the illiterates whose Bengali was markedly different from that of the language of the Bhadralok, acquired the identity of a Bengali as an imagined Bengali community emerged out of the fuzzy world in which they lived. Kaviraj says that this Bengali identity, which he calls as a regional one, was soon subsumed under a larger national identity. He cites the founding of a credible political coalition against British power as the reason for this kind of subsumption. The subjective position "we", the ones who have to oppose British rule, that was offered in Bengali writings of the period initially denoted Bengalis, but later included in it others like Rajputs. Sikhs and Marathas to denote "Indians". But he says further that though the regional and sub-regional identities were subsumed in the larger identity, they are still present in "an indistinct politically inactive state". The dynamics of their activity depends on how successfully nationalism deals with them in the postcolonial period. Because the Indian nationalists sought to understand their world through European nationalisms, where the successful nations had a single language as their basis. Indian nationalists have perceived this as a lack and used various strategies to combat this 'language problem". One of the major ways out for the nationalist elite was creation of linguistic organization of smaller regions as "states" (as opposed to nation) based on 'primacy of major language".

I have here summarized Anderson's views on the relationship between nation and language and then the analyses of Kaviraj where he has modified Anderson's views to understand Indian nationalism and the question of language. 1 here take the case of Kannada and will try to see whether it fits into the theoretical model sketched out by Kaviraj. The history of language and identity in India delineated by Kaviraj. I would argue, falls short in analyzing the case of South Indian languages. It is not in the 'medieval period' that the vernacular literatures

emerged in languages like Tamil. It is said that the literature in Tamil was composed in as early as the first few centuries of the beginning of Christian era, at the most it is not later than 4th or 5th century AD. In Kannada the first available text that refers to Kannada compositions is *Kaviraja Maarga* and is dated around 9 century AD. All this happened much before Muslims came to power in India and Arabic or Persian languages were almost unknown to these language speakers. It is the Jaina poets who started writing literature in Kannada. The first epic of Kannada *Pampa Bharatha* of 10th century AD was written by Pampa who was a Jaina and most of the Kannada texts that are available during this period are by Jaina writers. So the trajectory of development of Kannada literature is completely different from that of Bengali. In feet the literature that came out of Veerashaiva movement[33]. which is unsatisfactorily termed as Bhakti movement. was not at all considered as literature proper. It was considered as part of Dharma Shastra of Veerashaiva religion community. And only in the 20th century it was considered as literature.[34] If we mean by Bhakti literature. the dynamic exchange of cultures that took place after the influence of Islam in India. then that kind of exchange took place in Karnataka after the 15 century and the literature that has come out of it is still not recognized as literature proper. Only now some of these literatures are being collected and analyzed as part of folklore. These literatures include *Tatvapadas*, oral epics etc... So there is no question of that being the beginning of literature in Kannada.

It is not that the attempts to standardize the language happened only during the colonial period. In Tamil the first available text *Tolakappiam* (around 4th century AD) is an attempt to write a grammar of the Tamil language, and it identifies various dialects that are spoken and their difference with the literary language. In Kannada too the first available text *Kaviraja Maarga* attempts to standardize the language and it also tries to delineate the boundaries of the Kannada-speaking region. There were attempts to write a grammar for the Kannada language much before the missionary activities took place. Nagavarma's *Bhashabushana* (12th century AD), Kesiraja's *Shabdamani Darpana* (around 13th century AD) and

Bhattakalanka's *Shabdanushasana* (1604) are some of these attempts. But these attempts were based on the model of Sanskrit grammar and used Kannada mainly to illustrate the rules that already existed in Sanskrit. If some usages in Kannada language were found to be unexplainable by the rules of the Sanskrit grammar then they termed them as exceptions instead of deriving new rules for these usages. In fact the missionaries and colonial administration just reprinted these old texts on Kannada language and circulated it in printed form during the colonial period. Thus the trajectory of the Kannada language and the development of its literature is different from that of the Bengali language and literature as narrated by Kaviraj.

Another important formulation of Kaviraj's, that we have looked at above, is that the 'we" that Bengali literature tried to fashion was initially Bengali but later on became Indian by including others to find "a credible political opposition to British power". This formulation too needs to be checked against the kind of literature that emerged in the 19th century in Kannada. I shall take up analyzing the Kannada literature of late 19th century in the next section and here 1 would like to state a few of my observations on the way Sudipta Kaviraj defines the relationship between Bengali identity and a pan-Indian identity. He is very clear in his formulation that Bengali, a regional identity, got subsumed by an Indian identity, the national one. In calling Bengali identity a regional one and Indian identity as national, one assumes that region is smaller than the nation. 1 would rather call both Bengali identity formation and Indian identity formations as regional. What 1 mean by regional needs to be clarified here. For me any geographical entity with marked boundaries is a region. In that sense nation also inhabits a particular geographical location with boundaries. The politics of nationalism is basically that of marking a geographical location as its own and claiming it as the rightful owner. Nationalism in this sense is a politics of region. For a Bengali identity the main basis is not region but language. Because languages are spoken in a particular region the invocation of region becomes necessary for any language identity to emerge. Nationalisms in Europe took shape

when region and language were mapped on to one another. But in India this mapping of region and language did not seem to have worked out very effectively. We have no successful language-based nationalisms in India. Though Tamil witnessed a Dravidian national movement and it was based on language and anti-Brahmin politics, later it too succumbed to the hegemony of Indian national movement.

But all language-based identities need not be anti-colonial, as Kaviraj seems to suggest. And even if they are anti-colonial. the "other" for this kind of construction of language-based identities need not be the "colonial master" but could be others as well. What I have in mind here is the case of language-based identity formations like Oriya and Assamese in early 20th centuries, which tried to fashion their identity vis-a-vis Bengali. After the treaty between the Burmese Government and the British Government in India, Assam came under the British colonial rule. Since the Bengali elite was influential with the colonial power in Calcutta which ruled Assam then. the colonial administration used Bengali language in schools and colleges since 1837. At the same time. a kind of language consciousness originated in Assam due to the standardization processes of the language under Christian missionaries and the publication of books related to Assamese language in mid 19th centurv. It is said that Bengalis were considering Assamese as a dialect of Bengali and were denying the status of a language to it. The publication of books like *Grammatical Sotices of the Assamese Language* in 1844 by Reverend Brown. *A Dictionary of Assamese - English,* publication of a monthly called *Arunodaya* by American Baptists and publication of Assamese Bible in 1864 created a standard form of language and consciousness about the language. Thus a kind of distinct Assamese language identity emerged in contrast to the Bengali, which became the "other".[36] Most of such identities based on language were initially not anti-colonial but tried to fashion a distinct Assamese identity. by keeping the dominant language. Bengali, as the other. The Kannada consciousness that emerged during colonial period in today's north-Karnataka (then southern Maratha, also known as Bombay Karnataka) conceived Marathi as

the other to define its self. It is not that there were no Indian nationalist writings in these languages, later these languages also became the sites of production of Indian nationalist discourse. But this shift from "we" as Kannadigas to "we" as Indians is not simply the indication of building a pragmatic viable opposition to colonial power; it is a very complex phenomenon, and in different cases we might obtain different reasons for such a shift. As this is not the focus of my argument in this chapter, **I will** not elaborate on it here. But in the next section as I focus on the construction of Kannada identity and Kannada community by examining the mechanism of its construction, 1 touch upon some of the above issues pertaining to the Kannada case.

II

Benedict Anderson's argument, that nations were imagined as a result of certain modern developments and accompanying factors, gives the impression that the nation alone is an imagined community. But many other communities are also imagined. When we add the adjective 'imagined" to a community does it mean that there are `unimagined` communities? Or to put it in another way - are there `real` communities? Imagined is not used in opposition to real. imagined communities are also real. The collective formations that stand on blood relationships are supposed to be natural communities. Even they are not natural but cultural. since we see different forms of social institutions such as family prevailing in different societies. If they were natural we should have obtained a universal family system. But often we assume that these collective formations such as family and kin relationships are supposed to be non-imagined collective formations and are natural. Benedict Anderson clearly defines imagined community as one where the members of that community wouldn't have seen each other, and if they meet are not able to recognize each other, but still they all feel that they are members of the same community. A community, where members are bound by such an imagination, is called an imagined community. In this definition

any collective formation of human beings cemented by an imagination based on a principle. such as language, religion. caste etc.. would qualify to be an imagined communitv There are many such collective formations where the members wouldn't have seen each other but feel that they are related.

The studies on European history tell us only about a particular type of imagined community being constructed in the context of modernity. As we have already noted the language- based community and nation are synonymous in the context of Europe and in the Indian context that was not the case. In India though language-based communities were also imagined during modern developments. it is Indian national movement that dominated finally.

If we look at the consequences of modern developments in India, we witness various "new" communities getting constructed through discourses and the "old" ones wearing a "new face" or getting reconstructed. Here I think it is necessary to ponder o\er the notion of community and modern developments. The question of old and new is a matter of identifying the changes that take shape. The imagination of a community constitutes itself by (re) assembling the available material from its past. by reinterpreting them. so it uses old identities and communities too in this process.

It has been often remarked that the nationalists in the West whose cumulative efforts culminated in an imagined community and a nation-state to govern that community on the basis of citizenship, claimed the nation as not something new but as an antique one. This has been the case even with Indian nationalists too: they claimed antiquity for their imagination. But it is not that the imagination takes shape in vacuum. The imagination uses the available materials in history, which are tangible and real. to build a rational argument in support of its claim to be antique. If in Europe the decline of the religious order and primacy of religious community gave rise to the language-based nationalisms, in India there were attempts to equate nation with religion. In India we see a kind of religion-based

nationalism. In Indian nationalist discourse we can see an equation of Hindu and India (or rather Bharat). Partha Chatterjee, points out that even Bengali Muslim historians of 19* century (eg. Abdul Rahim) did not deviate from Hindu writers (Chatterjee, 1993a: 106).

It is not that there were no secular attempts to imagine an Indian community, in fact this secular notion of Indian community was able to secure hegemony over Hindu nationalism. But this so called secular imagination of Indian community was not able to suppress other discourses that were trying to provide a religious basis to the nation, in the post-colonial era after it sat at the helm of nation. What seems to have happened is a kind of admixture of religion and secularism. Both seem to have appropriated each other's discourse. But this is a different story than the one I am interested in narrating here.

What I am trying to point out here is that if a community is imagined in an historical context, it doesn't mean that it did not exist in some other imagined form earlier. Let me explain it with this example: if the Hindu community was imagined and fashioned in a particular way by Hindu nationalists such as the RSS in the face of modern developments, it does not mean that there was no conception of Hindu community in the pre-modern era. But the Hindu community that was imagined by Hindu nationalists and the conception of a Hindu community that might have existed earlier are not the same. This process of change can be looked at as both, 1. Old community is re-imagining itself or 2. A new community is being imagined. It is just a matter of quantifying the changes and a matter of scale for measuring the changes. It is a question of how much change would qualify something to be called new or not. But in order to identify changes we need to have two distinct communities to compare and contrast. In the absence of such a distinction we would call the changed one as a new one. This point is very crucial to distinguish academic writing from the discourses of communities who call their new imagination as antique.

Are pre-modern communities different from modern ones?[37] Sudipta Kaviraj has taken up this question in his analysis and says yes. He calls pre-modern communities as fuzzy and modern communities as enumerated one. He says, "In several ways, the communities in which people saw themselves as living were fuzzy compared to the community or the nation that is now proposed" (Kaviraj. 1992: 25). By comparing this early community to the nation he says:

> ...earlier communities tend to be fuzzy in two ways in which no nation can afford to be. First they have fuzzy boundaries. because some collective identities are not territorially based. Religion, caste and endogamous groups are all based on principles that are not primarily territorial. ...Secondly. part of this fuzziness of social mapping would arise because traditional communities. unlike modern ones. are not enumerated. ...They were ... incapable of a type of large action, with great potential for doing harm as well as good, which is a feature of the modern condition. ... Their sense of community being multiple and layered and fuzzy, no single community could make demands of pre-emptive belonging as comprehensive as that by the modern nation state" (Kaviraj. 1992: 26).[38]

Here the point of reference for comparison is pre-modern (traditional?) communities and nation, and he clearly indicates that religion. caste and endogamous groups are traditional. He says that the communities based on religion, caste and endogamous groups have fuzzy boundaries compared to nation state. The question is what happens to "pre-modern" (traditional) fuzzy communities in the context of modernity. If a language-based identity assumes significance along with a nation-based identity what happens to other identities? Kaviraj partly answers this in another context elsewhere. While discussing Bankimchandra Chattopadhyay.[39] he says 'the task (of these early nationalist writers) ...becomes one of naming the nation. electing it from among the many

given contenders of caste, religion, language identities, or creating one that is larger, more complex, yet unnamed'" (Kaviraj, 1998: 129). Here he identifies caste, religion and language as contenders to be chosen as a community by early nationalists, which were already descriptive categories unlike nation, which was yet to emerge. He is also suggesting here that one of the possible contenders is an unnamed entity, which is much larger and complex than the ones that were contending to occupy the empty notion of nation. Later on he points out that though Bankimchandra was appreciative of modern secular discourse quite often he was inclined towards naming it as a Hindu nation (Kaviraj. 1998: 129). What 1 am trying to suggest here is one possible answer for what happens to pre-modern communities in modernity is that they become possible contenders for 'the" modern community i.e., nation. But it is also clear that the nation that emerged later is something more than those communities and it is very complex in its constitutive elements. While constructing a nation, what aspects of these pre-modern communities get configured into it. is yet to be looked into. Does this possible answer mean that once certain aspects of pre-modern communities are configured into the modern nation. the remaining aspects are discarded. or the community itself disappears giving way to the new one? Further if no aspect of a community is configured into the new one. what happens to that community?

The second possible answer is though certain aspects of the community are configured into the new one. the community itself may cease to exist. but if it has to survive in the changed context, it will reinvent itself. The communities based on caste. language, religion that exist in the modernity are the ones which are re-fashioned to face the threat of modernity or have aligned themselves with it by redefining themselves. I am arguing that these communities along with re-imagining themselves in the context of modernity also sneak into the nation to become its constituent parts. Does this refashioning involve getting enumerated or are they still fuzzy? The answer to this question needs some discussion on the notion of "fuzziness" and the mechanisms of enumeration.

It is not that the earlier communities were essentially fuzzy; it could be that the modern mechanisms of enumeration were not available to them. The rigid caste system in India did in fact try to fix its boundaries through the mechanism of gotras. the sects within castes, subcastes and varna, identifiable body marks etc. But how successful these mechanisms are is a matter of investigation and is an issue that has been much debated. The specific debate that I am referring to here is of whether the caste system which is seen as an essential characteristic of Indian subcontinent had made India an unchanging society, or it had its own discontents that fuelled changes in it. a debate that has been initiated by Dumont's theory of caste in his *Homo Hierarchicus* (1996) and followed by Arjun Appadurai (1986), Nicholas Dirks (1987), Partha Chatterjee (1989 and 1993a), Dipankar Gupta (1991 and 2000) and the like. But with the availability of modern mechanisms of enumeration these communities have also tried to fix their boundaries in a more clear-cut fashion. Or as some would suggest the boundaries of these communities were fixed by the Orientalists and then by the Nation-state for its own purpose. What I am trying to suggest here is the notions of fuzzy and enumeration is a matter of scale than of two diametrically opposed systems of imagining a community.

One more thing that we have to keep in mind is that for a community defining its boundary becomes necessary only when it encounters the "other". With the encounter of 'other' it tries to construct its self and in that process constructs the other too. Sometimes the self-name itself will be an ascription of the other; it has happened in history earlier too: for example some scholars opine that the term 'Hindu' was used by the 9th century Muslims when they crossed Sindhu river to name the people who were living along it. This practice seems to have continued till as late as 14th century, as some Persian texts refer to Muslim rulers of "India"" as Hindu rulers. India too is an ascription of colonizers, which was a term very much used by the nationalists as well. Thus the need to fix the boundaries arises when a community encounters the "other". So it is not that fixing of boundaries is a purely modern phenomenon.

Again, it is not that in the context of modernity the boundaries of communities are fixed eternally and are unchanging. As new circumstances and challenges surface before the community, it tries to refashion itself and also redraws its boundaries if necessary. May be at a particular point in history, it might seem that the boundary is fixed. but if we look at it over a period of time the changing contours of its boundary can be visible. In fact the debate over what should be the boundary of a community. either of nation or religion or caste begun in the context of modernity is far from over. When there is no unanimity or consensus about the contours of a community it is not easy to say that the boundaries of the community are fixed. This would also suggest that if we look at the career of a community in the pre-modern era in an unhistorical fashion. its boundaries might look fuzzy as it carries the layers of various boundaries changed over time within it. If we take the existence of a community at a particular historical point or as it gets constructed around an issue it might appear fixed. So the notion of "fuzzy" and "fixed" can also be obtained as the characteristics of a community in diachronical and synchronical studies of that community respectively. This theoretical debate can be concluded saying that communities constantly reshape themselves for their own survival in the face of new circumstances and challenges. And whether we want to call a community a new one or an old one, or as fuzzy or enumerated is a matter of measuring the changes that it undergoes.

Now let me try to illustrate some of these theoretical debates by looking at the mechanisms through which a Kannada community was being imagined in the 19th and early 20th centuries. For this I mainly look at missionary activities, colonial administrative activities in collaboration with the native ruler in Princely Mysore and the role played by the newly emerging public sphere focusing on the construction of a history of Kannada language, Kannada literature and Kannada people. I will also briefly touch upon various other constructions of communities that were happening simultaneously.

The Kannada speaking people felt the need to define themselves and imagine the boundaries of their collectivity in the particular historical context of encountering an 'other". Some of the recent Kannada nationalist writings, including some academic writing grounded in Kannada nationalist writing, point out that there is a reference to a Kannada community in *Kaviraja Maarga* (10th century), the first available text in Kannada.[40] It will be interesting to see who the 'other* then was. But the problem with these writings is that they equate this 10th century community with the one constructed at the end of 19* century. What we need to keep in mind is that the contexts of both were different and the 'other' that defines the 'self in the 19th and 20th century is different from the earlier one. So 1 mainly focus on the construction of Kannada community in the colonial context. There are three main surveys of the production of printed books and the engagement of colonial missionaires with Kannada related activity and 19th century literature in general: Srinivasa Havanur's book - *Hosagannadada Arunodaya* (2000). I.M. Muttanna"s work *Bharata Sahitya Samskritige Paschatya Vidvamsara Seve* (1987) and Dharawadakara's book *Hosgannada Sahityada Udayakaala* (1975). I am more than indebted to their painstaking work for the factual details that I have used in this chapter. The intertextuality of these works is also quite interesting. I.M. Muttanna's work was the first of the three to be published in 1973. I.M. Muttanna is very critical of nationalists and a tone of celebration of missionary-work is evident in his writing. The one I have used for reference here is a revised and enlarged version published in 1987. The next year, 1974, Srinivasa Havanur's book was published. In Havanur's writing the nationalist tone is clearly visible though he is not critical of either missionaries or colonial administrators. It was reprinted in 2000. The reprinted version has an interesting appendix no.9 as a response to I.M. Muttanna's book (Havanur. 2000: 629-39). The very next year, 1975, Dharawadakara's book got published. Dharawadakara's book has an interesting subtitle saying that it is with special reference to North Karnataka. It seems to have come out as a reaction to Srinivasa Havanur's book, which is alleged to be slightly tilted towards south Karnataka, though that might not be the

intention of Havanur. Thus the survey of 19th century Kannada works seems divided in their response to colonialism and also on regional basis.

In Princely Mysore region the presence of missionary activities preceded that of colonial rule. The Portuguese had contacts with the Vijayanagara Kingdom since early 16* century itself. Some Portuguese had settled down in the court of Chandragiri, which used to link the coast (now South and North Canara districts) with the main land. The Keladi and Bidanur states. which came up as a consequence of the fall of the Vijayanagara empire had a good relationship with the Portuguese. The Sahyadri range of hills and forests was a passage through which trade of spices happened. There is a reference to the debate that took place in the various courts of Srirangapattana on *peringimatha* (the faith of the foreigner) and Jaina faith and the success of Vidyananda in an inscription dated 1530. B.L. Rice opines that the debate might have happened between Vidyananda and a Roman Catholic Christian. But there is no other evidence to establish the identity of the person who might have visited Srirangapattana. C. Hayavadana Rao indicates that after the fall of the Vijayanagara empire some Priests of the Franciscan Church had come to Mysore on their way to Goa. but he has not mentioned the source.[41] The missionary activity of conversion had begun in the 16th century itself in Chandragiri. Bidanur and Keladi states. The Keladi King Shivappa Nayaka had given a free hand for missionary activities in his state. But the missionary activity in Srirangapattana i.e., in *Princely Mysore* began only in middle 17th century. Fr. Leonardo Cinnami was the first Jesuit to come to Mysore princely state. He had come dressed like a Brahmin Sanyasi.[42]

The Portuguese were unable to make any distinction between the various languages of South India and also between the languages of the western Coast: so they used their own nomenclature for the languages they encountered. They used Malabari to designate Tamil. Badaga to designate Telugu, and various versions of Canarese (like Canaries, Canneries, Kanarese, Canarim) to designate not only Kannada but also Konkani. Marathi. It might also be because some people used

Kannada script for Marathi and Konkani. which lacked a specific script. For example *Arte de Lingua Canarim* is a work published in 1680, but it is a grammar of Konkani language. Fr. Leonardo Cinnami (1609-1676) has written extensively in Kannada on Christian faith. a criticism of caste, and other practices of Mysore people. He has also produced a grammar and a dictionary of Kannada language. Leonardo Cinnami is the first Jesuit to come to Mysore. He arrived in Goa in 1644 and the next year he was sent to Canara. Even after four years he didn't meet with much success there after which he was sent to Mysore. Though the missionaries used to visit the Mysore region from Madras, Cinnami was the first one to establish a center there in 1649. He had to face many odds in his stay as the people were hostile. but he was supported by the king of Mysore, Sri Kantirava Narasaraja Wodeyar. Cinnami on his arrival learnt Kannada and he was the first person to write Kannada books. In fact he can be called the first modem Kannada writer. But the manuscripts are not available. They might have been burnt by King Chikka Devaraja Wodeyar around mid 1690's (Anthappa. 1994: 250). But two bundles of Kannada writings are available and the two scripts bear the date 1741. Ha\anur says that the date could be that of the copy and actually it contains writings/translations (mostly from Tamil) in Kannada from 1659 to 1741 (Havanur, 2000: 92). Around the same period, two books are available. which were supposedly copied in 1739. and experts claim that they are translations and compilations of several Tamil texts on Christianity. These might have been written/translated by various people including Cinnami.

These Jesuits started writing in Kannada in the 17th century itself. Amador de Santa Anna, a Franciscan missionary. translated the devotional treatise *Flos Sanctorum* into Kannada. It is also mentioned by J. Dahlman that Fr. Prizikril "turned his imprisonment at St. Juliao to good account in working out a grammar and a dictionary of Canarese from materials collected during his missionary career" (as quoted in Havanur, 2000: 89). But none of these works is available. So the first attempt to write a grammar of Kannada language was undertaken by these missionaries in 17th century itself. But after this we don't find any Kannada

writings from missionaries till the 1830s. Jesuits were called back by the Pope on the demand of the King of Portuguese who accused them of being invohed in anti-colonial. national struggles in Latin America. This incident casts doubt over our common understanding of an easy equation between missionary activities and colonial power. I am not suggesting that there is no relationship between colonial power and missionary activities. but they are not one and the same; the relationship between the two. as the above withdrawal of Jesuit missionaries suggests, is much more than what an easy equation of the two assumes. The King of Bidanur and also the King of Mysore gave permission to missionaries for their activities. In fact when the Viceroy of Goa. Emmanuel Saldanha Albuquerque wrote a letter to the King of Mysore to extradite the Jesuits to Goa so that they can be sent back to Europe, the Mysore palace wrote back to him saying "The Jesuits are serving in Mysore since a hundred years. They are respecting the Crown and the law of the land. We don't see any reason to extradite them. It would be better if they continue to be here" (as translated and quoted in Anthappa. 1994: 334).

But in spite of the assurance and permission of the King for their missionary activities. these Jesuits were harassed by other religious leaders and Sanyasis. The common accusation against them was that they condemn other religious practices of India such as idolatry and they indulge in practices that are prohibited for a Sanyasi in "our" traditions. But most of the time the King. who was pleased with the gifts given by the missionaries to him, ignored these accusations. But once the British started indulging in territorial war with the Mysore state. the anti-missionaries started accusing the missionaries as spies of European invaders. This was also largely ignored. During Hyder Ali's period (1761-1982) also the missionaries enjoyed protection by him. But when he acquired Mangalore from the British in 1768. during the First Anglo-Mysore war, it seems that the Christians of Mangalore had helped the British. Hyder called them to his court and asked them what penalty is prescribed in their religion for helping the enemy of the King. It seems they replied "Capital punishment". But Hyder instead of punishing them took away their properties and imprisoned some of them. The

Christians of Mangalore again helped the British in the Second Anglo-Mysore war (1780-83). This time it seems, Hyder"s successor, his son Tippu punished them severely.

To be chronological in narrating the engagement of missionaries and colonial administrators with Kannada 1 have to alternate between the activities of missionaries and administrators.

With the fell of Tippu the entire south India from east-coast to west-coast came under the British rule. Already with the battle of Plassey the British had consolidated their power in the North. Now the other competing colonial powers had accepted the supremacy of the British in India. There were smaller princely states that were in no position to pose any danger to the British. Later in the 19th century through subsidiary alliance and annexing states whose kings didn't have any issue to succeed them and not recognizing the policy of adopted children having the right to rule. the British consolidated their position. All these necessitated the British to have a suitable administrative machinery to govern India. Efforts had begun in the latter half of 17th century itself. They had to set up everything new. as the\ had nothing to govern this country. Adding to it was the financial position of the Company after the battle of Plassey. The company was in such a situation that it petitioned the British Parliament to give financial aid to deliver administration. The British Parliament passed an Act to reform the administration in 1772 and appointed Governor-Generals for Bengal, Bombay and Madras provinces. Warren Hastings became the first Governor-General in 1774. With this the Supreme Court and a council to each province was also setup. But the condition didn't improve. as there was no proper coordination between the provinces. Again in 1784. the British Parliament passed an Act through which the financial transactions of the company passed on to the six commissioners appointed by the Crown. The Governor-General was also given complete powers in this Act. Thus necessary steps were being taken to form a colonial state in India.

But these institutions needed trained manpower to handle work such as maintaining law and order, collecting taxes, giving suitable directions to natives and also collecting information about natives in order to administer them. So the British established colleges to train administrators - first was the Fort Williams College at Calcutta in 1800, then Fort Saint George. Madras. Both the colleges were started around the same time as the fall of Tippu Sultan. It is interesting to know that the 32 lakhs that came to the British Government after the IV Anglo-Mysore War was utilized to teach native languages and thus the Fort Williams College was established. First the North Indian languages were given priority along with teaching of Hindu religious texts. Later South Indian languages were also included in the Curriculum. It was necessary for the trainee administrators to have a working knowledge of the local languages for better governance. Thus passing the examination in one of the native languages was compulsory to them. So teachers popularly known then as *Munsi* and *Pandit*, were appointed at these places to teach native languages and to examine the trainee administrators.[43] The 1804 records of the College show that two Munsis for Tamil and one for Kannada were appointed on a monthly salary of Rs. 200. But there was a clear discrimination with regard to salary between European scholars and native scholars who were appointed. In 1804 January, the teachers of south Indian languages were transferred to Fort St. George College (Sham, 1966: 6).[44] Apart from Munsis and Pandits who were teaching native languages at Calcutta and Madras, a need to create a post called official translator arose in the colonial administration as colonial administration was using English and the subjects used different native languages while transacting with them. The status of these official translators was that of the secretaries of administrative departments. Some of these official translators too engaged in writing grammar and dictionaries.

But the main problem in teaching native languages was that there were no teaching materials. The information available on native languages was also almost nil. So there arose a need to produce knowledge about these languages. For teaching, they sought to collect the materials available in those languages which

were in written form, mostly manuscripts written on paper or on palm leaves. The work done by Christian missionaries, though only on very few languages, was the only model available to them. One of the important tasks they encountered was that of writing the grammar of the languages. There were no authentic grammatical texts available for many languages. South Indian languages had their "own" grammar texts but derived not out of the language that was in use. but modeled on Sanskrit grammar and also these texts were quite old. For the next hundred years or so they actively engaged themselves in this area.

We have seen earlier that Fr. Cinnami had written a Kannada Grammar in the 17th century itself. But this is not available.[45] Then in early 19th century William Carey had taken up the task of writing a grammar for Kannada along with other languages at Fort Williams. A letter written by him to the Chief Secretary to the Government in 1816 shows that he had engaged a Kannada Pandit Bharata Ramana to help him in preparing a Kannada grammar (Quoted in Sham, 1966:16). Around the same time efforts were on at Fort St. George. John Maccarell. who served as a sub-collector at Canara. during his stay there learnt Kannada and had proposed to the Fort St. George College to write a Kannada Grammar. Later he became an Official Kannada translator from 1817 - 1820 at Madras and before that served as a Telugu translator too. On the basis of Kesiraja's *Shabdhamani Darpana*[46] he wrote *A Grammar for the Carnataca Language* with the help of natives. viz., Shambapati Meenakshayya. Kadambi Rangachari and Mudambi Srinivasachari. The earlier attempts of writing a Kannada grammar, even though successful. were not available. So this became the first available Kannada grammar book for people then. Based on Maccarell's Grammar book. Hudson wrote *An Elementary Grammar of the Kannada Language* (cited in Havanur. 2000: 153-54). S. Krishnamachari who was a student at Fort St. George has written a book on Kannada grammar in a question and answer format. It was published in 1834. Adakki Subbarao who was also at the same college wrote a book for the trainee officers to learn Kannada and it also had exercises on translation from Kannada to English. It was later reprinted by Basel Mission too.

He has also written another book *Easy Lessons in English and Canarese* (1846). Apart from writing Grammar books for trainee officers, there arose a need to write grammar books for students who were learning in the schools established by the missionaries in Bellary, Bangalore, Mysore, Dharwad and Mangalore around the 1830s. So simple grammar books were also attempted. In this direction Collin Campbell's *Kannada Vyakarana Saara* (1841) seems to be the first one according to Srinivasa Havanur. There were books of this type written by missionaries *viz.*, Frederick Ziegler (*A Practical Key to Kannada Grammar),* T.G. Maben (*Kannada Vyakarana Bodhini*). Later on natives also started writing for schools. Among them, some are B. Mallappa *(Shabdhadarsh),* M.B. Srinivasa Iyengar *(Vachaka Bodhini*), Dhondo Narasimha Mulabagalu *(Kannada Kaipidi* and *Nudigattu*), Bala Shastri Naregal *(Vani Mukura*) Muda Bhatakala (*Hosagannada Vyakarana).* Narasimha Madhava Mahishi *(Prosody of the Kannada Language*), But the epitome of all these efforts is *A Grammar of the Kannada Language* written by F. Kittel (1903). But it was preceded by nearly a hundred years' work by others.

Another important task the colonial administrators took upon themselves along with the Christian missionaries was preparing the bilingual dictionary of the language. Preparing the grammar book and dictionary occupied an important place in their effort to learn the language.

The main purpose of the missionaries was to spread Christian literature in Kannada language and also to translate the Bible into it. Their work on Kannada language was motivated by this purpose. While translating the Bible into Kannada they felt that there is a need for Kannada-English dictionary. But William Reeve of London mission was the first one to make an effort in this direction. He was an assistant to John Hands at Bellary in translating the Bible. He tried to write the first bilingual dictionary by providing Kannada meanings to English words in the English dictionary. It was completed by 1817. But he kept on improving it by including some words from Sanskrit dictionary too. though

some of them were not in use in Kannada. He also added old Kannada words by going through the old manuscripts of Kannada. The first draft was ready by 1823. Based on this first version he wrote another one after 1825. He was helped by seven natives appointed for the purpose. He was the pioneer in this work. Later Bangalore School Book Society formed a committee of missionaries to prepare an English-Kannada dictionary in 1940. But the work was incomplete even after two years. John Garret of Wesleyan Methodist Mission completed the work and brought out a dictionary in 1943. Srinivasa Havanur tells us that there is no mention of Reeve's dictionary by them (Havanur. 2000: 107). It leads us to assume that at this stage there was no synchronized effort between various missionaries engaged in similar work on Kannada. The next year John Garret brought out a Kannada-English dictionary. But this was an improved and modified version of Reeve's dictionary. Daniel Sanderson revised the Garret edition of the Kannada-English dictionary. It was very popular in schools and colleges then. But again the credit of giving a full-fledged dictionary goes to F. Kittel. Basel Mission entrusted the responsibility of preparing a Kannada-English dictionary to Kittel in 1872. It took him more than 15 years to finalize the work. It was finally published in 1894. He has looked into the earlier dictionaries available in Kannada like Nachiraja's *Nachirajiya* (around 14th century), Bomma's *Chaturasya Nighantu*, Abhinava Mangaraja's *Nighantu*, Devottama's *Nanartharatrnakara*, Linga's *Kabbigara Kaypidi* and Tottada Arya"s *Sabdamanjari* by collating various available manuscripts (Kittel, 1894: VII). He has also consulted 18 old Kannada works. 18 medieval Kannada works and around three new Kannada books apart from school textbooks that existed during that time. He has also collected on his own Kannada words in usage by an empirical methodology.[47] In preparing the format of the dictionary he has consulted Reeve's *Carnataka and English* dictionary published in 1832 and also Tamil-English. Tulu-English, Telugu-English dictionaries and Sanskrit dictionaries too (Kittel, 1894: V-VII).

The Christian missionaries also actively engaged in bringing out printed books in Kannada apart from those about Kannada. They did not only bring out Christian literature in Kannada and school textbooks but also edited old Kannada texts, which were in manuscript form either on palm leaves or on paper (very rarely).[48] The Fort St. George had its own printing press established in 1804. And in Calcutta. Srirampur press was well known already.[49] But the printing of books need a certain kind of standardization of language and also the script, as they have to prepare character-types. The first attempt to make Kannada types was made by Gonsalvez at Goa to print Konkani texts which had no script of its own, but depended on Kannada script. But he didn't succeed in his attempt. William Carey's *A Grammar of the Kurnata Language* (1817) was printed in Kannada types prepared by Carey's Bengali employee Manohar in 1815. Later in the Fort St. George John Maccarell's book *A Grammar of the Carnataka Language* (1820) and William Reeve's *English-Kannada Dictionary* (1824) were published. After that the Kannada book printing activity in these two places stopped. John Hands who was working as a missionary in Bellary made efforts to print books in Kannada. His Kannada translation of the New Testament was published in 1820 but in Commercial press. Madras. Later he made efforts to establish a press in Bellary. It started functioning in 1827. At first Telugu types were used to print both Kannada and Telugu texts. In 1832 he brought Kannada types made in London to Bellary. In 1840 the Weslyans established their own press in Bangalore and they made efforts to improve Kannada types. Thomas Hudson. Watts. Garret, Sanderson all made their contribution to improve Kannada types. Basel Mission also made its contribution towards standardization of types and minimizing its number. Hermann Moegling while publishing his edited book *Rajender Naame* (1857) changed the script itself to suit easy printing. Here the second consonant in a Kannada letter (could be English's one phoneme) which used to be printed below the first consonant was printed in the same line thus saving space. This was the first attempt of its kind. Moegling had anticipated objections to this new venture as readers not accustomed to the new style would find it hindering the reading and has answered their objections saying that it is

essential to change the script to suit the printing technology and it will add to the beauty of the language. But later this change did not carry weight. When after eighty years B.M. Srikantia and others mooted similar changes, it was again met with opposition. Later the Kodiala press at Mangalore also made its contribution to standardize Kannada types. Apart from the efforts of Christian missionaries, the press established by the Governments in Madras presidency, Bombay presidency. Mysore state and the Universities of Madras and Bombay have also contributed to these efforts. Individual efforts by natives also started in the late 19th century. Most of these efforts were made in the Kannada districts of Bombay presidency. At the end of the 19th century most of the Taluqs and towns had printing presses.

We had seen that in their effort to learn the native languages both missionaries and teachers of Fort Willams College and St. Fort George had collected manuscripts of texts available in those languages. But with the advent of printing technology they started publishing these texts. The first major effort in this direction was of Basel Mission's Hermann Moegling. Moegling took up the publication of old Kannada texts under the series titled *Bibliotheca Carnatica* in 1848 on the advice of the retired Resident of Mysore J.A. Casamaijor (1824-35). The intention was to find out the culture of the Hindus. They were eager to publish texts that would inform them about the grammar, history, religion and customs of the country. The first to get published in the series was *Jaimini Bharata* of Lakshmisha in 1848. In 1849 *The Torave Ramayana* was published. A collection of Dasa poems came out in 1850. Kanakadasa's *HariBhakti Saara* was also published in this series. Then *Chennabasava Purana, Kumaravyasa Bharata, Baasava Purana* and a collection of Kannada proverbs were published. All these texts were published within a span of 10 years. For editing these texts, University of Tuebingen conferred an honorary doctorate on him in 1858. Moegling had also translated a few Kannada Dasa poems into German.

Nagavarma's books occupied an important place in the 19th century, especially his *Karnataka Bhasha Bhushana*. Nagavarma is a grammarian who flourished in the early 12th century. His is the oldest text available on Kannada Grammar. So it is natural that this text occupied an important place in their reading list along with Kesiraja"s *Shabdhamani Darpana*, which was published by John Garret in 1868. Nagavarma's *Kannada Chandassu (Canarese Prosody)* was published by Kittel in 1875 and *Karnataka Bhasha Bhushana* was published by B. Lewis Rice in 1884. *Bhasha Bhushana* was published in the series *Bibliotheca Karnatica* brought out by B. Lewis Rice from 1884 onwards. *Kaviraja Maarga* the first available Kannada text (10th century) so far was also brought out in this series. Bhattakalanka's *Shabdanushasana* (beginning of the 17th century) another grammatical text was also brought out in this series. The first available epic of Kannada Pampa"s *Pampa Bharata* or *Vikramarjuna Vijaya* and Nagachandra's *Pampa Ramayana* were also brought out in this series.

Let me describe the way these old texts were published and the consequences they had for the construction of Kannada and Kannada literature. Most of these texts were palm leafmanuscripts, so their circulation was restricted to very few. Even if one searched hard, it was very difficult to find the manuscripts as the person or the family, which was in possession of it, wouldn't know much about it. There were very few scholars who were using it. As literacy was limited to the Brahmin caste, only a few among them had access to these manuscripts. About Jaina texts, they were in mainly Jaina *mathas* (monasteries). With the ascent of Veerashiva religion/sect the Jaina religion which was literally responsible for the origin of literature in Kannada went on to decline. So most of these texts were not at all available. But Vaidic literature which came after Jaina and Veerashiva literature like *Kumaravyasa Bharata* of Gadugina Naranappa were in limited circulation: people reciting them in villages on festive occasions could be found. That means that it was only through oral tradition that some of this literature was in circulation, though they were in written form. But apart from the limited circulation of some of these texts most of the other texts were part of the amnesia

of the people. It is interesting to see that the missionaries, colonial administrators, for their own reason brought these texts out of amnesia and made them not Jaina texts or Vaidic texts as they were known till then but Kannada texts.

In spite of difficulties to procure the copies of a text, the missionaries and colonial administrators relied on more than one manuscript to publish them. For example to publish Nagavarma"s *Canarese Prosody* F. Kittel had consulted 14 manuscripts. Four of them were from B.L. Rice's collection and three from the collection of Mr. Tirumale Syamanna, Munsi of the Wesleyan missionaries at Mysore. Rice obtained other manuscripts from other individuals and *maths* (Kittel. 1986: III-IV). The missionaries and colonial administrators used to compare different manuscripts and then if there were any discrepancies would arrive at one "correct" version. Discrepancies were bound to occur as they were copied manually and the copier used to manipulate some of the things consciously (to suit his religion or sect) or unconsciously (by misreading the source manuscript). Thus the texts, with their various versions and texts, which were in circulation through oral tradition, were published to give them a new identity as Kannada texts. The contours of the texts were also now more fixed and determined. Now the texts were attached to a particular author and to a particular historical circumstance of its origin. It is not that authorship and dates were permanently fixed, but only in a relative measure. Today if one wants to debate on the authorship and authenticity of a text, one will have to do it academically, on the terms and condition laid out by the European rational disciplines. These texts thus became classical texts of Kannada and formed part of a canon in the making.

Texts, though not mainly directed at the natives as target readers, nonetheless were read by them. The newly emerging English educated elite, who was just coming out of English modeled schools and college became avid readers of such texts. As the primary target readers were missionaries, administrators and European Oriental scholars, there used to be commentary on the text in English. In

order to supplement the reading of the text, the background of the author and the text were also added. For example B.L. Rice provides four pages of introduction to Nagavarma and his works. It also contains two pages of introduction to Kannada language with a table to illustrate the formation of Kannada character and twenty-nine pages of introduction to Kannada literature. The introduction to Kannada literature has at the end an alphabetical index to authors and works which approximately has two hundred and fifty, and three hundred entries, respectively. All this helped in the formation of a textual tradition of Kannada, which was hitherto missing.

These attempts at writing an introduction to place the texts, which they were editing in an historical matrix, were also attempts to construct a new notion, called Kannada literature with a History. Though at this time there was no political entity called a Kannada region or Karnataka, these efforts pushed them in the direction of conceiving a unified Kannada language and literary tradition and a region called Karnataka. While writing the introduction to Nagavarma. Lewis Rice uses the word Kamata-territory. Talking about Nagavarma he says "Nagavarma left Vengi after embracing Jaina faith, and settled in some part of the Karnata-region which was subject to the sway of the Western Chalukya kings: in all probability somewhere in the neighbourhood of the present Shimoga, Dharwad and Bellary districts" (Rice. 1985: 1). The invention of old texts and attempts to look at them historically was also linked to the present. This can be seen very well in the above statement. This connection of an event with the present fuses both together and gives a sense of continuity and makes language and literature as eternal entities. A sense of pride about a language and literature emerges in the people who speak it. This was already so when Rice wrote this introduction. At the end of the introduction (the third section) he points out while talking about Kannada literature that

> The extent and range of this body of writings will doubtless excite surprise, so virtually unexplored has the field remained, and so little acquaintance is there with the resources of the language. The

> early excellence of the compositions and the modern decline will be patent to all. But interest is even now awakening in the mother tongue of the Kannadigas; while the Native state of Mysore, recently (1881) restored to its own rulers, has a special mission to discharge, in relation to the learned world of Orientalists in general and to Karnataka and South India in particular, in vindicating the claims and promoting a revival of the culture of its sonorous and expressive language (Rice, 1985: xxxvii).

Here he has identified the awakening of Kannadigas towards their mother tongue. Not only that, we can clearly see that the political identity of Mysore state is overarched by Karnataka. He places the responsibility of reviving the culture of Karnataka/Kannada on the Mysore state. The loyalty of subjects towards the King recedes and loyalty towards one's mother tongue takes precedence slowly. Here in the case of Mysore it gets coupled with loyalty towards King, as the King was responsible for not only his own subjects but also for others who lived outside his region but spoke Kannada. This is also part of the process of a tradition building for the natives by the colonizer, where tradition is constructed in terms of golden age (early excellence) and decline (modern decline). The tradition thus constructed by the orientalists claims itself as "pure". So this is an attempt to restore the "pure" tradition to the natives.

It is not that the missionaries and colonial administrators published books only for schools or for trainee administers, but also to cultivate natives. In his preface to the anthology of Kannada poetry *Canarese Poetical Anthology* (1874), Kittel claims that "the present volume of selections of Canarese poetry has been prepared not only with regard to the want of schools, but also with the aim to cultivate a taste for good poetry in the reader" (Kittel. 1995: iii). If it is so let us see what kind of taste Kittel wanted the readers to cultivate. In the preface Kittel claims that certain passages have been omitted "as (they) appeared to be inconsistent with a high culture of the mind". A Victorian sense of morality seems to be operating behind such omissions. He also claims that true poetry is

characterized by "purety (sic) and freedom of sectarianism" (Kittel, 1995: iii). It is true in a way that what were termed as sectarian literature and religious literature were lifted out of the milieu of their writing and circulation and made part of a secular Kannada poetic tradition. An anthology of this kind fulfilled an essential need for construction of a Kannada identity. This anthology includes Jaina poets, Vaidic poets, Virashiva poets and Vaishnavites. But all these form part of Canarese poetry, though the sect/religion of the author is mentioned while introducing them in the introduction. Not only classical poetry and texts figure in these texts, even non-classical and folk poets such as Sarvajna[50], Dasa poets and other textual writers all figure extensively in this anthology. Altogether there are hundred and three pieces in this anthology. It starts with a eulogy to Kannada language.

The first attempt to sketch an introductory history of Kannada literature dates back to 1846. Gottfried Weigle, a Basel Mission Christian missionary wrote an article "On the Canarese Language and Literature" in German language, while he was staying in Nilgiri mountains. This article was originally written for publication in a German mission magazine, but as it was found to be too scientific it was published in an Oriental journal called *Zeitschirift der Deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* Vol. 2 in 1848.[51] This essay analyses and introduces Kannada language and also Kannada literature. He has not only looked into classical texts but also popular literature such as Vachana literature.[52] Dasa literature[53] and Yakshagana.[54] Translations of Purandara Dasa"s poems are quoted in this article. He also makes a mention of other folk literatures and says that Kannada literature is rich in oral folklore. Apart from mentioning old literature he also takes stock of the recent writings in Kannada, including Bible translations and other works published. He concludes his essay by saying that

> Canarese people, with whom this essay deals, even if it is still a barely-known name at home (Germany), in their language, ethos and literature are in no way on a contemptuous level, and that this language and literature merit a closer perusal of the true and highest

> interests of the people, and where possible, active participation, then the author of these pages would not feel that they were written for nothing (Gundert, 1997: 291).

Even if the colonial administration and missionaries started with a low opinion of native language and literature their own work showed them that it was not so. Not only did their work show the colonial administrators and missionaries that the native language and literature was rich. but it also showed the natives that their own language and literature was in no way inferior to that of the white man.

The next important attempt to write a history of Kannada language and literature was made by Kittel in 1874. While introducing Nagavarma's *Canarese Prosody* (1875). after writing twenty-three pages of introduction to the text on hand. he has written an essay of fifty-three pages on Kannada literature titled "An Essay on Canarese Literature". This is a fuller length piece on Kannada literature than the earlier one by Weigle. Weigle simply tried to introduce various things, which had come to his notice. But by the time Kittel wrote his essay, many more texts were available. So from that vantage point and with his erudite scholarship Kittel classified Kannada literature into three phases: 1. The Early period (800-1300 AD) 2. The Later period (1300-1872 AD) and 3. Recent printed texts. His treatment of the subject was exhaustive. He provided details about individual writers if available and made a mention of contending versions, if any, and tried to examine some of them to give his opinion. And at the end of each section he gave an index of the writers of that period. The final section contained a list of books that were published in Bangalore and Dharwad.

After this came the list provided by Rice in his introduction to Nagavarma's *Karnataka Bhasha Bhushana* (1884) which 1 have already mentioned. Later on the natives began to take interest in these studies, but 1 will come to that point a little later.

It is not that the construction of Kannada identity began only with the writings on language and literature. There were other writings, which have played their part too in the construction of Kannada identity. Now let me move to the construction of the history of Princely Mysore. As there was no Karnataka then, naturally the history on Karnataka didn't come as easily as the histories of Kannada language and literature. First we witness writing on Princely Mysore. Tippu was a formidable opponent in war for the British. He was determined to root out the British from India for which he had made friendship with the French, as they were competing with the British. With Tippu. it was simply a case of the enemy's enemy becoming his friend. In order to obtain information about Princely Mysore, which was necessary for them to have a better understanding of their enemy and the land on which they were waging war. the British resorted to writings by their military officers who had participated in the three Anglo-Mysore wars. We find abundant literature on the British's encounter with Tippu in the three Anglo-Mysore wars. The fear of Tippu and the stories of the British encounter with him seem to have given rise to a large number of writings, so that it can be a separate genre by itself. It might have been a "popular genre" during that period. [55] Thus the writings on Tippu was the main source of information on Princely Mysore for the British.

Apart form this genre there were other books too on Tippu Sultan. like Mir Hussain Ali Khan Kirmani's *Neshani Hydari's continuation* in Persian, ***Shunts Ul Moolke*** *Ameer Ud Dowla Nawaub Hydcr Ali Khan* ***Bahadoor****. Hydur Jang, Nawab of the* ***Karnatick Balaghaut****.* which was translated into English by Col. W. Miles in 1864 as *History of TipuSultan.* Mir Hussain Kirmani was in the court of Tippu and he was asked by Col. Mackenzie to sketch it. Some of the other books are Mirchand's *History of Mysore: Under Hyder Ali and Tipoo Sultan* (French) (1801-1809) translated into English by V.K. Raman Menon in 1926, *Select Letters from Tipoo Sultan to Various Public Functionaries including his Principal Military Commanders; Governors of Forts and Provinces; Diplomatic and Commercial Agents ...* arranged and translated by William Kirkpatrick in

Descriptive Catalogue of the Oriental Library of the Late Tipoo Sultan of Mysore by Charles Stewart in 1809. *The History of Hyder Shah alias Hyder Alikhan Bahadur Or New Memoirs Concerning the East Indies with Historical Notes by MMDLT* (1848). There were other books on the History of Mysore and other places like Mangalore.[56]

But the decisive thing that happened after the take-over of Mysore by the British was the survey conducted. Now the need was to obtain information on the people and land that had to be governed by them. After acquiring Mysore the Company Government appointed Col. Mackenzie to survey the Mysore region in 1801. He was an officer with the Survey department since 1773 in Madras. He had participated in the Mysore war. By the time the survey was completed, it was 1807. It is said that he had covered nearly 40.000 Kms. of South India. During his survey he had collected epigraphs, manuscripts of old texts, local histories and myths. and other important old materials. He had many natives under him to assist in the work. He had collected nearly 1700 epigraphs and more than 600 manuscripts. In fact before Kittel he was the one to classify the old Kannada manuscripts that were in his collection. He had classified the manuscripts available with him into Myth. Poetry, Narratives. Shastras and Jaina Discourse. But Kittel was the first to construct a literary tradition with distinct time periods. Mackenzie simply classified the manuscripts available to him; he did not construct a literary tradition. He was the one who goaded Kirmani to write the history of Tippu. *Kaifiyats,* which Mackenzie had collected. are perceived as important sources of history even today. *Kaifiyats* are written by various people on the request of Mackenzie, they include the oral history of a temple. of a place or of a community.[57] He had asked Devachandra of Kanakagiri near Mysore to write the history of Karnataka. But before Devachandra could complete it Mackenzie had left Mysore. Thus an important historical document like *Rajavali* (the Genealogy of Kings) came up in Kannada.[58] Mackenzie wanted Devachandra to wTite an Encyclopedia of Karnataka. The unpublished Mackenzie collection is yet to be tapped properly to understand the history of Princely Mysore/Karnataka.

especially the kind of discourse that colonialism gave rise to among natives about their own places, communities and their relationship with other communities.

After Mackenzie, it was the turn of Francis Buchanan to travel through Princely Mysore and other parts of today's Karnataka to write about the people. He was a doctor by profession. Earlier he had done a survey of Nepal and Assam region.[59] He was sent to survey south India including Mysore. He has published his observations in *A Journey from Madras through the Countries of Mysore, Canara, and Malabar* in three volumes (1807).[60] He was supposed to report the agriculture practiced in this region, but he has also collected information on religious, social and economic activities. He had also collected a lot of epigraphs and manuscripts pertaining to history.

But neither of them did attempt to write a history of Mysore or Karnataka. Mark Wilks was the first one to take up the task of writing a history of Mysore. He was a Resident in Mysore and during his stay from 1805-1808 he had collected a lot of information pertaining to Mysore. His book *Historical Sketches of the South of India* is an attempt to trace the History of Mysore "From the origin of the Hindu Government of that State, to the extinction of the Mohammedan Dynasty in 1799: Founded Chiefly on Indian Authorities. 2 vols. 1810". It continues to be an important source for historians. In this book he has not only narrated the rise and fall of dynasties but has tried to attempt a social history of the region too.

If all these were histories of South Karnataka, in North Karnataka, similar attempts were made by the British officers belonging to Bombay presidency. Philip Meadows Taylor was in the Hyderabad Nizam region and was in a small princely state called Surapur. He did a lot of archeological work around Surapur. He has also written about the architecture of ruins at Bijapur. Anegondi. Hampi, Lakkundi. Badami and Ihole. His book *Sketches in Deccan* (1837) contains his sketches of the architecture of these places. He published the *Architecture of Bijapur* and *Architecture in Dharwar and Mysore* in 1866. He also has two

historical novels to his credit, one on Chandbibi, titled *Noble Queen* and another novel titled *Tippu Sultan.* But his famous novel *is Confessions of a Thug.* He has also written his autobiography *Story of My Life. Outlines of Indian History* is another major work. Walter Elliot joined the British army at Madras in 1821. He was captured and kept in captivity by Kittor Chennamma in 1824.[61] He was instrumental in opening Kannada schools in the Kannada region of Bombay Presidency. He had also tried his hand at preparing Kannada texts in 1833. He was a kind of Mackenzie of North Karnataka. He has collected in his service the epigraphs of this region. He had more than 1300 epigraphs in his collection. He has written a scholarly work on "Hindu Inscriptions", submitted to Royal Asiatic Society. He has also done work on the history of Kannada scripts as early as in 1836. He tried to narrate nearly 500 years of Karnataka History using the epigraphs that he had collected. His *Memoirs* published after his retirement is also a good source book for the social history of the region in 19th century. He has also written a book on Forest animals of the region. Charles Darwin had corresponded with him to obtain information about the zoological species available in the region. He contributed regularly to *Indian Antiquary Journal* on the history of Karnataka and other cultural aspects. He also has books to his credit such as *The Memoir of the States of the Southern Marat ha Country,*[62] which describes the princely state of Savanur, and also has an account of South Indian coins.

After Walter Elliot it was J.F. Fleet who worked on this aspect of North Karnataka. Most of his writings are found in *Indian Antiquary* and *the Journal of Royal Asiatic Societies.* He was a revenue officer in Bombay presidency since 1867. Besides editing the journal *Indian Antiquary* for seven years with R.C. Temple. he has published some Sankrit. Pali and Halegannada Inscriptions in 1878. In addition, he has written an article on Kannada dynasties in the Bombay Gazetteer and was also the first to engage in folklore work. He has collected *Lavanis* (popular ballads in North Karnataka) and published some of them in *Indian Antiquary.* It appeared five times in *Indian Antiquary* between 1885 and 1890[63]. Most of these ballads were related to various uprisings against the British

in North Karnataka. The ballads were anti-British and celebrate the people who had participated in those insurrections. The articles contain an introduction and an analysis along with transliteration of the Kannada ballads and translation of the same. Of his collection of Ballads in the first article in the series, he says that

> their (ballads) historical and political value consists in their giving us the genuine native view, never intended for European ears, of our system of administration, and of what is thought of the various measures that we have taken to introduce and enforce it,- the popular native opinion about the local officers. who. to the lower classes. represent the government in person. and who is well-known cases, are constantly mentioned by name in these songs. - and illustrations, of the most ingenuous kind. of traits of native character which are familiar otherwise only to those who have had long official experience in this country (Fleet, 1885: 293-94).

The intention of collecting these ballads is to know how natives perceived the British and their administration. This work is hailed as path breaking and pioneering by native folklorists of later years. In fact the collection has fuelled nationalist plays on those who fought in those insurrections.

At the same time in the southern part of Karnataka. B.L. Rice was engaged in a similar kind of work - that of editing the epigraphs. B.L. Rice was born in Bangalore in 1836. His father Benjamin was a missionary. He studied abroad but came back to work in Bangalore in 1860. First he was a School Head Master and then became Inspector of Schools. He was Education Officer in Coorg. He played a key role in the Census conducted in Mysore in 1881. He also published the *Mysore Gazetteer* in two volumes, which became a better model for future Gazetteers in India. In 1879 he prepared a volume of Mysore inscriptions and was in-charge of Archeological department that came into existence in 1885. He planned to publish all epigraphs in the districts that came under his jurisdiction in the series *Epigraphia Karnatica* and brought out 12 volumes in the series. He

published regularly in the *Indian Antiquary* and *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society* and his published articles number more than fifty. He also attempted to write the history of Mysore and Coorg using the inscriptions and was actively engaged in editing and publishing old Kannada manuscripts as we have seen earlier. He published the revised version of *Ramayana* edited by M.A. Ramanuja Iyengar in 1868. Later *Amara Kasha* (1873) was published. *Bibliotheca Karnatica* was yet another ambitious project, under which he brought out many old Kannada texts like *Bhasha Bhushana, Shabdhanushasana, Pampa Ramayana and Pampa Bharata.* There was a constant academic dialogue/disputes between B.L. Rice and J.F. Fleet on dating epigraphs and other issues.

The British Officers also used Kannada in their administration. There is a long list of administrators who used Kannada in their work. Some of them such as J.F. Fleet. Col. Taylor. Aber Crombie. Marc Cubbon. John Garret. Thomas Hudson. Thomas Munroe, Anderson. John Mackerel. Raymond West, C.A. Roberts. Walter Eliot. J Garret and H.J. Brookeman not only knew Kannada but also worked as Kannada translators.[64]

Thus the kind of work mentioned above clearly illustrates how administrative divisions and different purposes/intentions of missionaries (of different Orders and nationalities like Basel Mission. London Mission. Wesleyan Mission), administrators (of different Presidencies and Princely states) and translators determined their engagement with Kannada. Bible translations, textbook writing, history writing, publishing old Kannada texts, collecting epigraphs and other related materials of history brought them together and created mutually cooperative and complementary work. The result of all these, was the construction of a category called Karnataka and its history. Kannada language and Literary history. Though their work started in different places and at different times, by the middle of the 19th century all of them were found to be working in the same direction.

These activities coupled with the introduction of English education made the native elite carry on with these activities further. The awakening of the love for their mother tongue began to show results by the end of 19th century. Many of the natives who were also trained by the above and assisted them in their work took on the mantle now. R. Narasimhacharya started his career as a schoolteacher in 1882. Later he went on to acquire MA. in Kannada that had just begun in Madras University. He was appointed as translator in 1894. And in 1899 he joined the Archeological Research Institute to assist B.L. Rice. After B.L. Rice, Narasimhacharya became the Director of the Archeological institute in 1906 and continued till 1922. He had collected more than 5000 epigraphs. He had studied the architecture of nearly a thousand religious structures belonging to all religions. He edited a volume of epigraphical poems in *Shasana Padya Manjari* (1923). It focuses on the way Kannada language developed over the years. But the epitome of his work is *Karnataka Kavi Charite* in three volumes (Vol. 1- 1907, Vol. 2 - 1919 and Vol. 3 -1929). It includes details of 1148 poets of Kannada. He had consulted nearly 2000 manuscripts for this purpose. He refined it with each volume. The much talked about history of Kannada literature was now available in totality. The seeds sown in the previous century began to bear fruit now. R. Narasimhacharya also wrote the *History of Kannada Language* in 1934. These were lectures delivered at Mysore University as Readership lectures in 1926. Similarly the lectures given at Bangalore have come out as *History of Kannada Literature*. Most of his arguments are based on earlier attempts made by Europeans, but he has dared to take issue with them in the light of the new materials available to him. Not only that, a sense of pride of the language can also be seen in his analysis such as in his definition of Kannada language. While defining Kannada he is not guided by the history of the language or the qualities of the language but engages himself in the etymological interpretation of the word "Kannada" to prove that because it is a good language it has acquired the name.

This sense of pride of the language, not founded on history or the quality of the language, but a simple assertion through etymological circus can be found not

only in him but also in many others. A cursory look at the books published at the end of the 19th century and early part of the 20th century clearly shows that there was a sense of Kannada pervading all over. We can find more than fifty books, which bear the word Karnataka in their title and another thirty books bearing the word Kannada in their title.[65] I have not mentioned all of them here but only a few important books, which have had wide circulation and are read even today as important texts of that period.

If the kind of construction of Kannada language and literature showed a sense of pride about Kannada language in the writings of R. Narasimhacharya, then the writings of Alur Venkatarao was openly Kannada nationalist in its orientation and his writings were more influential than others. He studied in Pune at the end of the 19th century and was greatly influenced by Balagangadhar Tilak. A kind of anti-Marathi sentiment awakened a kind of Kannada sentiment in him and a few other Kannadigas. His autobiography *Nanna Jeevana Smrithigalu* (1974) narrates how different people who went to study at Pune, who never thought that they were Kannadigas came to be called Kannadigas by the Marathi speaking people. It was a classic case of ascribed identity, which grew on them by making Marathi as the 'other' for its self-construction. It was to begin not with an anti-colonial stance but in a sense defined itself anti-Marathi. It was certainly different from the kind of Kannada that was getting constructed out of the orientalist discourse produced by the Missionaries and other administrators/scholars. This is not to suggest that for constructing their notion of Kannada and Karnataka, Alur Venkatarao did not make use of the orientalist discourse. In fact it was the orientalist discourse that came in handy to construct a glorious past for Karnataka.

Alur Venkatarao's *Karnataka Gala Vaibhava* (1919) attempts to construct a glorious past for Karnataka. It was based on the writings on Hampi and other places by the orientalists. In North Karnataka there was an overlapping of Hindu and Kannada identity. Though initially the "other" was Marathi for the Kannada self-construction, the language that they used was one of Indian nationalist

writings of the Tilak kind where obviously the "other" also became Muslim. This is evident in not only *Karnataka Gata Vaibhava,* where the fell of the Vijayanagara kingdom is mourned as the fall of Kannada and Hinduism but also in the writings of one of the early novelists of the region, Galaganatha. Galaganatha was a very popular novel writer who sketched many novels and some of the important ones are *Kannadigara Karma Kathe, Kumudini, Madhava Karuna Vilasa.* He is identified as a "revivalist writer" by scholars like Padikkal (Padikkal, 2001: 180).

Shamba Joshi. another scholar of North Karnataka has also written extensively on Kannada and Karnataka. Some of his works are *Karnata Samskritiya Purva Peetike* (1969) *Karnatada Veera Kshatriyaru* (1936), *Kanmareyaada Kannada* (1933). *Kannada Nudiya Huttu Athava Nirukta* (1937). *Kannada Nele* (1939). *Kannada Nudiya Jeevala* (nd). *Kannada Kate* (1947). Shamba Joshi was not so popular as Galaganatha or Alur Venkatarao. The reason for his unpopularity is yet to be researched. I would suggest tentatively here that his discourse, though very well within the Kannada nationalist framework, somehow displaces the upper-caste Brahmin group from the protagonist position in its narrative, and that might have lead to the unpopularity of his writings among the elite sections of Kannada intelligentsia, which mainly comprised upper-caste educated people.

The popularity of Galaganatha can be ascribed to the genre in which he wrote. But Alur Venkatarao was not only a writer but also an activist who involved himself in many activities that led to the popularity of his writings. He practised law to begin with. He established many publishing houses such as Karnataka Grantha Prasara Mandala (1908), Nava Jeevana Grantha Bhandara and Geethakusuma Manjari. He was also a key player in holding the All Karnataka Publishers meet in Dharwad twice in 1907 and 1908. He edited many magazines and journals like *Vagbhushana, Kannadiga, Java Karnataka, Karma Veera.* He was the president for Shankaracharya Samskrita Patashale (1910-1920). Shantesh Vachanalaya (10 years), Karnataka Itihasa Mandala (Karnataka History Association. 1914-1930)

and Kannadigara Sangha. He was the Founder of Karnataka Sabhe, the Secretary for Karnataka Rastriya Parishat (Karnataka National Conference) held at Dharwad in 1920 and also for All Karnataka Universities Committee. He was the main initiator of 600* year celebration of Vijayanagara Empire in 1935. In fact in his *Karnataka Gala Vaibhava* and the celebration, which was attended by all the main Kannada writers of the period, Vijayanagara/Hampi began to occupy an important position in the construction of Kannada and Kannada identity.[66] After that many writings came on Hampi/Vijayanagara. For all these activities, the thrust was given by the material provided by archeological work carried out by the Orientalists.

In the Mysore region the main organization that played a key role apart from the University and the State was Kannada Sahitya Parishat founded in 1917. Other public sphere elements like newspapers and magazines also played their role. Through the activities of missionaries, colonial officials and later on native educated elite, and the activities in the public sphere that emerged, a notion of Kannada community was imagined, and efforts in the form of a pan-Karnataka organization and movements to establish a single University for the entire Kannada speaking region began to realize that notion into existence.

It is not that print technology created only a unified field of exchange between people who spoke the same language. It also fuelled other kinds of construction of community too. As I have shown earlier the number of publications with the word Kannada and Karnataka was sizable, but that does not present the entire picture: there were other kinds of publications too. What were they? Venkatesh Sangali's descriptive bibliography tells us that there were nearly **twenty** books that were published during that period with the word 'Hindu" in the title. If we look at the bibliography more closely the majority of the books published were on religious issues. The number of books that have the word 'Arya" in their title are more than ten. Let me randomly pick a letter, lets say aa, and I give a small excerpt of it here: *Atma Nivedanam* (The Deposition of Atma), *Atma Bodhe* (Teachings on

Atma), *Alma Ramayana, Alma Vidya Vilasa* (The Knowledge of Atma), *Alma Shakthiya Tejassu* (The Power of Will), *Atmanubhava Prakashike* (Book on Inner/Spiritual Experience). *Adikavi Valmiki, Adi Purana Sangraha* (An old Kannada Epic), *Ananda Deepike*, *Ananda Mala* (Bankimchandra's Nationalist novel), *Ananda Ramayana*, *Ananda Lahari*, *Ananda Saamrajya*, *Aryaka* (The Aryan), *Arya Keerthi - Part 1 and 2* (The Fame of Aryans). *Arya Dharma Deepa*…. Thus the majority of the texts are oriented towards religion. *Bhagavadgite* was also a much-circulated text; there are seven or eight publications of it. There are twelve books, which have word Bharata in their title (Sangali, 2000). By looking at these titles we can say that religious discourse too used the new technology to fix its boundaries and establish a new way of binding its members.

Let me take up the issue of Lingayat community and examine it briefly. The Veerashiva Maha Sabha was established in 1905 itself, to promote the cause of Lingayats. It used to have yearly conferences, and if we look at the report of these conferences it is clear that the community was trying to modernize itself. The Association mainly aimed at educating the members of community and also aimed at garnering important positions in the newly emerging modern institutions. For that it established various schools and colleges and also hostels (mostly with free boarding) for students of their community. A cursory look at the biographies of elite educated Lingayats of this period would reveal this point clearly.[67] There are nearly thirty books that have come on Vachanas, Veerashivisam, Shiva texts and Lingayat community. Hardekar Manjappa had prepared a bibliography of magazines and journals that were related to the Lingayat community from 1860 to 1934. There are ninety-two periodicals that had come out during this period (Bhoosareddy and Venkareddy, 1995: 156-162). Hardekar Manjappa ventured into this to disprove the theory that Lingayats were not taking interest in Kannada. If we ask the question, who were the readers of these periodicals, then obviously the answer would be the community members. 1 don't think the number of periodicals of the same period on Kannada and Karnataka or literature in general

would be so many. Though no bibliography of periodicals of that period is available, if we look at the one prepared by Havanur the number of periodicals on Kannada and Karnataka or literature in general wouldn't cross **twenty-five** (Havanur, 1993: 71-82).

When histories of Kannada literature were emerging. Lingayats were busy with constructing the history of Lingayat writers. Gubbi Murugaradhya. the author of the novel *Shringara Chaturyollasini* (1896) at the end of 19th century has given an exhaustive list of Kannada writers who belong to the Lingayat community. Sri Guru Siddappa Bellary has also written a book on *Lingavanta Kavigalu Avara Kritigalu* (Lingayat Poets and their Works). What all these suggest is that there were competing constructions of communities at the end of 19th and early 20th century. A modern Hindu community. a modern Lingayat community, a Kannada community. an Indian community were all emerging in that turmoil. It is not that they were mutually exclusive or one was pitted against the other. though 1 characterize them as competing. For instance. Gubbi Murugaradhya's attempt to list out Lingayat Kannada writers is at the same time pan of inscribing Lingayats into the history of Kannada literature and constructing a history of Lingayat Kannada writers. These constructions were competing for hegemony. The memberships of multiple communities led to prioritizing them. If there were multiple subject positions that were available to a Kannada reader during that period. which one was chosen in a given context and why. is a question that arises. These constructions were competing for hegemony. These competing constructions over a period of time might have accepted the hegemony of one over the other. The question then is what is the relationship between these various constructions: What is the relationship between Kannada nationalism and Indian Nationalism? What is the relationship between Lingayats and Kannada Nationalism? What is the relationship between Lingayats and Indian Nationalism? But as these questions are beyond the scope of my present study. 1 limit myself to raising these questions. as these are very important in understanding how a particular discourse emerges hegemonic when there are other competing

discourses. Now I will shift to B.M. Srikantia and the modernization of Kannada language and the politics of it with this background of the construction of the history of Kannada language, literature and Karnataka.

III

By B.M. Srikantia's time the ground had been already prepared to launch Kannada into Modernity. Kannada Sahitya Parishat had been established with the patronage of the Maharaja of Mysore to take up the work. B.M. Srikantia **actively** participated in the activities of the Sahitya Parishat. He was also responsible for introducing Kannada Department at the Mysore University in 1926. He was trained in English and was teaching in the English Department, but he took a keen interest in establishing a postgraduate department of Kannada in Mysore University.

Though Missionaries and British Administrators had done a lot of work that led to the formation of a Kannada community, a lot of things still remained to be done. In this context we have to see B.M. Srikantia's writings and work. Before examining the way he was trying to mould Kannada, let me briefly touch upon his attempts to write a history of Kannada literature, language and also of Kannada metrical forms.

B.M. Srikantia's *Kannada Sahinada Charitre* came out as Part II of *Kannada Kaipidi* (Hand-Book for Kannada) in 1947. published by Mysore University. There were attempts earlier to write the history of Kannada literature by Rice, Kittel and R. Narasimhacharya as mentioned already. Though B.M. Srikantia's work spans over two hundred pages it has not been identified as an important work on the history of Kannada literature, though it had four reprints (1953, 1960, 1967 and 1983 in collected works). In spite of its reprints many do not know that he was also an historian of Kannada literature. Some of the reasons for this have been discussed bv others. The main reason that has been identified is that this

work fails as a history, and it is more a textual analysis of excerpts of texts from selected authors. The focus is more on evaluating texts or parts of texts. The details of an older writer that any history of literature should give had already been given by R. Narasimacharya's work. So, Srikantia might have focused more on what people call "Sahrudaya Vimarshe" (criticism for an empathetic reader) in his attempt to write the history of Kannada literature. It is not that he was not aware of what a history of literature should be. While reviewing E.P. Rice's *Kanarese Literature* that came as part of The Heritage of India Series. in *The Mysore University Magazine* (1919), he states what a good history of literature should have. He thinks that merely providing details of a work is not good enough. and independent scholarship is needed. He finds fault with E.P. Rice on this account:

> Good as we find the book to be. we should like to offer a few suggestions for the next edition. Practically all the main facts on the subject so far established by research have been gathered into the book. but we miss the note of authoritative and independent scholarship. There is no real criticism. worth the name. of individual writers of the first rank (Srikantia. 1983: 832).

I think his attempt to write a history of Kannada literature is a correction of this aspect that was missing in other histories of Kannada literature. The number of reprints that the book has had is not because it provides the history of Kannada literature but because of the textual analysis (criticism) he has done of the "'writers of the first rank".

Srikantia's *Kannada Chandassina Charitre* (A History of Kannada Prosody) was published in 1936 as part of *Kannada Kaipidi Part 1*. In this he tries to classify metrical forms available in Kannada literature into two: 1. Those borrowed from Sanskrit and 2. The ones that are close to forms found in other Dravidian

languages. His scholarship not only of Old Kannada literature and Sanskrit literature but also of Telugu and Tamil literature can be seen in this work. It stands out as a good comparative work too. Though he did not write a history of Kannada language independently, he wrote a chapter on "The history of Kannada language" in *Kannada Kaipidi* along with T.S. Venkannaia. He has also edited with the help of V. Seetaramaiah and K.V. Raghavacharya a collection of excerpts from epigraphs, old Kannada epics, folk poems and new Kannada poems that are related to the issue of Kannada language and describing the Kannada speaking regions. This text has seen 11 reprints so far. This was also a part of the process of lifting the religious texts belonging to various historical periods out of their context and making them a part of Kannada tradition. Apart from these activities. it is also important to look at his attempts to shape a new Kannada language.

B.M. Srikantia placed a proposal to reform Kannada script before Sahitya Parishat in 1936. D.V. Gundappa who was the Vice-president of the Parishat then accepted it and organized a special conference on "Akshara Samskarana" in that year's Vasantha Sahityotsava (Literary festival in Spring). A committee was formed to collect the views of people from all over Karnataka. A.R. Krishna Shastri was the coordinator of the committee. The conference was chaired by B.M. Srikantia. Experts of Printing technology. Publishers. Printers, people who had done experiments on the Kannada typing-keyboard and others attended the conference. The conference looked at the report placed by the committee and passed a resolution. The resolution rejected the argument that Kannada language should adopt European script or Devanagari to suit the needs of the modern technology. But it called for reforming Kannada script to suit the needs of the technology. However ultimately, many of the recommendations of the conference were rejected and those who believed in retaining the script as it was and in devising suitable printing types and typewriters for it had their say in the matter.

But B.M. Srikantia was successful in shaping a new language. He paved the way for using Hosagannada for modern poetry. It is interesting to look at what kind of

notions he held about Hosagannada and how he wanted to shape it. I have culled out his views on language from his various writings to analyze its politics.

His speech given at Vidyavardhaka Sangha in Dharwad (December 1911) is memorable and quoted even today with regard to uplifting Kannada. He clearly rejected the nationalist argument of having a single language for the whole of India. He used the theory that development of a civilization was related to language. He also rejected the view that English should be the language of India saying it is impractical to teach English all Indians, though it was necessary to use English with the British rulers (Srikantia. 1983: 245). He felt that there was no need to wait for the time till all Indians learnt English and advocated the use of native languages for communication till then. He proposes a clear diglossia that Kaviraj talks about.[68] For political activities. nationalist issues, inter-regional (prantya) activities. he accepts the use of English. Within the region (prantya) for the use of education of children. women and Okkaligas (Sudras). Srikantia says that we need the respective native languages (Srikantia. 1983: 246). In his reasons for the choice of English. he lists the activities for which it is needed. For native languages instead of listing the activities for which it is to be deployed, he states for whom it is meant to be used. If we see who is left out of that group of children. women and Okkaligas. some points become clear. It is obviously the adult men and non-Sudras. who are left out of the group for whom the native language is meant. It is not that all are advised diglossia. it is only upper-caste adult men who are advised diglossia. Or can we say that the second group should keep off the activities listed in the first. that is children. women and Sudras are not supposed to participate in political and national activities? There is another assumption that operates with respect to the native language and its implied users. When Srikantia talks of educating children. women and Sudras in the native language, the assumption is that the teacher is adult. male and non-Sudra. and children, women. Sudras have to be educated by the adult male non-Sudra. Clearly we can see here that the adult male upper-caste is assuming the role of mediating between the

power (the rulers with whom they have to use English) and the ordinary people and also between the nation and the region.

Then Srikantia goes on to clarify that he is not against Sanskrit, when he is favoring native languages. He says that Sanskrit is our ancestor's language, the language of the Aryans: it contains the knowledge that will help us understand the past, the present and also to plan our future. He says that the educated have to learn all the three languages (Srikantia, 1983: 246-47). After commenting on Kannada poetry he comes back to the question of how Hosagannada should be.

Srikantia says that Hosagannada should be used now. He says that old Kannada or Sanskrit words that are not much used by people should not be used with Hosagannada. This Hosagannada should not contain *gramya* (rustic language), and should be the language spoken by educated and upper caste people (Srikantia. 1983: 254). If this is going to be the standard language, then how to make it acceptable to the people? He says if this Kannada is used for writing books, then with printing and schooling it will spread to the others. Then he asks the question "Why do we need to filter and standardize the language being used now?". His answer is "So that all can read this language. The time when we wrote only for Kings and Pandits is gone. Now women, men. children, adults. Brahmins, Sudras all read. so we have to use the new language so that they can understand it" (Srikantia, 1983:254).

This argument is further elaborated in his article "Kannadakke Ondu Kattu" (A boundary/rule for Kannada).[69] He says that for the progress of the country it is essential that the English educated elite should convey the knowledge they have obtained through English to others through the native languages. For this, he says a fixed Kannada is needed. What is this fixed Kannada? It is normalizing the Kannada used now. He calls for using a "middle" language between Old Kannada and the Kannada spoken by the people. He is aware of the fact that there are several varieties of spoken Kannada and it varies according to region and also

according to urban/rural residence. He calls for simplifying the language to make it understandable to people. but in the same breath cautions that we should not make it rustic, but make it pure and rule bound.

He has clarified his notion of the "middle" language. He says that there are three varieties of Kannada:

1. The old one: Mainly used in books and very rule bound
2. The one in use: Sometimes spoken in a new way though rule bound.
3. Rustic language (gramya): Though spoken by many people. has no rules, is lacking in knowledge. is spoken in a hurry without much attention. in use in a few regions, used mostly by lower castes and a few upper-castes.

He calls for choosing the second one leaving both the first one and the last. Later he talks about constructing a new dictionary and grammar to suit the new language.

In 1938 while discussing *Kaviraja Maarga* the first available text in Kannada, he quotes the author approvingly sa> ing that we need to standardize the language and should leave out the dialects. What he envisages is a Tirulgannada (The Juicy/pure Kannada? 'tirul' literally means essence) not the dialects in the name of desi (nativism). While writing an introduction to Deshpande Manohar's book *Prabandha Prakasha* in 1941. he says the author is trying to be an ardent devotee of Kannada, fighting for the upliftment of Kannada. and trying to make it potent (veeryavatt) by cleaning it (Srikantia. 1983: 606). *Prabhandha Prakasha* was a book written to teach writing of essays in Kannada for students. The metaphor of potency used here implies that Srikantia assumed that the Kannada spoken by people is impotent and it has to be made potent. The word used in Kannada for potency is Veerya used in reference to men not to women.

These were some of B.M. Srikantia's views on standardizing the Kannada language. The language chosen for standardizing it was the language of upper-caste men. But as he rejects the dialects of the language, the language of upper-

caste men in other regions also stands disqualified to become the standard. So what remains is the Kannada spoken by the upper-caste men of Mysore region. If a particular variety becomes the standard language for all, then the people who use that particular variety will be in an advantageous position as their spoken and written language are one and the same; no extra effort is required to pick up the standard language. For those who speak other varieties, the language they speak and the language that they have to pickup for writing will be different. So a distance gets created between them and the standard variety. They have to make extra efforts to pick up the standard variety. In that sense they will be in a disadvantageous position. Thus the upper-caste elite of Kannada used their own variant of language as the standard language and garnered the advantages accruing out of it. The work started by missionaries and colonial administrators ended thus, with the entry of the native elite.[70]

Though we have looked at B.M. Srikantia's views on standardization of language, we have not yet answered the question, why Srikantia who spoke for rejecting old Kannada used it in his translations of Greek plays. In the introduction to A.R. Krishna Shastry's *Samskrita Naataka* B.M. Srikantia says that the play that has a noble theme and chorus naturally needs to have the rhythm of a metrical form. For him Tragedies had that noble theme. So Tragedy had to have a metrical form and a language that suited the theme. Earlier we saw that while speaking about the use of language he says that as the new language is meant for all (women, children and Sudras). it has to be simple. Can we assume here that since he has written Tragedy in Old Kannada it was not meant to be read by women and Sudras and was meant only for the Raja and the Pandit?

The choice of language in translating and writing Tragedy in Kannada was driven by B.M. Srikantia's notion of Tragedy but at the same time it is also a pointer to his notion of standard language and his understanding of the relationship between language, gender and caste.

Thus we see that the changes effected by missionary and colonial authorities with regard to Kannada was given final shape by the upper-caste elite, in the name of Language and nation. Though this fixing of the boundaries of an imagined community in a particular manner was effected through the efforts charted out in this chapter, it is not that the boundaries of the community were fixed forever. B.M. Srikantia might have been influential in making the others in the literary field follow his language to write poetry. But as new historical forces emerged things did change. The Dalit-Bandaya poets who came at the end of 1970s and 80s used a different language from the one that was used till then (the path shown by B.M. Sri) to write poetry. This use of a different language also changed the contours and content of a community.[71] This shows that the communities appear to be fixed only at a particular point in history; if we take an historical view we see that the boundaries are constantly redrawn. Also the definition of a community changes in response to external forces, coupled with its own internal dynamics rendering the communities appear fuzzy over time.

Translating Englishness: *English Geetagalu* as a Canonical Text

Any discussion of B.M. Srikantia and modem Kannada literature would not be complete without a discussion of his *English Geetagalu. English Geetagalu* is a collection of translations of selected English poems into Kannada that appeared first in 1921. In fact *English Geetagalu* and B.M. Srikantia have become synonymous. *English Geetagalu* acquired a canonical status as far back as in 1934. that is. within ten years of its publication. Masti Venkatesh Iyengar, the father of Kannada short stories. hails B.M. Srikantia in one of his poems in the collection *Malara* (1933):

> You are the chancellor of Poetry for modern Karnataka
> The Guru Belloora Mylara Srikantia.
> Whoever writes hereafter in Sirigannada[72] language
> They will all remember you. they will offer laurels to you.
> The melodies prevailing today in Kannada
> Resonate with what you have opened up:
> Modern. noble. prudent-paced. broad cosmic thought.
> You taught us by speaking: you taught us without saying:
> Taught us with your work; by awaking the waves of determination
> In the heart of the young. you inspired a desire to sing...
> (Iyengar. Venkatesh, 1960: 43).[73]

Not only Masti. even others of the period have hailed him. K.V. Puttappa in 1931 said "though B.M. Srikantia became popular with *English Geetagalu,* he has been a latent river nurturing many trees[7]" (as quoted in Ananthanarayana. 1991: 80). He was the first one in Kannada literature to receive a felicitation volume *Sambhavane* (Honour) in 1941. His birth centenary year 1984 witnessed five centenary commemoration volumes. including one in English.

In this chapter I have tried to find out the kind of discourse that prevailed and was hegemonic during the colonial period in Mysore. I use *English Geetagalu* as a text that bears the marks of the discourse that made it a canonical one. By looking at *English Geetagalu* I shall try to analyze how and why it attained the status it commands today. The first section of the chapter looks at emergence of the Lyric and modern poetry in modern Kannada literature prior to B.M. Srikantia. The purpose of this section is to frame the question, though many wrote the new kind of poetry and translated poems from English, prior to Srikantia, why did they fail to become canonical. Section two will try to answer this question, by looking at the evolving new literary atmosphere of the period, fashioned mainly by B.M. Srikantia and will try to place *English Geetagalu* in that context. Here. I will also look at some of the minor issues that have been raised about *English Geelagalu.* The third section will be a textual analysis of *English Geelagalu* and also his poems in *Honganasugalu* (1943 - Golden Dreams). The focus of this section is to unearth the multiple ideological and social conditions that made these texts possible and thereby to know some of the features of the hegemonic discourse of the day in Princely Mysore.

I

Epic was the mainstay of vernacular languages of India; independent poems were hard to find. Though there were some called *Keerthane*, they were mainly religious compositions. There were collections of "good" poetry like *Sukthi Sudharnava* and *Kavyasaara.* which were basically excerpts taken out of epics. But they were also religious in nature. The *Vachana* poetry of 12th century and *Dasa* literature too had compositions that could be called poems. Missionaries of Basel Mission have worked extensively on *Dasa* literature, as it was popular in the 19th century. They probably thought this could be the model to write Christian songs to spread their religion among natives. Moegling had published a collection *of Dasa* literature in 1848. Gottfried Weigle has included a translation

of Purandara Dasa's *Keerthane* in his article "On the Canarese Language and Literature" (1846).

Early modern poetry originated in three different ways: I. The efforts of Christian missionaries to spread their religion through literature 2. The need for poetry collections in schools and 3. The need for songs in the plays performed by the drama companies. Finally all these efforts made way for the emergence of the modern Kannada poem as an expression of an individual soul. The culmination point of these efforts can be located in the writings of B.M. Srikantia in the early 20th century. In the following section the focus however is on the attempts of those prior to B.M. Srikantia at writing lyrics/modern poems in Kannada and the issues involved in these processes.

Modern poetry in Kannada too. like the olden poetry, had religious moorings. But this time it was Christian missionaries who took up the mantle. Srinivasa Havanur says that missionaries of the Basel Mission might have composed a few Christian religious poems as early as in the 1830s but they are not available (Havanur, 2000: 386). The first collection came out in 1845 comprising sixty-eight poems. These poems were mainly meant to be sung in the church. But before this they had prepared poetry collections as an aid to the study of Kannada. They studied Kannada poetry to have a feel of the language and its literature, so that they could also use a similar style in their composition. One such collection was prepared in 1825. According to Havanur. London Missionaries, who were working in Bangalore and Bellary during this period, must have prepared this. It contains excerpts from old texts like *Jnana Sindhu*, *Basava Purana*, *Chora Basava Charitra*, *Akandeshwara Vachana* and *Viveka Chintamani* (Havanur, 2000: 365).[76] Most of these Christian songs were translations of songs composed in other languages. For the first time in Kannada poetry, attempts were made to leave the customary alliteration of the second syllable in a line, and invent new metrical forms of Kannada instead of using the old. This happened only in prayer songs. as they retained the tune of the original

to sing it as they had learnt it earlier. But in other translations they went back to the norms of Kannada poetry by retaining both the old metrical forms as well as the customary second syllable alliteration. Weigle who translated Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* in 1847 follows the customary second syllable alliteration. The poems here are composed in Aryavritta form. There could have been two reasons behind it: they might have been afraid of violating existing norms of poetry writing and/or they felt that it is conducive to write in the old form, as it is a well-trodden path. Even prayer songs, which retained the original tune and structure, later gave way to native tunes mostly of folk origin. Kittel's *Kathamale*, (1862) though a collection of songs related to Christ's life, is composed in *Shatpadi, Keertane* and other genres of Kannada literature.

W.G. Wuerth brought out a collection *Prakkavva Malike* in 1868. Though it was published in 1868, it was actually prepared as textbook in 1862 on the request of the Education Department of Madras Government. The Bombay Government announced Wuerth Prize Examination for the study of this work for many years. Wuenh has classified the poems into four sections on the basis of religion as Brahmana, Jaina, Veerashaiva and Christian. The summary of each poem is given in English with notes and a glossary.

The next attempt was by F. Kittel: his *Minor Canarese Poetical Anthology* was published in 1865. The third and thoroughly revised and enlarged edition of the same came out in 1874. The revised edition has 103 selections. The choice of selection is guided by "Purety (sic) and freedom of sectarianism" (Kittel, 1995 (1874): iii). If Wuerth classified his selections on the basis of religion, Kittel tries to be more secular. He has chosen those parts, which depict nature (such as spring, rainy season, sunset and moon rising, sun rise, winter, autumn, evening-time), and also poems that describe landscape and eulogies of the Kannada language. He has carefully edited the poems to make them "secular" and without any religious orientation. He has taken liberties to alter the lines and the dedications that come at the end of the stanza to the poet's personal deity in

Veerashaiva poetry. He has introduced the poets in the introduction; the book contains a glossary too. Gangadhara Madivaleshwara Turamuri has brought out another collection in 1874, *Kavita Sangrahavu* (A Collection of Poems). It includes writings of his contemporary writers along with excerpts from old texts.

The need to bring out textbooks containing poems for language classes was another incentive to write poems. First it was the propagation of religion that made them write poetry, the prayer-poems of Christianity. Then it was the need for poetry collections in school texts that prompted them to write poems. It was the Government of Bombay Presidency, which took the first step towards bringing out Kannada textbooks. *Kannada Kaviteya Modalane Pustaka* (First Reader of Kannada Poetry) published in 1873 has poems that are written in new Kannada. But these poems have not dared to leave the second syllable alliteration. These poems are also composed in Kanda (a Poetic form containing four lines), Shatpadi (a Poetic form containing stanzas of six lines), Choupadi (a Poetic form containing stanzas of four lines). *Kannada Kavya Bhaga I* (Kannada Poetry Part I) though claiming in its preface that the poetry written for children should be "free from all bombastic and pedantic imitation of Sanskrit fashion of expression, the elaborate phraseology and the fanciful word combination, only aiming at simplicity, clearness, naturalness and graceful, compatible with the spoken dialect", has not lived up to its claim (Quoted in Havanur. 2000: 396). It also adheres to the second letter alliteration and the old metrical forms.

Turamuri's collection mentioned above has a poem on Queen Victoria, probably written by him.[77] Another collection *Vishwakriti Parikshana* was published by Hiranyagarbha.[78] It also contains a section "Sarasota Prabhandha" written by Hiranyagarbha. Modern poems entered such poetry collections for the first time. Poems in Kannada translation of Kalidasa"s *Shakuntala* found their way into this collection. But this collection by Hiranyagarbha was not aimed at school readers; its purpose was to demonstrate the greatness of Nemichandra as a poet by comparing him with others.

Kannada had no tradition of drama, so to fill this lacuna, translations appeared from Sanskrit and English. As part of such plays, poems were included, as some of them were meant to be performed on the stage. The translator often composed the songs if there were no songs in the original. In such texts we also find a note along with the poem in which raga they have to be sung. Churamuri Seshagiri Rao's *Shakuntala* has nearly 80 songs. Popular folk songs also were some times included. The tunes were not only borrowed from folk and classical music but also from English music. Kanimbale Balacharya's play *Padmavati Parinaya* has a song to be sung by the chorus and the note says that the song should be sung in English note.[79] The language of these poems was both new Kannada and Old Kannada. Basavappa Shastri's translations of Sanskrit plays have heavily Sanskritized old Kannada songs and Kanimbale Balacharya's play is more in tune with the then current usage of language, which is considered as folk today.

But all these attempts to write new kinds of poems were happening amidst plenty of *Dasa literature* that was still getting composed, though originating in 16* and 17 centuries and *Kalajnana literature* (also known as *tatvapada.* short poems composed by bhakti tradition poets of 17th, 18th and 19th century. influenced by folk. Islamic and Veerashaiva traditions). Popular folk songs also existed side by side with all this. It was not that there were no lyrical songs in Kannada, but they did not become a pan of the canon. The collection of folklore by J.F. Fleet in *Indian Antiquary* clearly demonstrates existence of such poems, which were in the form of ballads (Fleet, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1889 and 1890). These folk poems, the *Tatvapada* and *Dasa* literature were mainly circulated through oral tradition and so they did not become direct models for poetry writing that had just began. Only the Christian missionaries took the trouble to look at these compositions. But these folk traditions/oral literatures might have had an unconscious influence on native writers, though it might be a limited one. *Tatvapada* was prominent in the Hyderabad-Karnataka region and we find hardly any modern writing emerging from that region. Whatever modern wTiting has come, has emerged

from three main centres. Traditional scholars have identified them as Mangalore center, Mysore center and Dharwad center (See Anantanarayana, 1991: 31). Mangalore center can be described as the center for Madras presidency. Similarly Dharwad was the center for Bombay presidency and Mysore was for Princely Mysore state. Anantanarayana who has worked on the influence of English Poetry on Modern Kannada poetry opines that these centres were not isolated from each other. He says that there was a constant movement of writers from one region to another. They used to write in all the magazines and newspapers of the three regions. Though the origins of these magazines were from these centres. the readership was scattered in all regions. M.D. Alasingacharya. a Mysorean was a teacher in Madras and he used to publish his poems in *Srikrishna Sukti* a magazine coming out of Udupi in the Mangalore region. Hattiyangadi Narayanarao. who hailed from Mangalore, was settled in Bombay and used to publish his poems in *Vagbushana* of Dharwad and *Sahitya Parishat Patrike* of Bangalore. The *Geleyara Gumpu* (A Group of Friends) of Dharwad also used to publish in the magazines and periodicals published from Bangalore. Thus the Kannada newspapers and magazines helped in a way to cut across these administrative boundaries and to imagine their readership across all regions. wherever there were Kannada-knowing people. But the regions carved out of the administrative boundaries devised by the princely states and colonial administration also had given rise over a period of time to a certain kind of culture specific to these regions. and so these regions differed substantively too from each other. As my focus is not on looking at the differential development of modern poetry in these regions but to provide a background of work done before Srikantia. I have not looked at the differences between the writers from the different regions. But whenever necessary to highlight certain aspects I will take the help of studies conducted by others to point out the differences.

In Mysore the main poets before Srikantia were M.D. Alasingacharya. S.G. Narasimhacharya, Jayarayacharya. Sosale Ayyashastri, S.G. Govindacharya. S.G. Narasimhacharya was a relative of R. Narasimhacharya and had helped him

as a co-author to bring out the first volume of *Karnataka Kavicharitre* (History of the Poets of Karnataka). He had written poems for many plays mainly staged by the Vardacharya Company. It is also said that he had written poems for B.Venkatacharya's translation of Bankim Chandra's novel *Vishavriksha* (Poison Tree) (Gundappa D.V.. 1996: 46). He was a Translator, in the Education department of Mysore Government. Most of the translated poems found in the Kannada textbooks of that period are by him. He has also sketched a few independent poems. He had also translated poetry from Sanskrit. He used old metrical forms to translate but the language he used was Hosagannada. He has written poems on the Train. the Rainy Season and translations such as Wordsworth's "To the Cuckoo".[80] S.G. Govindacharya was S.G. Narasimhacharya's brother. Apart from translating poems he has also translated Oliver Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield.* He too translated from Sanskrit as also from English.

In Mangalore the pioneers of the new poetry are Panje Mangesha Rao. Govinda Pai and Hattiyangadi Narayanarao. Later we also see Muliya Timmappayya. Kadengodlu Shankara Bhatta Sediyapu Krishna Bhatta. The second-generation poets were part of a group called *Mitra Mandali* (Friends" Circle). The re-circulation of old edited texts in print form. the publication of school textbooks in Kannada. Christian literature in Kannada. all these influenced the writers of this region. Vivek Rai, a Kannada critic. identifies the influence in two directions - one. work on Old Kannada texts. grammar. prosody like Muliya Timmappayya, Shankara Bhatta. Tekkunje Gopalakrishna Bhatta. and the other, writing lyrical poetry like Panje Mangesha Rao and Govinda Pai (Rai. 2001:4-5). But the first writer to reckon with in 19th century literature is Muddanna. Historically he occupies an important position in Kannada literature's transition from Old Kannada to New Kannada.

Panje Mangesha Rao (1874-1937) had started writing poetry in the last decade of 19th century. According to Govinda Pai. translations of "O Call my brother back

to me" as "Marali Ni Tammana Kareyappa" and "The Better Land" as "Uttama Rajya" were published in the journal *Satya Dipike* (The path to truth) in 1896. Govinda Pai also recalls an incident that happened in 1893. Govinda Pai as a high school student was impressed by Panje Mangesha Rao's singing of songs from Kirloskar's Marathi plays. So one day when he met Panje Mangesha Rao on the road, he requested Panje to write them down for him. Panje Mangesha Rao asked for a pencil and paper and wrote it down from memory (Pai, 1975: 117). This shows that there was an influence of the Parsi theatre on these writers during those days. As Panje Mangesha Rao was working in the education department of Madras presidency, he inclined to write poems for children. In his poems and translations, though he used modern Kannada and that too a simple language for children, he couldn't leave the old prosody and alliteration rules. Later he also edited many Kannada poetry texts for school level.

Govinda Pai (1883-1963) is another important early writer of poetry from the Mangalore region. He was one writer who moved in both directions that Vivek Rai has spoken about: he wrote modern lyric poetry as well as undertook scholastic study of old Kannada texts. As G.S. Amur has pointed out, both aspects, scholarship and creativity, are striking in him (Amur, 2001: 75). He started writing poetry from his 16th year. He had translated a few episodes from the first act of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night,* using old Kannada metre. His first poem was published in the magazine *Suhasini* coming out of Mangalore. It was a poem written for a competition and had won a prize. He continued to write poetry afterwards and kept publishing in magazines and journals. Some of them were compiled and published as *Gilivindu* (A Flock of Parrots) in 1930. It comprises 46 poems and translation of Omar Khayyam's quartets. It is a collection which includes both his compositions as well as translations. His other two collections were published posthumously. *Nandadipa* (Eternal lamp) was published in 1968 and *Hridayaranga* (The Heart Stage) was published in 1969. His *Golgotha* is an epic poem written in 1931. It is based on the last day of Jesus Christ. He has also written another epic poem on Buddha's last day *Vaishaki* in

1947. He had set out to write an epic poem on the last day of Gandhi, but he didn't complete it. His *Hebberalu* (The Thumb), a poetic play based on the story of Ekalavya has been mentioned in my chapter on Tragedy. Apart from sketching his own short plays he has also translated plays from English. His translations of Japan's Noh plays are known well.

In Dharwad too, modern Kannada poetry began as part of writing poems for textbooks and for stage-plays. In north Karnataka. the poems written were also meant for singing on auspicious occasions and were called *Arati pada*.[81] It has been said that Ramachandra Rao Churamuri (1800-?), the father of Churamuri Sheshagiri Rao[82] has written many such poems. Most of these poems are not available but people have recorded that Mudavidu Krishna Rao used to sing many such songs composed by Ramachandra Rao (Dharawadakara, 1975: 187). Similarly Ayyappayya Hiremat Shantagiri (1860-?) had also published many such poems not only for singing during arati time but also during other occasions. He has composed songs to be sung by women under the title *Streeyara Hadu* (Songs of Women. not dated). Small booklets *Balika Geeta Sataka* (Hundred songs for Girls, 1911) and *Bigittiyara Pada* (Songs of In-laws) were also popular compositions by him. Gangadhara Madivaleshwara Turamuri. who was working as a Government translator in Dharwad. published *Halagannada Kavita Sangraha* (A collection of old Kannada poems) in 1867. He has also written many school textbooks. His well-known work is a translation of Bana's *Kadambari* into Kannada. which is said to have been published around 1875. Similarly Shantaveera Rachideva Kittura (1827-1885). Deputy Channabasappa (1834-1881). Venkata Rango Katti (1833-1909), Shivarudrappa Somappa Kulakarni (Gowrisha) (1869-1918) were some of the writers who were engaged in Kannada textbook writing. Most of the poems in the then Kannada texts were composed by Shivarudrappa Somappa Kulakarni (Dharawadakara, 1975: 419). Churamuri Sheshagiri Rao and others composed poems as part of their translations from Sanskrit. Churamuri Sheshagiri Rao's *Shakuntala* songs were very popular. It saw several reprints consistently. It was first published in

1870, reprinted in 1882 and again in 1894. It was so popular that Anna Kirloskar incorporated the songs into the Marathi *Shakuntala*.

In Dharwad. Anubhavi poets[83] wrote *Tatvapadas*, folk poets composed *Lavani* (ballads), the newly emerging literate community wrote poems to include in school textbooks, translated plays and also composed poems to sing on auspicious occasions. The main poets among the newly emerging poets were Balacharya Sakkari known as Shantakavi (1856-1921) and Narasimhacharya Bhimacharya Kittura known as Kavyananda Punekara (1870-1929). Shantakavi has written books numbering more than sixty-five. He also translated plays from Sanskrit. Among them are *Meghadoota*, *Geeta Govinda*, *Parvatt Parinaya*, *Nagananda.* and Act three of *Raghuvamsa*. He has written more than 35 plays for staging. He has also written a small booklet on writing poetry *Laghu Kavita Paddati* (Style of light poetry). His writings whether poetry or drama extol Kannada vis-a-vis Marathi. He was also very active in the Kannada reunification movement and was closely associated with people like Alur Venkatarao. who spearheaded the movement. He has written poems both in Halegannada as well as Hosagannada.

Kavyananda Punekara wrote many poems. most of which were published in various magazines like *Prabhata, Karnatakavritta, Dhananjaya, Vagbushana, Vokkalatanavu Sahakaritanavu, Kshema Samachara, Karnataka Vaibhava, and Jaya Karnataka.* He has not however publish them collectively. He was one of the first poets to give up alliteration in writing poetry in North Karnataka. Sridhara Kanolkar was another important poet of this period. Most of the poems of this period were published in a magazine exclusively devoted to poetry called *Prabhata.*

After these early writers, the next generation that wrote a full-fledged modern poetry belonged to Geleyara Gumpu (Friends" Group/Community). D.R. Bendre was one of the founder members of this group. Khanolkar, Burli Bindu Madhava,

Shamba Joshi, Madhura Chenna, V. Ramachandra, V.K. Gokak. Ram. Sri. Mugali were other prominent members of this group. This group trained itself in three ways: 1. Using English critical concepts to review Kannada literature, 2. Collecting and editing the Folk songs and using its rhythm for new poetry and 3. Writing new poetry (Ananthanarayana, 1991: 139-162). The Kannada literary historians have often spoken about only one group in North Karnataka, but today we also find historians talking about another group called Halasangi Geleyaru (Friends from Halasangi).[84] As Madhura Chenna who was a prominent member of the group was also involved with the activities of Geleyara Gumpu, historians have clubbed together both the groups or have ignored Halasangi friends. Madhura Chenna. Dhoola Saheba, Kapse Revappa and Simpi Linganna were prominent members of the group. The activities of the group were very much similar to that of Dharwad's Geleyara Gumpu. They used to read. collect folk songs and write modem poetry. Both the groups were very much influenced by Aurobindo.

Thus, modern Kannada poetry emerged in the early twentieth century in all these centres. With this background I now touch upon some of the features of the emergence of modern Kannada poetry. The first and foremost debate that we come across is the debate around abandoning alliteration and old Kannada prosody.

It seems as if in writing modern Kannada poetry poets were hampered by the prosody and alliteration rules of the Old poetry. Though Christian missionaries used old Kannada and old prosody to write their religious literature. the modern educated native intellectual probably wanted to move away from it. The first person to break this rule was Govinda Pai and his decision to stop using alliteration created a storm. He has recollected his decision to leave alliteration in an autobiographical piece, "Atmakathana". He says that this decision to leave alliteration was a kind of a sudden decision:

> I was in Navasari of Baroda state for a month in April 1911. When I was wandering on the upstairs. I thought that furrowing and seeding is my job, sprouting is left to god and so let me decide now itself without any hesitation to give up alliteration in poetry...Immediately I took up Ravindranath Tagore's poem "Bharata Lakshmi" which begins as "Aayi Bhuvana Manamohini" and translated it into Kannada. Next 1 took up his poem "Vidaya" from the collection *Shishu*, then Mohammada Iqbal's "Hindustan Hamara" written in Urdu and translated them into Kannada. Three months after coming back from Baroda. I published them in *Swadeshabhimani*. That was the first time 1 published the poems without any alliteration (Pai, 1975: 15-16).

But before coming to this decision he had already given it a thought in 1900 itself. As mentioned earlier. Panje Mangesha Rao was his teacher in Kannada. Around 1899-1900 he asked Panje about leaving alliteration in Kannada. He recollects the reply given by Panje and his own reaction to it in the autobiographical piece:

> He smiled wryly and said something in a crooked way to evade the question. I thought it is in vain to probe him further and if I do so it will look awkward. 1 decided not to discuss about my poetry now onwards with anyone... I should worry about it only after writing much poetry. not now itself. Then 1 wrote poetry with alliteration (Pai. 1975: 14-15).

In 1911 after publishing three translated poems without alliteration in *Swadeshabhimani*, he published his own poem "Holeyanu Yaaru?" (Who is an Untouchable?) in September. This publication created a huge outcry in that magazine, readers wrote several letters to the editor condemning giving up alliteration in writing Kannada poem. Several articles were also written to

condemn Govinda Pai himself. People wrote poems criticizing those who had given up using alliteration. As Ananthanarayana says, it was common in those days to criticize people who derived their inspiration from English and other languages. A poem written against abandoning the use of alliteration in Kannada poetry by "Gadadhara" in *Madhuravani* asks Govinda Pai "You also write poetry like Shakespeare, Keshavasuta and Madhusudan. But why do you bark like a dog which doesn't bite?"[85] We can also look at another example of such criticism. Mallikarjuna Shastri wrote in *Sri Krishnasukti* in a piece titled "Kavite" that "...(Govinda Pai) spoiled the epigraph; refuted *Shabdamani Darpana* and started imitating Tennyson of English to spoil Kannada" (quoted in Ananthanarayana, 1991: 42). The debate around giving up alliteration was also cast in terms of Kannada v/s English, Tradition v/s modernity. In *Vagbushana* Mahdeva Prabhakara Poojara wrote a 14-page article to support giving up alliteration and old Kannada prosody. The people who took the side with giving up alliteration, did not cast the debate in terms of Kannada v/s English. or Tradition v/s modernity. They chose to appeal to rationality in leaving old Kannada prosody and alliteration. They quoted (or sometimes invented) poems where just because of alliteration. certain words came in and spoiled the meaning of the poem. They were for the first time moving towards a definition of the poet and the poem in tune with Romanticism. This can be witnessed in Poojar's article in *Vagbushana.* He tries to make a distinction between poetry (poetic quality) and the external attributes to it:

> *Alankaras* (ornaments) help our body to look good, even our poetic *alankaras* make our poetry beautiful. but ornaments themselves can't fill in for poetry. Even in poetry the *alankara* based on words is of lesser significance. In writing poetry it is not so important (quoted in Ananthanarayana, 1991: 43).

He defines poem and poetry thus:

> From the point of view of poetry. sticking to rules of prosody is not so important. The emotional outpouring (*Bhavalahari*) or

> *Rasalahari* coming out of the mouth of the poet is poetry. Prosody is artificial and is not natural to poetry. The *rasalahari* that arises in the heart of poet comes out in the form of sentences that a poet speaks. When he speaks he doesn't count the number of words or phonemes (quoted in Ananthanarayana, 1991: 43).

He further clarifies that if the poet has to adhere to the rules of prosody and alliteration, he may have to change his emotions to suit prosody and this would adversely affect the poetry itself. He concludes saying:

> Poets who write *rasa pradhana* (where rasa is a major component) poems can violate old rules if these rules are coming in the way of their rasa. Just because prosody didn't affect our old poets, it doesn't mean that it won't affect anyone.

Further he says:

> If for poets with imagination, alliteration is acting as a handcuff then they have to cut it off... if there are any shortcomings in the poem due to lack of alliteration, the poets should fill the lack imaginatively, so that the shortcomings won't come to the notice of the readers. By negating alliteration rules 1 don't think that it will adversely affect either the Kannada language or the Kannadaness of Kannada speakers. It is natural that when there is something new, people raise a huge cry against it. A poet who wishes to give the world an emotion (rasa) -dominated poem that everybody will love, should make a road trespassing the alliteration rule (Quoted in Ananthanarayana, 1991: 44).

In the above statements, we can clearly discern a shift towards imagination and emotion from pedantry in language. It is not for the first time that there was discussion about alliteration in Kannada literature. The first available literary text of Kannada *Kaviraja Marga* mentions that alliteration is a compulsory rule and it

adorns poetry. In fact this rule of second syllable alliteration does not exist in Sanskrit. In order to conform to the rule, Kannada poets used to add or delete words in a line. In 1918, in *Karnataka Vaibhava*, R.G. Habbu wrote in support of doing away with the alliteration rule. The editor of *Kannada Kogile* Muliya Timmappayya also voted in favor of giving up the rule. If we look at his writings, we see that till 1918 he wrote poetry with second syllable alliteration and only after that did he take liberty with the rule (Timmappayya. 1990). Around the same time. Kavyananda Punekara in Dharwad too stopped following the alliteration rule. The prominent literary personalities who stood in favor of the alliteration rule were R. Mangesha Rao, Mulabagala Narasopant and Keruru Vasudevacharya. Mulabagala Narasopant had written about "The Murder of Kannada Prosody" in the November 1918 edition of *Vagbushana* magazine. It was a reply to an article by Kannada Vamana in the May issue of the same magazine. Kannada Vamana had translated a part of *Prithviraja*, an epic in Bengali by Jogindranatha Basu, without any alliteration to assert the view of the supporters of freedom from old prosody. As a reply to it Narasopant wrote:

> There is no relation between Kannada and English languages. It is absurd to follow the style of English in Kannada. The poems, which are against the wisdom of our old pandits, against our current grammar, against our language tradition, will be murdering our Kannada language and doesn't suit the language. Kannada language doesn't need poems, which are against our rule and are written about crow and owl (Quoted in Dharawadakara, 1975: 50).

Keruru Vasudevacharya, one of the earliest novelists in Kannada, wrote supporting the alliteration rule in the December issue of the magazine *Shubodaya* that was edited by him. Pandit Keshava Sharma Galagali, wrote opposing him in *Vagbushana.* He concludes his argument thus:

> What I stress again and again is that free the beautiful lady, poetry, by freeing her legs from the cuffs. Let her freely move around the garden of Kannada discourse. In this age of freedom, it is not good for us to keep Kannada poetry goddess in custody (quoted in Dharawadakara. 1975: 51).

But finally the rule of alliteration was left behind to suit the needs of the new themes and also in accordance with the practice in English and Bengali. It is not the oppressive present that we witness in the then Kannada scenario, though those who opposed any changes in Kannada prosody might have felt so, but the oppressive past/tradition.

We have seen in the above discussion that the stress was increasingly towards the expression of individual emotions (rasa) and feelings on a theme than on the description of the same using ornamental language. This shift can also be traced back to the influence of British Romantic poetry both directly and also indirectly from Bengali, where modern poetry had already arisen, after coming under the influence of British literature.

Earlier in Kannada poetry the poet used to talk about himself only in the opening verses, in the rest of the poem, he would depict what he was supposed to.[86] While depicting it he would have used his own experiences to narrate other experiences, but that is a different story. As Dharawadakar says, "if the poet is suffering from pangs of separation from his wife that also has to come out of the mouth of Rama who was separated from Sita" (Dharawadakar. 1975: 56). This situation changed in the early 20th century. The notion of poetry as enunciated in English Romantic poetry came to acquire the definition of poetry. To be precise it was Wordsworth's definition in his preface to the *Lyrical Ballads* that ruled the roost.[87] But as Raghavendra Rao says it is not just the influence of the *Lyrical Ballads* but the kind of transformation that was going on due to the process of modernization that created a conducive atmosphere for modern poetry

(Raghavendra Rao. 1995: 41). He identifies changes in the composition of readership and communication as reasons for changes in poetry. Earlier poetry was read aloud in a congregation. The focus was on reading poetry aloud. So naturally the focus was on the sound pattern that would make it amenable for hearing it than on emotions and feelings. In feet Gamakis who would read poetry aloud were there in most of the villages. The art of reading was called Gamaka. So the equation then was one Gamaki and several listeners. But with the advent of universal education and printing technology the equation changed to one book and one reader. With this, poetry became an individual interaction with the poem in privacy instead of a public affair. This however is not to deny the existence of individual reading of poetry earlier. Only, now reading poetry became more important than singing it in public. The function of narration of a story, which was earlier performed by the epic/poetry, now shifted to other genres such as novel and short story. With this, poetry became more inward looking and subjective in the expression of individual emotions and feelings. As the narration function was taken over by other genres the length of the poem decreased. With the decrease in length, modern Kannada poetry gained a certain freedom to invent new forms. But the kind of form it acquired was not a direct replication of the English poetic forms but a reorganization of the old forms that existed already in Kannada. This is well shown by T. N. Srikantia (Raghavendra Rao. 1995: 35-37).

Thus modern Kannada poetry took shape in a span of nearly a hundred years through the efforts of Christian missionaries, colonial administrators and the native elite, who emerged out of the processes unleashed by the colonial administration and modernity. We have also seen in this section that modern Kannada poetry was a mixture of both - what existed already, and what came as a colonial/modern package. I will look at this mixture that emerged a little more closely in the last section of this chapter.

But the question that arises out of the account of the first hundred years of modern Kannada poetry is that though there were many attempts prior to B.M. Srikantia, why has B.M. Srikantia acquired the status of an initiator of a certain kind of discursive practice. Whether in giving up the second syllable alliteration, which stood for the old Kannada poetry, or using modern Kannada, or translating English poetry there have been predecessors to B.M. Srikantia.

To make this point clearer. let me give a few examples. In the book *Kodagu Desada Varnane* (1869) (A Description of Kodagu Country), A. Grater has penned a poem on Kodagu. and I am quoting just the first stanza and the last one to show the lucidity of the language used. A rough translation of the same is provided on the right side of the poem:

Kodagu svadeshavu	/Our land Kodagu
Esto chandavaadudu!	/how Beautiful it is
Betta betta tudiye	/the land of peaked mountains
Malenadu teerave	/shored by mountainous regions
Neelabanna kadalu	/the blue ocean
Suttu muttu kanbudu	/all around us

Innu yenu kadime	/What else is needed
Kodava janangake?	/for this Kodava race
Astu preeti maaduva	/if the loving
Kartanada devara	/all mighty god
Nambi sevisidare.	/is believed and worshipped by the people
Suka poorty janake![88]	/they can all live in happiness.

If we look at this poem it becomes very clear that it has already given up second syllable alliteration and uses a contemporary Kannada diction. This language and

form is in no way different from that of Srikantia's translations. Only the style might change. This poem is a very simple description of Kodagu country, whose people are well endowed with all natural resources, and it ends on the note that with all these things if the people of Kodagu believe and serve the Almighty they will be completely happy. Language here tries to be transparent without any metaphor or simile. Except the content and style, in terms of use of contemporary language and form, it is similar to any early twentieth century modem Kannada poem. We also see that the last letter rhyming pattern of English poems, which later became the mainstay of modern Kannada literature, are found in this poem already.

Similarly look at another poem in a textbook *Kannada Kaviteya Modalane Pustaka* (1873 - The first Kannada poetry reader) published by the Bombay presidency government. The poem titled "Mangana Aata" (The play of a Monkey) is in the form of Shatpadi, an old Kannada prosody. The language is contemporary literary Kannada. It has not left the second syllable alliteration, though.

Ondu mangavu tanna kaiyolu
Chandavagiha kola pidiyuta
Andadali gejjegala kattisikondu naduvinali
Bandu vaiyaradali nintiha
Kanda hotina mele kuduta
Mandi noduva haage periya tirugisuttihavu

A rough translation of it reads like this:

A monkey in its hand
holding a beautiful stick
wearing jingling bells
gracefully came to the middle
and sat on the little goat
and as people watched, started a circular procession.

Though it employs a new literary diction, it goes back to the old form and adheres to second syllable alliteration rule. So though the diction is new, the poem appears to be structured around the old rule.

As we saw earlier, it was Govinda Pai who consciously took the decision to leave the second syllable alliteration rule. Hattiyangadi Narayanarao then published a poetry collection of English translations by the name *Angla Kavitavali* (1919).[90] But none of these have been canonized like B.M. Srikantia, as the precursor of modern Kannada poetry. In the next section I will try to locate some of the reasons that might have contributed to the canonization of B.M. Srikantia.

II

The canonization of B.M. Srikantia has haunted some of the critics. but instead of looking into how canons form, the> have tried to reinstate someone else in the place of B.M. Srikantia. Critics from north Karnataka have tried to prop up the Geleyara Balaga group as the first such entity alleging that the canonization of Srikantia was due to the prominence attributed to B.M. Srikantia by the Mysore literary circle ignoring the North Karnataka writers. Similarly some other critics have tried to highlight Hattiyangadi Narayanarao. as his is the first collection of poetry translated from English.

It is true that canonization of B.M. Sri has something to do with the dominance of Mysore-Bangalore literary circle. but it isn't enough of an explanation for the canonization of Srikantia. Even if we assume this explanation as the sole or partial reason, the question of why Mysore-Bangalore literary circle acquired such dominance remains. For this we need to look at the institutionalization of Kannada literature and its activities in this region.

There are two important moments in the process of institutionalization of Kannada literature in Mysore. The first one is the establishment of Kannada Sahitya Parishat in 1915. Much earlier the Karnataka Bashoiiivini Sabha (An association for Karnataka language rejuvenation) had been established in the 1880s in Mysore by the King of Mysore Sri Jayachamarajendra Wodeyar. Following this move, in Dharwad, which was in Bombay-Karnataka, Karnataka Vidyavardhaka Sangha was established in 1890. Jayachamarajendra Wodeyar generously contributed to its establishment. Vidyavardhaka Sangha did well to promote Kannada literature announcing prizes to the best novel, poem etc. It published several Kannada books. It also established a magazine *Vagbushana* in 1896, which supported the cause of Kannada language and literature.

Under the Diwanship of M. Vishveshwaraiah. the Mysore State was developing economically and industrially into a modern model state. In order to get feedback for his plans. Vishveshwaraiah had established the Mysore Economic Conference, which also published a bulletin on the affairs of Mysore State. In the 1914 annual conference of the MEC. a decision was taken to recommend to the Government to establish an autonomous body. Parishat, for encouraging production of books in Kannada on various subjects. It also recommended that the Government should support the Parishat financially. Along with this recommendation it also constituted a sub-committee to establish such a bod). This sub-committee invited suggestions from various people and held a conference in 1915 on those suggestions. It was in this conference that the Karnataka Sahitya Parishat was established. B.M. Srikantia was very active in the **activities** of the Parishat. He was its Vice-president and later became the President from 1938 to 1943. He also chaired the 14th annual conference of the Parishat in 1928 held at Gulbarga. He was the one who devised the flag of Kannada and an emblem of the Parishat, which had in it the map of Kannada-speaking regions. He was also instrumental in establishing a Printing press of its own for the Parishat. He took interest in changing the name of the Parishat from Karnataka Sahitya Parishat to Kannada Sahitya Parishat.[91]

The second moment was that of establishing a Kannada Department at Mysore University. It again goes to the credit of B.M. Srikantia. It was established in 1927. It trained many post-graduates in Kannada, who in turn became researchers, poets and critics. B.M. Srikantia was the first honorary Kannada professor at this department. Both Mysore University and Kannada Sahitya Parishat, apart from encouraging writing in Kannada and publishing them, also became centres that would write the history of Kannada literature both modern as well as non-modern.[92] Towards this end a series called *Mysore Vishvavidyalaya Kannada Grantha Male* was envisaged of which B.M. Srikantia was the general editor. The university not only produced knowledge about Kannada and Karnataka but also spread it through training/teaching thousands of students and by publishing the same to reach many others.[93]

It is not that Kannada Sahitya Parishat was a regional institution catering only to the needs of the Mysore State. Since its conceptualization and inception it had representatives from other regions in its governing body. For example when the elections to the first executive committee of the Parishat was held in 1915, apart from the office bearers it had members from all regions: twelve from the Mysore region, eight from the Bombay region, five from the Madras region, two from the princely states of southern Maharashtra, two from the Hyderabad- Karnataka region and one from the Kodagu region.[94] Though the number of representations heavily favors Mysore, no region was neglected. But the people who participated in the projects undertaken by both University and Parishat were drawn invariably from the Mysore region. As its scope covered the whole of Kannada speaking regions, it helped them to reach the other parts. But it was a one-way traffic. Many have voiced their dissatisfaction with the workings of the Kannada Sahitya Parishat (Venkatrao, 1974: 227 and 1999: 22). Thus the opinions of Mysore people reached almost all the people through the activities of Parishat and the Mysore **University** (through both teaching and publishing).

It is not that other regions lacked any institutional attempt to promote and publish Kannada literature. The groups in coastal region and North Karnataka were very active in publishing and also in cultivating their own readership. Apart from Karnataka Vidyavardhaka Sangha, there were many other small organizations, which supported such activities. But the reach that these activities commanded was small when compared to the reach of Mysore University and the Parishat. The institutions in Mysore had active patronage of the State unlike in the case of institutions that existed outside Mysore state. Thus a regional imbalance had been created and a pro-Mysore bias had set in into Kannada and Karnataka related activities.

The above account shows that there was a regional imbalance and a bias in favor of Mysore, but that alone is not a sufficient factor to explain the canonization of B.M. Srikantia.

As I said earlier, the reach of the institutions in Mysore was more wide-ranging, compared to that of the institutions in other places. While shaping the subjectivity of the newly emerging educated reading class, the discourses that were circulated by the institutions in Mysore played a prominent role. To be precise, B.M. Srikantia played an important role in cultivating the new reader who emerged during this period. An analysis of the various speeches and occasional writings of B.M. Srikantia would provide us some inkling of the way B.M. Srikantia fashioned the subjectivity of the newly emerging educated reading class and also of the other writers. It would also reveal the constituent elements of their subjectivity.

Many researchers have analyzed the relationship between the emergence of the educated middle class and modern literature in Indian languages.[95] But education cannot be the sole reason for the making of a reading public: it is just an essential requirement. There are other forces that determine their reading. What they read depends on their subjectivity, which in turn might depend on their social

background. Again, social background alone cannot be the sufficient explanation for the shaping of their subjectivity in a particular way. There could be a relationship between the way their subjectivity gets shaped and their social background. Shivarama Padikkal who has analyzed the relationship between the emergence of the novel form in Kannada says that it was the elite class, which read the novel. He says that though reading became universalized through the democratization process, this universalization itself took place within the ambit of the literate class (Padikkal, 2001: 252). He has tried to look at the content of novels and magazines that they read to determine what could have been the subjectivity of the reading class. What I will do in the following section is that, by looking at the occasional writings and speeches of B.M. Srikantia, I will try to delineate the way in which the subjectivity of the educated class was molded into a modern Kannada reader. In another sense I would be looking at the emergence of the modern Kannada reader. I also argue that at the same time, we witness the emergence of the modern Kannada writer. It is not that the readers read whatever the writer writes or the writer writes only what the readers read. They mutually complement each other and both are influenced by the larger discourses that are operating in society.

Why did the others who wrote/translated lyrical poetry before the publication of *English Geetagalu* not make an impact like that of B.M. Srikantia is an important question. Earlier attempts, though they might have been influential in their own way, were scattered in various journals and magazines; so it was not easy to identify their influence and hence most probably might have been overlooked by modern Kannada literary historians. But *Angla Kavitavali* of Hattiyangadi Narayanarao though published before *English Geetegalu* also did not seem to have made any impact. *Angla Kavitavali,* as mentioned earlier, is a collection published in 1919, comprising translation of poems from English literature by Hattiyangadi Narayanarao. Hattiyanagdi Narayanarao was from South Canara district. He was educated and started practicing as a lawyer in Madras but soon shifted to Bombay as the editor *of Indian Social Reformer* in 1898. It is said that

he started writing poems around 1900. but the translated poems in *Angla Kavitavali* began to be published in various journals since 1918. Some of these poems appeared under the name "Angla Kavitasara" in the March 1918 edition of *Vagbhushana* of Dharwad. A few other poems were published as part of his articles "Kannada Kaviteya Bhavitavya" (The future of Kannada poem) and "Kavitavardhana" (The growth of a poem) in Karnataka Sahitya Parishat magazine. But the entire collection of his translated poems came out in 1919. The book was printed in Puttur of South Canara district. But as it was published in Bombay, the copies of the book were hard to procure for the Kannada-speaking people, as Panje Mangesha Rao recollects (Quoted in Panditaradhya, 1985: xi). Till the 1980s the copy of Panje Mangesha Rao was the only available copy. It had been passed on to T.N. Srikantia in 1953 and then to S. Ananthanarayana in 1962. Thus copies of Hattiyangadi Narayanarao's poems were not available to the people and also to the literary historians. Dharwadkar was the first one to identify the publication of Narayanarao's poems in the magazine *Vagbhushana.* It is not incidental that Dharawadakar identified it when he wrote the history of modem Kannada literature with special reference to North Karnataka as a response to Havanur's history of early modern Kannada literature. which he glossed as neglecting the literan activities that had taken place in North Karnataka.[96] Till the 1970s it was thought that Narayanarao had published two collections of translated poems *Angla Kcn'itavali* and *Angla Kavitasara.* Only with the publication of the Panditaradhya edited *Angla Kavitavali* were some misconceptions were cleared. Though *Angla Kavitavali* was reviewed in various magazines existing then. none of the literary historians have talked about it.[97]

Thus it is clear that writers like Hattiyangadi Narayanarao. though they published anthologies of English poems were not recognized and read by the readers then. Does it mean that Hattiyangadi Narayanarao had not translated them according to their taste? It is true that he has kept the second syllable alliteration intact in his translated poems. But in 1919 the debate over giving up the second syllable

alliteration was still going on and was unresolved. So we cannot say that because he used the second syllable alliteration, his translations were not popular.

However, it is interesting to see what position Narayanarao had about the second syllable alliteration debate. In his article "Kavitavardhana" written in January 1919, he takes up this issue for discussion. He takes a very curious stand: "1 wouldn't say that the decision of our old poets to have the second syllable in every line to be the same in a Kannada poem is wrong. But 1 wouldn't also say that instead of second syllable alliteration if we had the last syllable of each line rhyming it is not melodious" (Narayanarao. 1985: 121). For the first proposition he falls back on music to substantiate it. For the second proposition he says, "in Kodava songs we find the last syllable alliteration. May be that was the custom in Dravidians[98]". He further says that though till now he has written more than a thousand lines of poetry he has not left the second syllable alliteration. But he is quick to add that we cannot say that by leaving it we would lose the melody of poetry (Narayanarao, 1985: 121).

If we come to his use of language in translated poetry, it is clearly what we would recognize as modern literary Kannada. In the above-mentioned article he also touches upon the issue of language. He is of the clear opinion that we have to use new Kannada in writing popular poetry of today. He further says that though it is important to safeguard old Kannada language that exists in old texts, writing in old Kannada is as useless as writing in Sanskrit today (Narayanarao, 1985: 121). When it comes to the liberty of the poet. he clearly states that the poet has the liberty to take old myths and stories to rewrite them in a new fashion. He reminds us about the Jaina and Brahmin poets of Old Kannada who interpreted myths according to their religious mooring (Narayanarao. 1985: 122).

Thus his position about language. alliteration and the liberty of the poet was in tune with his times, but still his translations did not gain the importance that came to be acquired by Srikantia's *English Geetegalu.* One obvious reason that would

come up as we look at the story of the availability of his *Angla Kavitavali* is that of the location of its publication. But that cannot be a sufficient reason. I would say that Narayanarao translated only poems from English into Kannada but Srikantia not only translated poems from English into Kannada but also did much more than that: he translated the literate classes from one sensibility to another sensibility. That is, B.M. Srikantia accomplished the task of translating readers. He also created a group of writers who wrote like him. He shaped the sensibilities of the readers to receive the kind of translations/writing that he was directly or indirectly responsible for. It was not just enough to have a literate people in a culture, and translate new writing for them; one had to convert/translate this literate class into a reading community.

Studies on the emergence of the middle class readership in India as a consequence of the introduction of English education have identified the crucial role English education has played in the emergence of modern literatures in Indian languages. But literacy through English education cannot be a sufficient reason for the emergence of a middle class readership. it would just be a pre-condition. and it needs other factors to convert this literate class into a particular reading community. It might be argued that the English education through English literature cultivated a new sensibility that enabled them to write and read "modern" literature. But again this is only partially true. Because "modern" literatures that emerged in Indian languages were not just the replicas of their English "counterparts". It was much more than that and therefore demands a separation of the colonial discourse from that of the nationalist one, which at one level seem to be one and the same (See Chatterjee, 1989). So what gets configured as "modern" and what gets configured alongside it either as the "other" that has to be eschewed or the "other" that complements the "modern-self" for the nationalist elite has to be looked into. In other words, what we need to look at is the mediation activity performed by the English literate native elite while translating "liberal" discourse into native languages. In this context too,

looking at B.M. Srikantia's writings would offer some insights into this translation process.

B.M. Srikantia's book *Kannadigarige Olleya Saahitya* (1948) (Good literature for Kannada people), as the name itself suggest selects certain texts as good literature for the Kannada people. Though the book was published only in 1948, many of the articles collected in it date back to 1911. Some of them are actually the prefaces he wrote to the books written by others, of whom many were his colleagues or students. The first article in the book is a speech delivered at Karnataka Vidyavardhaka Sangha in 1911. It is a very important historical document, which clearly speaks out the agenda before Srikantia and also how he places this as an agenda of Kannada. To understand the politics of the new literary sensibility that was shaping up during this period, it is essential to look at this article more carefully.

The article is titled as "Kannada Maatu Tale Ettuva Bage" (Ways of Improving Kannada Language). The focus of the lecture is on the present condition and the development of Kannada language. The speech starts by addressing the audience as "Aryare" (Aryans). Aryans was a term that was then used to denote the people who were supposed to have come from Central Asia to India, and was normally used to refer to "Hindus" and "Indians" in the nationalist context. But in south India in the context of non-Brahmin movement this referred only to Brahmins and was derogatory. The term Aryan was conceived as Brahmin and perceived as the "other", and the term Dravida was used to construct a "self" to give it a political charge in the Dravidian movement. Dravidians were supposed to be the original inhabitants of India before the Aryans pushed them towards south of India. Srikantia's use of the term 'Aryans" while addressing the audience would mean then that the audience was by and large of Brahmins. It also indicates the composition of the class that had acquired English education and was interested in Kannada language related activities.

His speech begins by taking up the argument put forth by people who do not agree with the notion of developing Kannada language. The first argument that he takes up for refuting is that of people who advocate Hindi and English in place of the native languages. He summarizes their argument thus:

> (Now) in the heyday of the red people (*kempu janaru* - the British), we have been integrated with the outside world, we are suffocating and lagging behind in English education, Business. Industry. We might be having a peaceful life under the British rule. But other *purushartha*s will come only when we earn them by uniting together.[99] The obstacles in the way of unity of people of the Aryan land must be set on fire. The tradition, caste, religion should be one. But before that the language should be one. Either English or Hindi, whichever is possible. Let other languages die. If we waste our energy on the development of these languages, which are about to die, we will be creating obstacles to the unity of the people of India (Srikantia, 1983: 246).

After summarizing the above argument B.M. Srikantia says that

> the people who think so are not bad people, in fact they are thinking of the long term good. They are advocating their opinion in the larger interest of the entire country. What can we, the people who believe in the development of Indian languages say to them? Can we say that we don't want unity? If without a language, there is no unity, then it is better to drop Indian languages. But it is not the case. It is true that if there is a single language it is good. And those people who have a single language are lucky. But having a single language or multiple languages depends on the history. In whichever country only a single type of people increased, there we find a single language. But in India, it was a different history altogether. Though we had only two tribes the Arya and the Sudra. the two languages of these tribes have become now at least more than fifteen. How can we select one out of

> this and say everyone should accept this? Will others agree to leave their language and learn something else? What will happen to their pride? What will be the effort of teaching a language to all of them? Even if they learn, there will be only one language for the people, but with the ruler we have to talk in English. At least for that we have to learn English. Then some people might suggest why not make English the language of the country? Just think is it possible to make everyone in this country learn English? Till they all learn English what should we do? When we have Kannada language at hand, why should we keep quiet till everyone learns English? (Srikantia, 1983: 245-46)

While answering people who hold the view that for the unity of India it is necessary to have a single language either English or Hindi, he explores the idea of language and nationalism. He agrees that it is good to have a single language in a country but he says that it is impossible in the Indian context. He subscribes to the view that a nation is already there and we must just get united. And this can happen even without a single common language. He also warns that in fact imposing a single language might offend the pride of many people who speak other languages. He also shows how impractical it is to teach a new common language (English) to everyone, when they already have one.

This doesn't mean that he was against English. He proposes another position:

> To deal with political matters, to discuss the issues that span entire India and also for our interaction with people of other regions we shall use English. Within the region for the sake of educating children, women and peasantry (Okkaliga) we shall use Kannada. Thus along with one national language if we have many desi languages they can coexist without any problems. The proposition that a state needs a single language is not true.

The solution he proposed was that of a two-tier system:

> With pride we need to develop our desa bhashe for the sake of people of that region, and for usefulness let us accept English for the sake of the educated class of India, as this benefits both the groups (Srikantia, 1983: 246).

The position he proposes conceives the Indian nation in terms of region and their congregation. We can see an incipient form of federal system of languages in his position. He proposes English at the national level and "desi" (vernacular) languages at the regional level. This position also envisages the native English educated elite to hold the regions together using English and mediate between the nation and the region. At another level, this can also be seen as the upper caste English educated male mediating between the nation and its citizens, mainly children, women and the peasantry, the Sudra class. The politics of upper caste men envisaging themselves as a mediating class between the nation and its citizens or the imperial class and its subjects is crucial and helps us to see what kind of modernity and liberal discourse got instituted in vernacular languages.[100] It is interesting to see if the same kind of mediation happens across languages or is it language specific. However, as the scope of this study is limited to Kannada literature. I restrain myself from venturing into such a comparative study.

Even as B.M.Srikantia argues for accepting a two-tier formula, he is quick to add that Sanskrit, the language of the Aryans should not be forgotten:

> (Sanskrit is the language of) our ancestors (and) ... all our books are mainly in Sanskrit. Without knowing Sanskrit, we can't understand our history, without having a sense of history we can't analyze our present condition, without knowing the present condition we can't think of our future. Therefore the educated class in India should know English, Sanskrit and the language of his region well. For individual benefit and also for the progress of

> our country we need these three languages necessarily (Emphasis added. Srikantia: 246-47).

Here we see that it is not just a two-tier system of language that he envisages but a three- tier one, in which Sanskrit also plays an important role. The role of the Sanskrit is very crucial. As he says, it is the language of "our" ancestors. He is not advocating that just because it is the language of "our" ancestors we have to keep it. but because it tells us about "our" past. And an understanding of our past is necessary to analyze our present and also plan our future. He is not for installing the new by wiping out the old but by using the old to know the present and also build the future. He doesn't visualize a dichotomous position between history. the present context and the future. He strings them together to complement each other. And he says that for the educated class (the group that holds the reins of the nation or the one that mediates between nation and its subjects). it is necessary to know the three languages (for the others it is essential to know only the language of the region). The mediation of the educated class is going to be informed by the wisdom of the past contained in Sanskrit.

Later in the speech he takes up the issue of Kannada literature. The agenda he sets out for the educated "Aryans" is that of sifting and refining the old literature. He also advises the future writers about what to write:

> If we don"t refine the old literature and follow certain regulations (in writing literature), nobody will read them. no matter how many books you write. The educated won't look at it and the uneducated will be indifferent to it (Srikantia. 1983: 249).

Before setting out to tell them what to write and how to write. he briefly touches upon Kannada literature's relation with Sanskrit:

> We all know that for strengthening the Kannada language, Sanskrit is the base. Aryans brought civilization to Dravidians when they came down to south (of India). They enriched the language to make it fit for the expression of emotions of the civilization; taught us writing; showed us what poetry is; they also gave us prosody, poetics, myth, and history. ...They helped Dravidians through their language (Sanskrit)...by this the language got strengthened, knowledge developed, their religion (mata) became great.

The nature of relationship Srikantia conceives between Kannada and Sanskrit is one of patron and client, or shall I say of the benevolent conqueror with his subjects. The argument in support of justify ing the colonial rule in India and elsewhere that the culture of the colonized is inferior and uncivilized and only the colonizer's culture and his rule can civilize it. gets applied by Srikantia to an old conquest. But what happens once this civilizing mission is over? Srikantia has this to say:

> But the Jains and Brahmins who wrote in Kannada didn't enrich Karnataka. It is true that these people taught religious themes; but their style, theme. emotions didn't cater to the taste of the common people. 1 doubt whether the common people of olden days read any of their texts.... Common people in the south mean not the Aryans but the Sudras. Aryans had contempt for Sudras. Even now they have it. maybe it was much greater in those days....

Here, Kannada. he seems to suggest. enriched by Sanskrit became too pedantic in the hands of Jaina and Brahmin poets and consequently moved away from people. The pattern here seems to be one of constructing a golden past, then a Dark Age before pointing to the present need for rejuvenation. He is also aware of the fact that the issue is not just one of Pandits v/s common people, but also the contempt that the Aryans (Pandits) had for the Sudras (common people).

> (The old poets) wrote for the Kings, not for the people. But as the importance of Kings declined their glamour also declined. Only since the time of Shaiva devotees do we get poetry written for the people. But if the poetry of Jainas and Brahmins looked too outdated due to its pedantry, the poetry of Lingayats lacked any scholarship. Nowadays Yakshagana (Classical Folk theatre in Coastal Karnataka), Dombi Dasara Pada (Songs of the nomadic Dasas). Shuka Saptati (songs of lizards) have become great epics for our people! (Srikantia. 1983: 249-50)

The pattern is now complete: people's tastes are completely corrupted. They are addicted to popular cheap songs and believe that it is great poetry. He is also quick to dismiss *Vachana* literature as lacking in scholarship. Thus by tracing the golden past. the Dark Age and the pathetic condition of the present, the ground is prepared for the new influence that can lift Kannada literature from the crisis it is in.

> Only English literature can rejuvenate our Kannada literature; only English can remove the ills besetting our poetry that has trickled down to us from Sanskrit (Srikantia. 1983: 250).

What are the ills that have to be taken care of? He classifies the ills as relating to six categories: theme, narrative structure. emotions. mode of depiction. style and form. After describing each of them he says that the people can't understand "our" literature because of these ills. In order to turn people towards literature he asks both Sanskrit and English literates to chalk out a program of action. He has two sets of programs - one for old literature that already exists. and another one for the literature that is to be written.

He says "whatever be the problems with the old literature it is not completely useless: we can learn the history of Mysore from epigraphs; Epics can be used to know the history and society of the past; we can also know about religious issues. We need them to have a history of language and literature.'" So he proposes three concrete steps that are to be taken up in this direction: 1. Collect all the available texts of the past and get them printed. 2. After publishing all these texts, use them to write the history of Kannada language, old and new Kannada grammar, dictionaries, poetics, prosody, and history of literature from today's point of view. The people who undertake this should know both Sanskrit and English traditions, and by weighing each of them they should find a new direction. 3. Choose fine excerpts from old poetry to teach children.

Then he takes up the question of how a new writing should be:

> Use new Kannada for all writings. Old Kannada should be used only for the texts that have to be understood by the educated class or for great epic-play-poems. We should not mix old and new Kannada. The standard Kannada should not be infiltrated by rustic words. It has to be the language of the educated and the upper caste people. By teaching this language in schools, we can make everybody use the same (Srikantia. 1983: 254).

A clear-cut economy of languages (or the dialects of a language) is evolved here by Srikantia. For the writings, that everyone is going to read, he prescribes the use of new Kannada. He is also clear about what he means by new Kannada, a language not spoken by all but by the educated upper castes. If so then how will the others understand this language? By teaching this language in schools, he says we can make it available to all. The language of the educated upper castes will be the standard literary language. He also has the answer to the question why language has to be refined in this way: "So that all can read. The time when we wrote for Kings and Pandits has gone now. Now women, men, children, elders,

Brahmins and Vokkaligas all have to read" (1983: 254). He is advocating a new language economy for democratic times and is aware that autocracy is on the decline. Not only the language, even the themes have to be such that it will help the society in its development, such as the history of India, development of religions, medicine, law and scientific writings, which will help in eradicating superstitions, etc. He again envisages a mediatory body of people who learn from Sanskrit and English to mediate a modern discourse to the people who know only the native language.

He says that profit alone is not to be the sole motive for publishing, what is published must also be entertaining. He says that to pass time and to refresh minds fiction, novel and entertaining episodes have to be written. He advises writers that they would get a lot of help for this purpose from English as it has aplenty in these genres. He says that the time is not yet ripe for writing epics (big poems) and plays. His stand is that these can be translated from other languages, as our language is not yet capable of producing such a one in it. He also advocates writing biographies of earlier acharyas. poets and heroes. so as to generate patriotism and self-pride in our children.

He asks the audience, the learned class, to give up hesitation, if any. in translating from English. As earlier Kannada had benefited from translating from Sanskrit, it would now benefit from English. He says that English literature itself became rich by drawing from great literatures of Greek. Latin, German, French and Sanskrit. On the mode of translation he says that "we need to translate as **we want** from these languages to fill the treasure of Kannada. After some time both swadeshi and videshi will get together. and those which doesn't fit either. will be left out to give us the best literature" (Emphasis added. Srikantia, 1983: 255). It is clear here that he is advocating a kind of translation that we call today as appropriation. He doesn't expect the translators to be faithful. At the same time he tells them not to worry about whether it would fit into Kannada or not. He says after some time the translations, which don't fit in, would automatically get dropped and only the best

will **survive. In** the same breath he says that he is not against translations from Sanskrit. He says that even if we want to. we cannot escape from our past. So he says that instead of translating dry plays from Sanskrit, the scholars should translate Shruti, Smriti. Upanishads. Myths and the treatises of great Acharyas in such a lucid way that even women can read them in every house. He advocates **two** one-way translations, one from English into Kannada and the other from Sanskrit into Kannada. I call it one-way translations because he doesn't talk about translations from Kannada into other languages. It is implicit that Kannada is at the bottom. the receiving end. Thus what would constitutes modern Kannada literature would not just be a selective appropriation/ translation from English but would also be afflicted/complemented by translations from Sanskrit.

In another speech delivered at Gulbarga. when he chaired the 1928 annual conference of Kannada Sahitya Parishat he reiterates his stand. This speech is titled "Kannadigarige Olleya Sahitya" (Good literature for Kannada people). It is matter of prestige to chair the annual conferences of the Sahitya Parishat. The people who are related to Kannada language and literature make it a point to attend these conferences and the chairperson's speech assumes a lot of significance.[101] It is interesting to note how he addresses the audience.

The speech starts by addressing the audience as ***Arya Mahashayare*** (Aryan gentlemen). The first sentence itself assigns a certain kind of subject position to the audience: "1 have to bow **my** head in humility for the honor you, the ***Deshabhimanh*** (the patriotic people) and ***Bashabhimanh*** (the people who love the language). have conferred on me" (Srikantia. 1983: 267). The subject position that he assigns to them is that of being patriotic towards their country and being proud of its language. In the second paragraph of the printed speech he addresses **them** as ***Mahashayare***. or gentlemen. Later addressing them as ***"'Karnataka Bhaktare"*** (The devotees of Karnataka), he asks them to listen to him. In the last two paragraphs he calls them *"Kannadigare"* (The Kannada speaking people) and "***Sahitya Kalaaradhakare***" (The connoisseurs of art and literature) (Srikantia,

1983: 267-279). It is important to take note of the subject positions that come together here: Aryan gentlemen are the people who love their country and its language. They are Kannada speakers, not just speakers but devotees of Kannada language. They are also the people who are connoisseurs of art and literature. As argued earlier, the word Aryan in Dravidian context in southern India means Brahmins, and if it is made to signify well-born or noble people, it might include non-Brahmin upper castes also. It is then attached to these Kannada speaking people who are patriotic towards their country' and love their language, art and literature. What then is good literature for these people, according to Srikantia?

In the first paragraph he recollects how as students in Madras University they had talked about coming back to Mysore and serving the Kannada land, its people and its language. They had planned to read all the Kannada epics and make others read them. By becoming teachers they wanted to instill in students the love for Kannada and also wanted to write books that would bring the best of the world (European) literature into Kannada. such as Shakespeare's plays, Greek plays, Plato"s dialogues and Carlyle's teachings. He claims that he is happy to be in the service of Kannada, though he has not able to execute all his plans as he had then wished (Srikantia, 1983-267).

Then he claims that for the betterment of a nation. among many other things, developing literature is also important. He says that for this very purpose the Sahitya Parishat has been established. Then he talks about how due to democratization of education. all - men, women and children - are becoming literate and they don't have good books to read during their leisure time. Here we can see how Srikantia, being part of the elite perceives the newly educated people whose social background is different from his and has felt the need to mold others' subjectivity through literature. He makes a plea for developing good literature that can be read by all to spend their leisure time usefully. He tells them that the range of literary experience that a person undergoes while reading English literature should be available for a reader in Kannada too. He clearly places

Kannada below English while comparing the two literatures. He shakes their complacency by saying that it is not enough to be content with what is there in old Kannada literature. He says if we compare the old Kannada texts with the best of the world literature, they seem to have no standing and calls for a proper assessment of the old texts. Further, he develops his argument that old and medieval Kannada texts would not be of any use for the modern man and his world. He regards most of the old texts as those that were compiled to spread a religion, or to spread a mythical history, or written by poets to exhibit their pedantry. So he calls for sifting these literary texts to select only good sections for teaching children. Then he reads out such selected pieces from *Pampa Bharatha* and from the epic *Harischandra Kavya* by Raghavanka. Then he says that our first and foremost duty is to cull out such good literature from old Kannada literature. Though he doesn't define what good literature is we can make out from the kind of selections he has made - to cull out such portions that are shorn of any religious overtones, and would fit in with what liberal discourse regards as "universal values". Here we see an attempt to fashion a "secular" Kannada self. Then he puts forth the second task before the modern educated Kannadigas, that of writing a new literature which caters to the aspirations, tastes and life style of the new world (Srikantia, 1983: 269-275).

Srikantia is very clear about what this new literature should be. Though it could take the help of old literature for its sustenance it should not be written to spread religion. It should be written to spread new knowledge, to get complete aesthetic experience and to inspire people to lead a better life. Then he declares that in the new age, the writer would use prose more than poetry, he would take the best from world literature to write in Kannada. He would leave mudslinging debates about religions and instead would spread the liberal essence of religions. The kinds of themes that he sets out are factual writings, biographies, history of communities, evolution of man, history culled out from epigraphs and other reliable sources of evidence. The new writer would depict the emotions of his own mind and that of his contemporaries, and the emotions of the heart in one

stroke like a monsoon downpour in the form of small poems and lyrics. The new writer would also write plays for the entertainment of people. He goes on listing all kinds of new genres that we see today like children's literature, social science writings, travelogues etc., (Srikantia, 1983-275).

While listing the tasks of the new writer he also describes the new writer as the one who knows the principle that "manujanige magu tande" (Child is the Father of Man). We can clearly see here the influence of Wordsworth. Even when he describes short poems and lyrics as downpour of emotions like a monsoon rain it echoes Wordsworth's definition of poetry that poetry is "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings"' (Wordsworth. 1986: 307). So the notion of literature and other related concepts were highly influenced by British Romantic literature.

He ends his speech with a clarion call to the Kannada people, similar to that of Swami Vivekananda's call to revive Hindu culture: "Awake, arise and begin the work" (Kannadigare Yeli. Echcharagolli. Aramba Maadi) of rejuvenation of Kannada language and literature (Srikantia. 1983: 278).

In his welcome speech at the 16* Kannada Sahitya Parishat annual conference held at Mysore. he again broaches the idea of new writings in Kannada. He takes up the question of how to understand this transition period. He says that some people might call it rejuvenation, others might call it reformation and still others might call it revolution, but whatever the nomenclature whenever these transitions occur it was not going to be a complete change. He is of the opinion that this transition is not a move from old to new but it would be a mixture of both old and new. He says that whatever was still useful for the new society it would remain and only those things which become obstacles for the march of new life would be removed. Srikantia uses this occasion to call for the unity of the people of all regions of Kannada-speaking areas in the onward march of Kannada society. He

not only proposes a unity between the people of the Kannada-speaking areas but also of all religions. At the end of the speech he tells them:

> Gentlemen, once we publish the old texts, the treasure of our elders will be available to us. It is a literature that is equal to all religions, be it Jaina epics, Veerashaiva epics, Brahmin epics or the Bible which is already available in our language, and I wish very soon the stream of Muslim poetry would soon join these streams of Kannada literature. Whatever be the nature of streams in front of us it is Kannada, so we all should respect it. We have to have a critical belief in all cultures, in all religions, in all literary traditions (Srikantia. 1983: 282-283).

Here we can see how he tries to strip the religious signification of old literary texts of Kannada to make them part of a secular Kannada literary tradition. He is not only alluding to Jaina. Veerashaiva and Brahmin texts, but also to the newly created Christian literature. He is aware of the fact that Muslims have not yet written in Kannada and wishes that they also would write soon and would join the mainstream secular Kannada tradition.[102] The Kannada elite felt the need to fashion a "secular" self and tried to bring in all communities within the ambit of a Kannada nationalist discourse.

Srikantia takes up the question of language in his speech delivered at Sahitya Parishat on 26th April 1935. It is titled "Kannadada Punarujeevana" (Kannada Renaissance). After defining what he means by Renaissance, he goes on to examine concepts like mother-tongue, Vernacular, National language. Language of the King. Classical language etc.,. Then he says that today there are four languages before the Kannada people: Sanskrit - the classical language. English - the language of the rulers and also the nation, Kannada - our language; with these three, a new language is now entering the horizon Hindi - as an alternative to English. Then he organizes languages on a priority basis. He says that the priority

should be to Kannada. He goes on to clarify further that it has to be a particular kind of Kannada that is *tiligannada* (a transparent/simple-Kannada), *tirulgannada* (the essence-Kannada). For the rejuvenation of Kannada he proposes borrowing freely from English and Sanskrit. He says that if there is anything to learn from Hindi, then we need to take from that too. After placing Kannada in the middle he puts other languages around it, from which Kannada has to draw sustenance for its rejuvenation.

In his welcome speech at the 5th Vasanta Sahityotsava organized by the Sahitya Parishat in Bangalore in 1938, for the first time he addresses the audience as Ladies and Gentlemen ("Mahileyare mattu Mahaniyare"). The printed speech is titled "Parishat should become the University of Kannada People". While chalking out the goals, objectives and future plans of the Parishat. he mentions that from that year in the utsavas (festivals) they have included a separate program for women and children everyday. There seems to be a move to include women as well in/for their agenda.

While inaugurating the Karnataka Sangha of Emmiganur in April 1940 he delivered a lecture called "Namma Kula Kannada Kula" (Our Caste is Kannada Caste).[103] Speaking about the necessity of such associations in Kannada-speaking regions, he says:

> We the Kannadigas need to get organized. When we proceed to serve our land and language, we have to set aside our narrow opinions such as distinctions of Brahmin and Non-Brahmin. We have to claim Kannada as our caste and Kannada as our gotra.[104] Kannada Gelge (Let Kannada win)-Kannada Balge (Let Kannada live) should become our Panchakshari Mantra. All Kannadigas should become the priests of Kannada. We should get her blessings to proceed towards worshipping Bharatambe[105] (Srikantia. 1983: 324).

Here we see him addressing the issue of caste for the first time. After mobilizing the educated upper castes and then women, he is trying to mobilize non-Brahmins for Kannada politics. He is trying to project Kannada identity as the primary identity for various castes and thereby bring unity among them. It is interesting that though the title directly alludes to castes, in his speech while naming them he uses the categories Brahmin and non-Brahmin. It would be appropriate here to mention that Mysore saw a bitter battle between Brahmins and non-Brahmins till the end of the 1940s. The only common factor that could bind the people was a Kannada identity. So B.M. Srikantia is projecting Kannada identity to neutralize caste-based identities, or at least asking them to give primacy to Kannada identity than the identities based on caste. But by 1940 Praja Mitra Mandali, the non-Brahmin party had merged with the Indian National Congress and pan-Indian nationalism was making strong inroads into the Mysore region. Till then Mysore state had been dominated by the Backward class movement (non-Brahmin movement) and Kannada movements, and the Indian National Congress was hardly a force to reckon with. In this context we have to see the next stage of his argument in the above-quoted passage. Though he says that Kannada identity should be our caste and we should all become priests of Kannada, he quickly adds that we have to worship mother Kannada to get her blessings before we proceed to worship Bharatambe.

We have seen how B.M. Srikantia is forging a Kannada identity in which regional differences, religious differences, gender differences and caste differences get submerged to form a secular identity of Kannada. The modern Kannada readers and writers are ascribed only one identity in B.M. Srikantia's scheme. Even the old literature which emerged out of religious moorings is to be stripped of its religious content and only those passages that depict liberal values in keeping with modern life are to be selected as the best and also deployed to construct a history of Kannada literature, language and culture. The new identity would thus combine the '"best" of the old literature and would also draw from Sanskrit and

English. This process of Kannada identity formation is somewhat similar to the formation of an Indian identity.

The rest of the essays in *Kannadigarige Olleya Sahitya* also reiterate the above sketched position. Most of these are either lectures delivered on various occasions or prefaces written to certain new writings. Most of these new writings are in tune with B.M. Srikantia's agenda for Kannada. Many of these new writers whose books figure in *Kannadigarige Olleya Sahitya* are either colleagues of B.M. Srikantia in Mysore University or his students. Thus B.M. Sri did not just translate a few poems from English into Kannada but translated the subjectivity of the educated middle class (which includes upper castes, women, people of other (than Hindu) religions, non-Brahmin castes) into a secular Kannada subjectivity. He also cultivated a group of new writers, who dominated Kannada literary scene in the coming years.

With this background we can now look at his *English Geetagalu,* the collection of translated poems and *Honganasugalu,* his own poems.

II

Among his poems, *English Geetagalu* is more discussed than his *Honganasugalu*; in fact we can say that there is no discussion of *Honganasugalu* at all. It may be due to the canonical status that *English Geetagalu* has acquired. Whatever the articles available on *Honganasugalu,* they are mostly commissioned for the special editions on B.M. Srikantia so as to cover all his writings.[106] This differential treatment by critics might also be for the reason that some have perceived certain contradictions that emerge in their evaluation of B.M. Srikantia's writings when they take *English Geetagalu* and *Honganasugalu* together. Some of them have tried to address this issue. The most obvious contradiction that one encounters is with regard to the language he uses in both. As said earlier, Srikantia is hailed for the use of contemporary, simple, literary

language in *English Geetagalu.* But in *Honganasugalu* the language sounds archaic. contradicting his practice in *English Geetagalu* and also his own statements on language of poetry. In an earlier chapter, I have discussed his use of old Kannada for Greek tragedies, but it can be explained with the help of his own theory that for noble themes, old Kannada could be used. But his use of language in *Honganasugalu* offers a different challenge.

Let us now look at how some of the critics have tried to take up the challenge of explaining the contradiction. Most critics don't address this issue at all in their analysis of *Honganasugalu:* they are just happy to introduce and describe the poems (See for example Seetaramaiah V, 1984). H.S. Venkateshamurthy falls back on Srikantia's theory that for noble themes old Kannada could be used to explain the use of archaic Kannada in *Honganasugalu* (Venkateshamurthy H.S., 1985). He identifies the themes of *Honganasugalu* as Loyalty to the king. Patriotism and love for language. Does he mean that these themes are noble and so B.M. Sri used archaic language for them? Srikantia often speaks about these themes except the first one and according to him they were the need of the hour. He wanted people to be patriotic and love their language. It is inconceivable that he would have used archaic language, when he was trying to rope in all sections of the population irrespective of their region, religion, gender and caste into the task of building a modern nation and rejuvenating Kannada. He has time and again said that for the themes. which are meant for all the sections of society we have to use Hosagannada. So Venkateshamurthy's explanation doesn't hold good.

M.H. Krishnaiah uses the argument provided by A.N. Murthy Rao in the context of writing about *Ashwaththaman* (Krishnaiah, 1985). A.N. Murthy Rao talking about Srikantia says that the imagination of Srikantia can respond to a great work of art but cannot create one such work. He categorizes the imagination of Srikantia as one of Responsive Imagination as opposed to Creative Imagination. According to Krishnaiah as B.M.Srikantia had a responsive imagination, he did well in *English Geetagalu* and as he lacked a creative imagination he failed in

Honganasugalu. But A.N. Murthy Rao was making that distinction in the context of answering the question, why did B.M. Srikantia not write plays and only translated plays from Greek or rewrote epic portions into play form. That can be explained by B.M. Srikantia's views on the rejuvenation of Kannada literature discussed in the previous section, that the Kannada language was not yet ripe for writing long poems and plays and it was better to translate them. So using the distinction made by A.N. Murthy Rao to explain the language *of Honganasugalu* is not tenable.

The arguments about Srikantia which made him a canonical figure and *English Geetagalu* a canonical text doesn't hold good in the context of *Honganasugalu.* So critics have tried to ignore *Honganasugalu* in their evaluation of Srikantia. It is not my intention here to answer why there is such a contradiction. In fact, for my analysis in this section 1 wouldn't see *English Geetagalu* and *Honganasugalu* as contradictory texts at all but as complementary texts that would hint at the hegemonic discourse of the day and would help explore what discourse has made the production of these texts possible. First I will take up *English Geetagalu.*

English Geetagalu contains around 60 poems translated from English. Some are by well-known poets and some by not so well known ones. Two of them are by poets whose name is almost entirely unknown. In *English Geetagalu,* Shelley's poems dominate - nine by him, followed by Burns - seven, Wordsworth - five and the rest are by others. The complete collection came out in 1926, when the Karnataka Sangha of Central College published it. Before that three poems were published in *Vidyadayini* magazine in 1919. Twelve more poems were published in *Granthamale* in 1921 and D.V. Gundappa published 24 poems in his *Karnataka Jana Jeevana* newspaper in 1924. The date of publication in *Granthamale* is taken as the date of publication of *English Geetagalu* though the complete collection came out only in 1926 (Seetaramaiah, 1985:iv).[107] The intention behind translating these poems is clear, as Srikantia himself has stated it. It is to introduce the English poetic tradition to the Kannada people and to

encourage them to take up and excel in writing poems on themes which are universal in nature such as war, love, death, patriotism, nature, beauty, ups and downs of life etc.,. He had no pretensions about the poems that he had selected as representing the best in English poetry. The criteria for selection were what he liked and which he could translate when he was reading English poetry (Srikantia, 1983: 57-58).

The collection has a poem "Kanike", Srikantia's own, as an introduction. In it after describing his love for his mother tongue (Kannada) and its land he describes Kannada thus:

Kannada tongue: our girl,
The girl of our garden;
Later, she grew up with others
Then came back to us.
Ripe new fruit
Came near us.

Then he goes on to describe the English:

The golden girl of the western sea,
The breath of my life, my eyes,
Taught me. made me happy and
Made me dance with her;
Once that girl, once this girl
Are making me dance.

What happened to the narrator who is fascinated by both?

I felt joyful
I weighed both the loves
Tried to see by dressing
The one with the other's beauty;
By putting the ornaments of one on the other

I tried to sing (Srikantia, 1983: 59).

The poem stages the fascination of the narrator for both Kannada and English. For him it is not a case of either Kannada or English, he can be with both; and he tries to mix the two - trying to see the beauty of the one in the other, by putting the ornaments of the one on the other. These lines stand as metaphor for his translations. He is not translating English poems directly into Kannada; while bringing English poems he dresses them with the beauty of Kannada. This stand is similar to the one he has taken up in his speeches that translate English texts, as "we" want them. So for the nationalist elite, the translation of the colonial discourse was to be on "our" terms, not on the terms of the colonizer. Whether this "our" terms would mean on the terms of nationalism or religion or a particular caste group is not yet clear. Or it also could be a mixture of all these aspects with certain inter-links between them.

This brings us to another issue that has dogged the critics who have written about B.M. Srikantia. Among the 60 poems of translations we find around ten poems celebrating the British national spirit. They are: Scott's "Gathering Song" and "Coronach"; Wolfe's "Burial of Sir John Moor"", Tennyson's "Charge of the Light Brigade". Cowper's "Loss of the Royal George", Campbell's "Ye Mariners of England"". Thomson's "Rule Britannia", Henley's " What have I done for you England. My England?", Southey"s "After Blenheim" and Browning's "The Patriot". The critics who were shaped by Indian nationalism find these poems as an anomaly to their argument, in which they celebrate B.M. Srikantia as one of the prominent writers, who was patriotic and served the land and its language. Most of them ignore this aspect in their analysis of B.M. Srikantia's *English Geetagalu*. Only a handful of them have tried to explain this "anomaly".

In the introduction, the General editor to the felicitation volume *Sree Utsava* (1986). the then president of the Kannada Sahitya Parishat, writing about Srikantia says. "B.M. Srikantia didn't respond to the freedom struggle that was

going on in the country as the king of Mysore was under the British rule. He had unlimited loyalty to the King of Mysore and thus we don't see any expression of freedom in his writings" (Vishalakshi. 1986: xix).[108]

V. Seetaramaiah, as an answer to criticism that B.M. Srikantia wrote poems in celebration of the British, writes that

> Some raise objections to Srikantia with regard to his poems like "Alou Britania" (Rule Britannia), "England Naavikaru" (Ye Mariners of England) and over some other matters that he had a non-Indian opinion. He was a government employee, though he was not under the direct rule of the British in British India: he was in a princely state, which was under the British! It was a two-fold subjection. The officers immediately above were English. If there were any patriotic songs, either Resident Cab or Campbell, the Private-secretary would have written warning letters to our (Mysore) Government. Whatever the love B.M. Srikantia had for the British, he selected a few poems as examples to show how the English loved their nation (V. Seetaramaiah in Srikantia, 1983: 24).

He quickly adds that

> I am not saying these words to defend B.M. Srikantia: when he passed away, the country was just preparing itself to attain freedom. It was a time when government employees were not supposed to attend any political meetings. They did not have that freedom - you can say they were unenfranchised if you want. ...We have escaped that situation due to god's grace. We have to remember that our love for India came through English. Our myths, history, epics, philosophy, all came from there (V. Seetaramaiah in Srikantia, 1983: 24-25).

As I have said earlier, V. Seetaramaiah is trying to point out that only from today's nationalist standpoint we can accuse Srikantia, but the situation then was very complex. Seetaramaiah is making two more points here. One is that Srikantia

only had the intention of showing how the British loved their nation through the poems that he had chosen and we need not accuse him of subscribing to it. The other point is that what we claim as ours today is in fact a product of this complex story, often deriving from the British themselves.

S.K. Desai developing further on the argument of Seetaramaiah in his article "Reflections on B.M. Shri's *English Githagalu*" tries to explain it thus:

> I would like to think that it was B.M. Shri's future-oriented nationalism that worked behind the choices of these war poems for translation. B.M. Shri knew that India was poised on the brink of a longish war with the British and he wanted us to prepare for it. What he was doing here was to arouse our own national spirit in a tactful, indirect manner and to summon us to fight for the freedom of our country. If the British have such an intense national spirit, why-should we not be able to build our nation in the future? Why should we not fight for our birthright of freedom? (Desai, 1984: 61-62)[109]

Then he quotes lines from Scott's "Gathering Song" and says that these poems extol and speak of warriors who fight bravely; so it was the need of the hour in India to stimulate people to fight against the British. But this argument seems to be farfetched as he seems to ascribe intentions to B.M. Srikantia. V Seetaramaiah had left his argument at the level of saying that he wanted to include some poems to show us how the British loved their nation, but Desai stretches it too far. But the possibility of that kind of effect might not be ruled out, though we cannot ascribe it to the intentions of B.M. Srikantia.

But the argument Desai puts forth later seems quite interesting:

> It is clear that in the heart of *English Githagalu* there was an insistent patriotic summons to rise and fight the Enemy! There is I think a

> certain instinctive cleverness in just translating the English nationalistic lyrics (except 'The charge of the Light Brigade') without trying to transcreate them in Indian terms (the way he does the English poems). He kept them as 'English" poems celebrating British patriotism since Indianising them would have been 'false' and pointless. In keeping them 'English', B.M. Shri achieved two points. 'Look, this is your enemy', he pointed out. 'Look at his patriotic spirit. If you want to fight him out develop a similar spirit and prepare to sacrifice your life!' (Desai, 1984: 62-63)

Though again we may hesitate to accept his statements on Srikantia's intentions, the point about translation and transcreation that Desai is making seems quite interesting.[110] Only the lyrics, which are on love and other emotions, are modified in *English Geetagalu* to suit what generally gets called as "Indianising". Is it that B.M. Srikantia is making a distinction between certain poems which are universal in nature because they have certain themes which are universal, and others, which need to be located spatially?

When we take up this question we find that the poems which are on the themes related to Britain as a nation are also stripped of their historical context to make them appear to contain themes which are "universal" or have been "Indianised". For example, Sir Walter Scott's "Coronach" is an elegy mourning the death of Duncan.[111] But in Kannada it becomes *Viragallu*, which is a stone monument with an epitaph describing the person who dies in a fight for the sake of the King/village/land. And there is no mention of Duncan in the Kannada version, the hero of the elegy in Scott's poem. Thus in Kannada the poem gets stripped of its historical context, and as the title changes to a culturally loaded word like *Viragallu,* it doesn't signify anything even remotely connected to Britain.

Another poem by Walter Scott "Gathering Song of Donald the Black" is also translated in a similar manner. The Kannada title is "Kalagada Pada" meaning

war-song. And all the proper names, which would have indicated the historical and spatial context the poem, get deleted in Kannada and making it any war-song. But as Desai says, some other poems around the theme of British Nationalism retain proper names, which signify the original context. They are "Burial of Sir John Moore at Cobunna" by C. Wolfe, "The Charge of the Light Brigade" by Alfred Tennyson, "Loss of the Royal George" by William Cowper, "Ye mariners of England" by Thomas Campbell, "Rule Britannia" by James Thomson, "What have I done for you. England, My England" (Pro Rege Nostro) by W.E. Henley and "After Blenheim" by Robert Southey. Among these the poem "Rule Britannia" cannot be explained as an "anomaly". Both the original and translation seem to be justifying the colonial rule. This poem just cannot be wished away as an example to show how the British love their nation. It is a poem that can be used only as an example of an imperialist poem justifying Britain's colonial rule. I quote a few lines to show how it justifies colonial rule. It starts by stating that the guardian angels blessed Britain, when it came into existence, saying

Rule. Britannia! Rule the waves!
Britons never will be slaves.

So it is the blessings of the angels that made Britain rule the seas and not be a slave to any other. Now see how the poem justifies Britain's rule over others:

The nations not so blest as thee
Must in their turns to tyrants fall.
While thou shalt flourish great and free,
The dread and envy of them all.[112]

Oriental despotism gets cited as the reason for Britain's conquest over other nations. Even in the translation, this view remains the same.

It would be interesting to see what kind of changes he has made in poems which depict "universal" themes, as they reveal the process of mediation and the factors that shape the mediation. The poems, which have become "Kannada poems", are the best examples of what has been termed as "transcreation". What 1 mean by "Kannada poems" are those poems which the readers first read in Kannada and

then turn to the English version, and the English poem appears to be a pale translation of the Kannada version. The examples are "Vasanta" a translation of "Spring" by Thomas Nash, "Maada Maadi" translation of "Duncan" by Robert Burns, "Mudiya Ramagouda" translation of "Auld Robin Gray" by Lady Anne Lindsay, and "Kariheggadeya Magalu" translation of "Lord Ullin's Daughter" by Thomas Campbell. In these poems the changes are made to suit the folk tune and the proper names have been changed to Kannada.

In "Duhka Setu", translation of Thomas Hood's "The Bridges of Sighs" the change is worth pondering. The word 'cerements' becomes just "dress" in the Kannada version. The word 'cerements' connote a whole cultural process of Death ritual. But 'udige' in Kannada just means "dress". What happens here is a cultural process associated with rituals of death in Christianity getting ironed out. Similarly see the translation of the following stanza in the same poem:

Alas for the rarity,
Of Christian charity,
Under the sun

In Kannada it reads as:

Aaha, Elladagito
Arya Dharmada Karuna.
Aryajanagala Maruka,
Uriyuvavane Balla!

Back into English Srikantia's translation, reads as:

Alas, where was it hidden.
The compassion of Aryan religion
The sympathy of Aryan people

Only the Burning one knows![113]

We can see clearly Christian charity becoming the compassion of Aryan religion and the sympathy of Aryan people. So the poem gets converted to Aryan religion from Christianity. The values ascribed to the Christian religion in Hood's poem simply get attributed to the Aryan religion. Similarly Church becomes 'Gudi' (Temple) in the translation of Robert Browning's "The Patriot - An Old Story". Thus what gets modified into "Kannada" setting is not actually Kannada setting but into a pan-Indian religion that got reconstructed during the nationalist phase.[114]

In terms of prosody too Srikantia has not followed the prosody of the English poems, as it is not possible for a language to easily adopt the prosody of another language. B.M. Srikantia though did not use the prosody of Old Kannada either; Shankarnarayana who has worked on it has shown that he invented a new prosody for Kannada. Bendre. writing about it says that the prosody used is similar to some of our folk forms. In that sense. folk forms that had been neglected in Kannada literature was brought back to it by B.M. Srikantia through translation.

As we move from *English Geetagalu* to *Honganasugalu* we encounter a lot of questions. I have addressed the issue of language, that *English Geetagalu* was in new literary Kannada and *Honganasugalu* was written in archaic language. in the beginning of the section. Even considering his theory with respect to the themes or the definition of poetry, which B.M. Srikantia himself sets out in his prose writings and speeches. and demonstrates through translations in *English Geetagalu,* we find that *Honganasugalu* remains an exception. In *Honganasugalu* the poems are not the soul's musings or the expression of the emotions of the poet, but occasional writings, and most of them are composed for a specific occasion and are well thought out before writing. "Sri Krishnaraja Rajata Mahotsava Pragatha" (1927) is an ode written on the occasion of the Silver Jubilee celebration of the King of Mysore. "Kannada Taaya Nota" (The vision of

Mother Kannada) (1936) is written on the occasion of the 600* year celebration of the Vijayanagara Empire. "Baankonda Krishnan" (The Krishnan who passed away) (1940) is an elegy written on the death of Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar. "Sri Jayana Belaku" (The light of Sri Jaya) (1940) is a poem written on the occasion of Sri Jayachamarajendra Wodeyar ascendancy to the throne. "Sukra Geete" (1941), was read out in the poets meet held on the occasion of Mysore University Silver Jubilee celebrations. "Pampana Orate" (The stream of Pampa) (1941) is a poem written on the occasion of the 1000th year celebrations of Pampa. "Haraike" (Blessings) (1945) is a poem written on the occasion of the 29th Kannada Sahitya Sammelana held at Madras. "Munnudi" was written as a preface to his translation of the old Tamil epic *Shilappadigaram*.[115]

Though the poems are written for different occasions there are certain recurring themes in the poems and they are loyalty to the King, patriotism and love for language. One more important thing in the collection is that most of the poems are written in the form of ode and elegy. It is interesting that he has not chosen to translate any ode in *English Geetagalv.* What he didn't do in *English Geetagalu*, the translation of the ode form, dominates *Honganasugalu*. We can read it as a complementary volume to *English Geetagalu*, unlike some critics suggestion.[116] Whatever it is the themes that he has handled are important and also the contexts with which they are associated.

The first poem "Bharata Maateya Nudi" is written as far back as in 1914. The poem has two voices: one is that of the narrator who appeals to mother India (Bharata maate) and another one is that of mother India herself. First the narrator appeals to mother India about the state in which the country is in today; he asks her when she will appear and spread the greatness of India in everyone's heart. As a contrast to the present condition he extols the past glory of India. He says that now we have given away our mother to others. At this juncture it is not clear who the other is, but at a later stage it becomes clear that the 'other' is Muslim not the English, who were ruling India then. He prays for her to unite them and to look

after her children for a better life. Then Bharata Maate assures him that she won't forget her children. She accuses her children of spoiling the nation, though she was the first one to bring religion and other arts to the world. Instead of pursuing the path of truth shown by her, the children slid backwards by getting into the groove of religion and castes. Then she says that in order to wake them up she had sent some kings, who by pressing the borders united many states, after which the people woke up, but again they went back to sleep. Then she opened the western valley so that troops could enter, the troops belonging to the valiant Muslim clan, who had immense faith in their religion and also brotherhood. They stood on par with her children. Then she requested her loving younger sister, Britannia, the queen of seas to come and unite the country. Britannia came and drew the boundaries of love again. She taught us the crux of all religions. She opened the floodgate of all knowledge. So Bharata Maate tells her children to extol the good qualities of her younger sister. Britannia and asks them to forget her limitations. Then she advises her children to go on the right path and assures them that she will once again send good and efficient people to solve their problems. Then at the end the narrator assures her that they will not forget her words and also will not abandon their Saaku Taayi (the mother who brought them up - Britannia). He takes a vow that from then onwards the people would get united and would pursue a single object - to retrieve the past glory of India by discovering her Dharmamruta (could be religious essence) which they would sprinkle over barren lands. He assures her that from that moment onwards they would be at her service.

In this poem, we clearly see that the "others" who have conquered this land are not the British but the Muslims. It draws heavily from orientalist arguments such as the glorious past of India, then the despotic rule of Muslims and the division of the people on the basis of caste and religion. In Srikantia's poem it is interesting that the Bharata Maate herself says that to get the nation united again, she had sought the help of her younger sister Britannia, the queen of the seas. Bharata Maate is all praise for her younger sister's rule. She goes to the extent of advising

her children to forget the limitations of her sister and to extol her positive qualities. Even the narrator in the end accepts Queen Britannia as Saaku Taayi.

The next poem is "Mysoru Makkalu" (Children of Mysore) written in 1920. The poem describes Mysore as a model state gifted with all natural resources and as the abode of Kannada, looked after by the Great King Naalumadi Krishna (The fourth Krishna Raja Wodeyar). It adopts a technique where simple lucid poetic lines get intercepted twice by prose writing. The next one is an ode written on the occasion of the Silver Jubilee celebration of Sri Krishna Raja Wodeyar's ascendance to the throne in 1927 in which the narrator requests the gods to sing the achievements of the King which are then listed one by one.

The next poem in the collection is "Kannada Taaya Nota" written on the occasion of 600* year celebration of Vijayanagara Empire. The 600th year celebration of Vijayanagara Empire was an important event, in which almost all those related to Kannada language and literature came together. It was organized by Alur Venkatarao and others, who were spearheading the movement for reunification of the Kannada-speaking regions. The Vijayanagara Empire became a symbol of the past glory of Karnataka and it entered the imagination of our writers through such celebrations. Many of the writers who participated in this celebration have written about Vijayanagara either in a play, a poem, or as memoir or in other forms.[117] Srikantia's poem belongs to that category of writings on the Vijayanagara Empire. Seetaramaiah has recollected the story of this poem's birth. Before reaching Hampi, where the celebrations were held, both Seetaramaiah and Srikantia roamed many places. As soon as they reached Hampi, Srikantia asked for a paper, and Seetaramaiah brought it to him from the organizers' office and Srikantia penned the poem without striking out a single letter. Seetaramaiah says that Srikantia must have framed the poem on the tour itself. The poem is an irregular ode divided into seven sections. The first part is a preface: the second part describes the land and the Kannada people. In the third section the narrator meets mother-Kannada and in the next section listens to her sorrowful state of

affairs. Then in the next three sections she assures her children of a good life. The occasion of the 600* year celebrations of Vijayanagara Empire becomes the turning point in the life of Mother Kannada. She gets onto the chariot of Bhuvaneshwari Devi and people celebrate this rejuvenation in the sixth section.[118] It follows a structure similar to that of "Bharata Maateya Nudi".

The next poem is "Kannadada Baavuta" (The flag of Kannada) written in 1938. It was written around the time when Srikantia proposed modifying the Kannada script to suit printing technology. But the idea was dropped and later the use of the existing script continued. This poem is written in the script proposed by B.M. Srikantia and others and acquires significance in that context. The poem depicts the glorious past of Karnataka. In this poem mother-Kannada gets associated with Goddess Rajeshwari.

"Baankonda Krishnan" is an elegy mourning the death of Sri Krishna Raja Wodeyar in 1940. It has seven sections and he calls the muse to join him in singing about the King. In section five of the poem he deals with Krishna Raja Wodeyar's scheme of relation between Mysore state. Karnataka and India. Mysore is part of Karnataka and Karnataka is part of the Indian Union. The loyalty to King, loyalty to the language-based nationalism and the growing influence of the Indian National Congress in Mysore can be seen in this poem. The way he tries to negotiate these conflicting identities and the way he organizes them is interesting.

Thus in *Honganasugalu*, themes such as loyalty to the king, love for Kannada language and patriotism (towards Mysore, Karnataka and India) have been taken up by B.M. Srikantia and he tries to put them in such a form that they neatly co-exist with each other without any conflict. Such a non-conflicting scheme of identities is pan of the nationalist discourse that emerged in Princely Mysore. As both *English Geetagalu* and *Honganasugalu* were part of such a discourse and also shaped such a discourse they were able to get canonized. However, it is not

just that, but a combination of this with other factors. This discourse got institutional backing in the form of the University of Mysore, which molded thousands of students; and Kannada Sahitya Parishat, which circulated the discourse through its publications and annual conferences. Adding to all these was the location of Srikantia himself in Mysore region.

Thus the challenge for the English educated middle class was not just one of negotiating the colonial discourse to evolve a nationalist discourse. It was a very complex situation that existed here. There was no direct rule of the colonizer; instead there was a benevolent ruler, who was bent on developing the state into a modern one. All these added to the complexity of the situation in Mysore. So the English educated middle class had to negotiate with various identities such as the identity of being the subjects of Mysore princely state, the newly evolving Kannada identity, the growing influence of Indian identity. Sometimes these identities were conflicting with each other. But B.M. Srikantia tries to balance these various identities and thus emerges acceptable to all.

I would say that this successful negotiation of all these identities made B.M. Srikantia's writings part of the hegemonic discourse of the day. Indian nationalism really didn't pick up momentum in Mysore until the Backward-class movement merged with the Congress party in the late 1930s."[9] Till then the people of Mysore never felt that they were colonized (See Chandrashekar. 1995). This also explains the pro-British stand of B.M. Srikantia. People had no problems with that position then. Only now we see it as an anomaly and invent arguments to explain it. Thus the reasons for the canonization of *English Geetagalu* lie in the way B.M. Srikantia negotiated with these various competing identities and the way he fashioned a whole generation's sensibility about Kannada literature.

5

Translation in Translation: Colonialism and Caste in the Princely state

This chapter, by looking at the debate around the concept of translation at the turn of the 19th century and the beginning of 20* century in Princely Mysore, tries to look at the ways in which modernity gets configured mainly by the then existing caste hierarchy and the challenges, if any. to this hierarchy. While doing so, I try to demonstrate that using binary concepts such as pre-colonial and post-colonial notions of translation that some scholars have posited in their discussion on colonialism and translation, is not useful. In the first section of the chapter I have tried to give a brief sketch of the argument that some of the translation theorists in India are positing. In the next two sections I will be examining, what I would call, two moments in the history of translation in Kannada/Princely Mysore. The first moment is the debate on Sreekantesh Gowda's translations during the 1890s. The second moment involves the comments made by Bhashaanthara Vairy (The enemy of Translation) on the then existing translation practices in Kannada. In the fourth section I will try to answer the question whether the "earlier" notion of translation and the "new" notion of translation that some theorists posit are radically different or similar, and also find out whether there is any difference between the function politics performed by the two. The interest behind such an analysis is to show that instead of classifying varying notions of translation as being faithful to the original or not being faithful, we need to look at it as a question of representation, of construing reality in a particular mode.

I

Some of the theorists, whom I call nativists. are trying to recover a notion of translation that "existed" in the pre-colonial period in the Indian languages. These theorists claim that earlier "we" (Indians/Kannadigas) had a more dynamic notion about moving texts from one language to another, and with the onslaught of

colonialism the notion of translation underwent a sea change. The words of Sujit Mukherjee express this view well:

> Until the advent of western culture in India, we had always regarded translation as new writing. This can be demonstrated most easily in the career of the *Mahabharata* and the *Ramayana* in various Indian languages. The *Pampabharata* and the *Pandava-vijaya*, for example, are complete and self-contained literary works, irrespective of their sources. ... New literary texts derived from *itihasa* or Purana sources are obvious examples of this process. The erratic passage of Gunadhya's *Brihatkatha* into other languages would be a more typical instance of how later authors used an existing story and re-made it to suit their own purposes. ...Western practice in this regard - or at least as seen from published evidence in English - has swung back and forth between close fidelity (to the original) and utter freedom (from the original). Modern Indian practice, influenced unavoidably by the West, also swings between the same extremes but does not maintain the sharp distinction western literature generally makes between original writing and writing derived (by translation or adoption or by plain plagiarism) from other texts (Mukherjee. 1981: 77-79).

A similar kind of opinion emerged in a seminar on "Culture and Translation" held in 1998 by the Department of Translations at Kannada University, Hampi. K.V. Narayana, a noted Kannada critic, said that Kannada had a different notion of translation: it never acknowledged the original or placed the source of the text, the original, on a high pedestal. That was its way of negotiating with the cultures imposed on it. While talking about Kannada as a language of translation he says:

> From time immemorial Kannada poets are involved in the process of translation. But this translation is not the one that we

> understand today. They (Kannada people) had a hegemonic language in front of them: Sanskrit. While bringing the literary works of that language into Kannada, they never bothered about the asymmetry of power relations in which both the languages are implicated.

After analyzing Pampa and Ponna (Jaina poets of 12th Century), he concludes:

> Both these samples indicate the same to us. Kannada poets did not behave like servants who will switch off their imagination in front of a hegemonic language. They did not hesitate to interpret the original to get the meanings they want out of it... (Thus) majority of the poets (in Kannada of pre-colonial period) thought of not rejecting Sanskrit but decided to fight it out... Because of their choice (of rewriting hegemonic texts) Kannada was able to find ways of saving its identity (Narayana K.V., 1999: 4-5).

Further. K.V. Narayana contrasts the situation in pre-colonial period with that of the post-colonial period. He says that English has consolidated its position as a source language. He claims that this situation is a result of the 19* century language politics. He says that though many works are getting translated into English, it is not to fulfill the needs of English literature. But with this translation activity. English has become a legitimizing medium. through which many languages pass. He explains further that all the European language literatures come to "us" through English, and similarly "our" language literatures first get translated into English. and then to other languages if necessary. Thus English has become a legitimizing via media for translations. According to him, the problem with such a trend is that English language "transforms the natural qualities of any language that is getting translated into English to its framework". He laments that as a result of this situation we have "lost the sense of freedom we enjoyed for thousands of years". He blames the choice - of choosing English as the source of enrichment of Kannada culture - made by Kannada culture during the colonial

period for such a situation. The colonial notion of translation, that of being faithful to the original, he concludes, was adopted by Kannada translators and today we have come to such a situation where we look at the relationship between source and translation in terms of original and copy, and due to that the identity of Kannada is in danger.

Two other papers presented at the above-mentioned Kannada University seminar, one on early and medieval Kannada literature and translation by O.L. Nagabushana Swamy and the other on medieval Kannada literature and translation by K.C. Shivareddy attempted to reconstruct the old notion of translation in operation during the period discussed by them.[120] Let me briefly paraphrase the argument put forth by O.L. Nagabushana Swamy: "We can't see what we today understand as translation in ancient and medieval Kannada Literature. ... The assumption that 'Source' is sacred, great and translation should be faithful to it developed only in this century" (Nagabushana Swamy, 1999:30). He claims that the intention of our old poets seems to be to construct structures that would fulfill the needs of Kannada (Nagabushana Swamy, 1999:32). After anal> zing a few examples of that period he concludes by saying, "But today we have made the relationship between Kannada and English complicated. We believe that translation is a second rate work. We are living with the illusion that it is a crime to change the meaning of a text as conceived by the English lord" (Nagabushana Swamy, 1999: 38). Shivareddy also echoes more or less the same argument. This trend is not only limited to Kannada scenario, it is an all India phenomenoa K. Satchidanandan, secretary of the Central Sahitya Akademi and noted writer and critic of Malayalam, also expresses the same opinion about the pre-colonial notion of translation: "...(T)he distinction between the original work and the translation was rather blurred and uncertain in India's pre-colonial discourse"(Satchidanandan, 1995 :172).

These critics discussed above are trying to recuperate the "lost" notion of translation, which existed in the pre-colonial period. These critics are involved in a two way process:

1. they are trying to construct the old notion of translation that informed those translations by studying the old texts, translated mainly from Sanskrit, and
2. they are comparing the old notion thus constructed with the present notion of translation.

If we agree with this proposition of two diametrically opposed notions of translation, one more dynamic and existing in the pre-colonial period, and the other the "colonial notion" of translation, then also the question of how and when this "transition" occurred remains.

Though these studies lament the loss of a notion that was supposed to be pre-colonial and indigenous, they never look at the function the "new" notion might have performed when this much talked about "transition" was happening. One more problem with these studies is that the dynamic notion of translation for them existed only in the pre-colonial period and that too only in translations from Sanskrit into Indian languages. Though I wouldn't subscribe to the notion of translations that these theorists posit, I use them in my following analysis to show how problematic such a definition and classification of translation would be.

If we look at the translations during the colonial period, that too from English into Indian languages, almost all the translations during that period have been changed drastically by the translator, sometimes to the extent of beyond recognition. These changes happen at several levels, at the level of values, costume, cultural settings and finally all these culminate in a change at the level of discourse. And we have to keep in mind that these translations were mainly undertaken by the English educated elite of the period, who invariably belonged to the upper strata of the society. It would be interesting to link the changes that happen at several levels in the text and the politics of the group that wrote these changes into the translation. The English educated elite group was involved in the production and circulation

of the nationalist discourse, and consequently I would argue that these translations, in which adaptation to suit nationalist politics is carried out, also became part of the nationalist discourse. If even in the late 19* and early 20th century, translations from English into Kannada did not adhere to the so called "original" and changed the text to suit the nationalist politics, the question that comes up is, if the nationalist elite also operated with the "old notion" of translation, then when did that much talked about "transition" to the new notion of translation occur and why?

There are two moments in the history of translation in Kannada/princely Mysore where the "new" notion is invoked. Analyzing these moments would throw light on this issue of "transition":

i) When M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda published *Pratapa Rudra Deva* (*Macbeth*) in the 1890s, a person called "Bhashabhimani"(One who is fond of Language) in the *Vidyadayini* newspaper launched a severe attack on it.

ii) In 1915, a person calling himself "Bhashaanthara Vairy" published a book called *Akindarane* and in its preface he came down heavily upon translations from English into Kannada.

II

Now I am revisiting a colonial event of 1895 to see how the so-called new notion of translation that privileges the original is invoked and for what politics. This is the translation of Shakespeare's play *Macbeth* by M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda. First let me introduce the scenario of translation of Shakespeare's plays into Kannada during that period and then give a brief introduction to M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda before investigating the debate around his translation.

If we look at the available translated texts of that period, Shakespeare seems to have first appeared on the Kannada scene in the form of a story. In 1876 B. Venkatacharya translated the play *Comedy of Errors* as *Bhranti Vilasa* in the form of a story of around 88 pages, which was published by Karnataka Press in Bangalore. This is not a direct translation from English. B. Venkatacharya knew Bengali well and has translated many novels of Bankimachandra from Bengali into Kannada, and the story of *Comedy of Errors* has also been translated from Bengali.[121] But if we go by some of the available references of that period then we come to know that Deputy Chennabasappa had translated Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* into Kannada in 1871 itself. Reference to this translation can be found in Reverend F.G. Kittel's introduction to Kannada literature in his edited book *Nagavarmana Chandobudhi*: "Chennabasappa Basalingappa Dharwad as Deputy Educational Inspector ventured on a translation of Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* in 1871 had it printed at Dharvvad under the title "*A Wonderful story that will cause to laugh those who do not laugh* (nagadavarannu nagisuva kathe)" (Kittel, 1895: LXXI). Also there is a reference to this book in a newsletter by name *Shala Patraka* accepting it for review in 1872 (quoted in Seegihalli, 1993:103).

But according to the translations available now, A. Ananda Rao's translation of *Romeo and Juliet* as *Ramavarma Leelavathi Charithre* in 1889 is the first translation of Shakespeare in the form of a play, published by the Government Branch Press of Mysore. A. Ananda Rao also translated in the name of *A Mysorean*. He translated *The Merchant of Venice* as *Panchali Parinayam* in 1890. Pandit Basavappa Shastri, who did not know any English, but had translated Kalidasa's plays from Sanskrit into Kannada, also translated Othello as *Shoora Sena Charitre* with the help of C. Subba Rao in 1895. Basavappa Shastri is known as *Abhinava Kalidasa* for his Kalidasa translations. At the same time, M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda published his translation of *Macbeth* as *Pratapa Rudra Deva* (1895). He was one of the pioneers of translations from English into Kannada in the 19* century and the only non-Brahmin among them.

It has become our commonsense that it is the Brahmin caste, which collaborated with the colonial rule and occupied all key positions. It was natural that given the cultural capital they had. it was easy for them to quickly learn the rules of the game of modernity and enter those spaces. M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda appears to be a rare example of a non-Brahmin being in such a modern space and venturing a translation of Shakespeare into Kannada. In this context it will be useful to look at his background more carefully.

M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda's (1852-1926) forefathers were from Nagamangala region of Mysore princely state. When there was a severe famine in that part they migrated to Deshahalli of Maddur Taluk. Sreekantesh Gowda's grandfather was a Subedar in the British Government.[122] This Subedar Linge Gowda cowed down the torchlight thieves (Panjina Kallaru) who were operating from the Arkavathi river valley near Ramanagara. Even the military was not able to suppress the activities of these thieves. So, the government appreciating and recognizing the sen ice of the Subedar gave a village by name Kanchana Doddi as a gift to Subedar Linge Gowda. Later he was raised to the post of District Collector. Linge Gowda had four sons: Putte Gowda, Bhaire Gowda, Anne Gowda and Tammayya Gowda and all of them were well educated during that period. They were appointed as Subedars by the government. Sreekantesh Gowda was the son of Subedar Bhaire Gowda. Subedar Bhaire Gowda was working in far off places of Mysore princely state like Gowribidanur, Surjapura etc., so Sreekantesh Gowda was brought up in his grand father's house. His primary and middle school education took place at Kunigal. He graduated from Central College, Bangalore in 1876. Then he took a law degree, from Madras University. Later he started working under a famous lawyer in Bangalore and in 1885 shifted to Mysore to start his own law practice.

M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda soon became a famous and rich lawyer. He started a publishing house along with other graduates like A. Subba Rao, Jaya Rao, and

Ananda Rao. Thus Graduates Trading Association came into existence, which played an important role in the cultural history of Mysore Princely state. Popularly known as G.T.A. Press, it published a series of books, both translations from English/other European languages and Indian languages including Sanskrit into Kannada. But the focus was on translations from English. Many of M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda's books were published by this press. In a span of 20-30 years this press published more than 100 books. It published three special series:

i) English Classics for Kanarese Readers - in which they published translations from English into Kannada;

ii) Science series - in which they published books on psychology, biology. teaching methods, magic lantern etc.;

iii) Children's literature - in which they published books like Gulliver's travels, Robinson Crusoe, Fables of Aesop etc. (Gundappa, 1996: 327).

This publishing institution also brought out a magazine called *Vidyadayini*. Sreekantesh Gowda was a poet fond of prosody by the name Kanda. Many of his early writings were published in *Vidyadayini*. Later he cut off his relation with GTA press and started another magazine called *Surabhi*. He edited and wrote regularly in *Surabhi*. Many of his writings were published during 1895-1897 in these magazines. Recognizing his popularity and expertise in law the Mysore Government appointed him as Magistrate. He served in the towns of Hasan. Shivamogga, Holenarasipura, Kolara, Madhugiri and Nanjanagudu.

His play *Pratapa Rudra Deva* was performed several times by Rathnavali Theatre Company of Varadacharya. His fescination for theatre took him to such an extent that finally he established a theatre group in Nanjanagudu. It was called Srikanteshwara Nataka Sabha. He also acted in many of the plays.

With all his activities he was in the thick of Mysore culture that was under modernization. Naturally his activities caught the eyes of the people around him. Finally it ended up in a complaint to Chief Justice Miller. The content of the

complaint was that Magistrate Sreekantesh Gowda is busy with theatre, music and has no time for delivering justice. Chief Justice Miller decided to visit his place and make an on-the-spot inquiry. M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda got wind of it through a friend in Bangalore who sent him a telegram. There were around 19 verdicts he was supposed to document. On the previous evening he went to the office, wrote down all the 19 verdicts with details of arguments by candlelight, and completed the task around 5.00 A.M. Much to the chagrin of Sreekantesh Gowda's opponents, the Chief Justice found that all the documents were in order. When his opponents said that all these were written overnight, Chief Justice Miller said "Even if it is true that all these were written in a day, I should appreciate the intelligence and incredible capacity of this judge to create 19 documents with all details". Thus he faced many problems in his Government service.

Sreekantesh Gowda has translated two plays from Shakespeare into Kannada. *Pratapa Rudra Deva.* the translation of *Macbeth* was published in 1895 and *Pramilarjuna Vijayam*, the translation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in the next year i.e., 1896. There are two more translations ascribed to him: 1) *Romeo and Juliet* as *Ramavarma Leelavathi*[123] and II) *Othello* as *Shoora Sena Charitre*[124].As the title page of the book *Ramavarma Leelavathi* (1889) says, it is written by "A Mysorean" identified by many historians as A. Ananda Rao. 1 agree with the assumption that "A Mysorean" is not M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda as there is no reference to it in his fairly long preface to *Pratapa Rudra Deva.* Also the style of *Ramavarma Leelavathi* is quite different from that *of Macbeth.* Regarding *Shoora Sena Charitre* it is evident by the title page of the book itself that it is written by Basavappa Shastri with the help of C. Subba Rao. But it is said that with the success of *Pratapa Rudra Deva.* Sreekantesh Gowda wanted to translate all the works of Shakespeare into Kannada.

Apart from these two translations of Shakespeare's plays, he has also translated two novels into Kannada from English, Maria Edgeworth's *Little Merchants* as *Chikka Banajigaru* (1895) and Henry Fielding's *Silicon Summer* as *Kanya*

Vitanthu (1895). . His translations include several (auto)/biographies of people from English. He has published several articles in *Vidyadayini* and *Surabhi*. He has also collected many folktales and jokes, which were published in the above said magazines. He is also hailed as the father of Kannada folklore.[125] He has a novel to his credit called *Bhavani Balu*. with an English subtitle *The Sword of Shivaji* (1926). As the title suggests it is about Shivaji's mother and is based on the history of Shivaji written by one Dup Saheb (mentioned by the author in his preface to the novel). [126] He has also composed a tribute in verse using Kanda meter to His Highness Late Maharaja of Mysore Chamarajendra Odeyar (1863-1894) called *Chamanrupachandra Prahhe* in 1895. This verse composition hails the Maharaja for supporting art and literature, bringing electricity to Mysore. establishing Chief Court, hospitals in every taluk head-quarters, *mujarahi* department to look after temples, irrigation works like building canals and tanks. establishing Kolar Gold Fields. Representative Assembly, banks, archaeological department, steps taken for women's education. drinking water to Mysore through pipes. abolishing child marriage etc. He also has a play to his credit, *Seetha Swayamvara* (1901), which is based on the Sanskrit play *Jaanaki Parinayam.* as he himself claims in the preface. He states in his preface that he has specially gone for the manner of English plays in writing the play to make it suitable for staging it in today's context. What he means by manner of English plays is using new Kannada not only in prose but also in composing poetry, so that contemporary audience can grasp its meaning. It is in contrast to his earlier translations where he used old Kannada when it came to poetry.

But his writings were unknown till his collected works came in 1974. We just knew that he had translated a few of Shakespeare's plays into Kannada and those books were not available. But the editor of his collected works has done a commendable job by unearthing those books from several libraries and putting them together. This was not an easy task. As the editor says in his preface, though he found many of the books ascribed to M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda in libraries in Srirangapatna and Mysore. the title page of the books were torn.

making it difficult to ascertain the authorship. It shows how M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda became almost anonymous after the 1930s on the Kannada scene, with the extinction of his generation. Even today after the publication of his collected works he has not got the credit he should have got in the history of modern Kannada literature.[127] With this background, I now turn to the debate in *Vidyadayini* magazine in 1895 between "Bhashabhimani" and Pandit Karibasava Shastri, who was a close friend of Sreekantesh Gowda.

I think before discussing the comments made by Bhashabhimani it is appropriate to give a brief introduction to the word "Gowda". Gowda is a surname for most of the Vokkaligas. Vokkaliga is a community that traditionally belongs to the Sudra class, the last level of Varna hierarchy. But it is a dominant caste, as it is the majority community in princely Mysore and also is a land-owning community. However it is listed, even today as a backward caste, on the basis of its poor representation in modern institutions, including education.

When GTA Press published *Pratapa Rudra Deva* in 1885, a person who called himself a Bhashabhimani wrote a scathing review of it in *Vidyadayini* magazine (1886). The title of the review was "Sojigave Pele Kabba Gowdam". Actually the title of the review is based on the verse that appears before the play as a hymn to goddess of poetry. The verse goes like this:

vaaNiye karNaTakadoL
raaNiyu sojigave peeLe kabba gowDam
jaaNaridoodiri niiv bi
nnaNava kaaNuvidaroLu mannisi tappam

The translation of it in English goes like this:

When goddess Saraswathi is the Queen of Karnataka
It is no wonder that Gowda also composes poetry
Oh! Learned people, read this and see for yourself
The skill of art in it. Please forgive the mistakes.

But when the line is lifted out of context and placed as a title of the review it acquires an ironical tone coming to mean: "A Gowda writing poetry! What a wonder!" The reviewer says " It would have been better if Gowda had written it in prose instead of poetry, in which he is a novice". He further says, "the book is replete with grammatically incorrect sentences. There is no consistency in the use of language as both old Kannada (halagannada) and new Kannada (hosagannada) are used. A lot of rustic and colloquial words have crept into the play".

Before taking up these comments on M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda's translation for analysis it is appropriate to speculate who this Bhashabhimani could be as it would help us to look at the complexity of the controversy in a more subtle way. There is no direct mention of Bhashabhimani anywhere in the texts 1 consulted for this study, except in the recollections of those days by D.V. Gundappa in a letter to H.M. Nayak, the then head of the Institute of Kannada Studies in Mysore University, on receiving the copy of the collected works of Sreekantesh Gowda in 1974. But D.V. Gundappa's version is based on what was picked up by his teacher Bapu Subba Rao from the literary gossip of those days. Gundappa says that there were two groups during that period in Mysore. One was led by Pandits (largely associated with Sanskrit scholars) and the other by their opponents. According to him it was Basavappa Shastri who wrote in the name of Bhashabhimani (Gundappa, 1995:180). Bapu Subba Rao was one of the founder editors of *Vidyadayini* magazine in which this debate took place (Gundappa. 1996:325). In this context it is not inappropriate to look at the background of Basavappa Shastri. There is already a reference to his translation of *Othello* and Kalidasa's plays earlier in this chapter. Apart from translating Kalidasa's plays, he had also translated *Rathnavali, Uttara Rama Charitre* from Sanskrit. His own compositions are *Damayanthi Swayamvara* and *Krishna Rajabhyudhaya,* both in *champu*[128] style and *Savithri Charitre* in *shatpadi*[129] style. He has also written several shlokas in Sanskrit like *Shiva Bhakthi Tharangini, Saraswathi Dandaka,*

Kayo Sri Gauri etc. He was in the court of Sri Chamaraj Odeyar and a student of Garalapuri Shastri, another well-known Sanskrit scholar. He knew both Sanskrit and Kannada well, but did not know English. But in spite of that he translated *Othello* as *Shoora Sena Charitre* in 1895 with the help of C. Subba Rao. He translated plays mainly for the Court theatre established by the Mysore King in 1882.[130]

But on verification of the veracity of D.V. Gundappa's information that Bhashabhimani was Basavappa Shastri, I found that Basavappa Shastri died in 1891 itself, four years before this 1895 event. So, what Bapu Subba Rao might have heard during those days as gossip is not at all true and Bhashabhimani is not Basavappa Shastri. Nevertheless invoking the caste related word Gowda in a negative sense suggests that it must be someone from a caste, which is above the Vokkaliga community in the traditional caste hierarchy. But the two camp theory that there was a Sanskrit learned Pandit group and another English educated elite group which were at logger heads in Mysore cannot be disputed. If it is not Basavappa Shastri, then it might be someone else from the Pandit group, who belonged to a higher caste-class configuration than that of Vokkaliga community.[131]

Now let me take up Bhashabhimani's comment on the language of *Pralapa Rudra Deva* for analysis, before stating his other comments on the play. Instead of analyzing the language of the play myself, I quote other scholars, who have talked about the use of language in Sreekantesh Gowda's writings, to show that the later critics, many of them belonging to the Brahmin community, have a different opinion on the language of Sreekantesh Gowda's writing in general. This would tell us that the comment of Bhashabhimani on Sreekantesh Gowda is not accepted by others:

i) H.K. Ranganath, a noted historian of Kannada theatre and drama: "M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda was the first to translate Shakespeare. ...He gave

popular local names to the original characters and employed easy flowing, simple Kannada. Of his renderings, *Pratapa Rudra Deva* is well known and was repeatedly staged by the Rathnavali Theatrical Company of Varadachar" (Ranganath. 1982:142).

ii) Masti Venkatesh Iyengar, Jnanapeetha awardee and noted short story writer: " In his (Sreekantesh Gowda) Shakespeare's translations we come across our village people. He has wonderfully created their language. ...It is one thing to be born in a village, brought up in a village, enjoy listening to their language and another thing to mingle with them, imbibe the language and use it creatively. This creativity is not there in everyone" (Iyengar, Masti Venkatesh. 1995:159). And he has this to say on the language of Sreekantesh Gowda's another play "The writer of this play *(Pramilarjuna Vijayam)* is a very clever person. He has understood the lifestyle of our people in a better manner. And he can write well in Kannada. Instead of translating Shakespeare into Kannada, if he had written original plays, his talent would have found a more useful purpose" (1965: 223-245).

iii) Goruru Ramaswamy lyengar. a noted writer of Navodaya period: "Sreekantesh Gowda's translation is not a rhetoric of high sounding words, which emanates out of the loom of words by weaving texts[132]. In his translation we don't see word to word placement but genuine Indian and folklore values" (lyengar. Goruru Ramaswamy, 1995: 28).

iv) Ramachandra Deva. the author of *Shakespeare In two Cultures,* while commenting on *Pramilarjuna Vijayam* observes that: "By using the language very subtly. Sreekantesh Gowda shows the difference between the characters in the play. In *Pramilarjuna Vijayam* workers use dialects and main characters Pramila and Arjuna use Sanskrit mixed Kannada... Kunta Setty mispronounces Sanskrit Kannada in trying to imitate upper caste people. By showing Kunta Setty's improper use of Sanskritized Kannada. Sreekantesh Gowda implies his caste/profession" (Ramachandra Deva. 1993:40).[133]

If we look at the above opinions it becomes clear that the language of Sreekantesh Gowda's translations was in fact excellent and suited the needs of the day. The success of *Macbeth* on stage in the production of the Rathnavali Company of Varadacharya justifies the above claims about Sreekantesh Gowda's translations.[134] Now let us look at what Sreekantesh Gowda has to say on his own translation. Writing the preface to *Seetha Swayamvara* in 1901, he says:

> Though this play is not specially/totally modern, there is a difference between the first part of the play where I have followed the Sanskrit play *Jaanaki Parinayam*, and the rest. Why have 1 made these changes, are there any special features to it? If people get affirmative answers to these questions, then they won't think that by writing this play on a theme taken from *Ramayana*, *Phaniraya* would get burdened.[135] If we claim that the aim of writing a play is to entertain the audience, then we find some special feature in this play. This play has given immense pleasure to both pandits (scholars) and *paamaras* (lay (wo/)men) in its several performances. But to write this kind of a play we specially have to use contemporary Kannada. So, in this play I have used new Kannada not only for prose but also for poetry. If we don't do it, it will not be of any help to theatre. The people, who nowadays study Kannada just to amass words, may not like this. I regret that the style recommended by them would not help the audience (1901, (1974:212-213)).

While translating *Pratapa Rudra Deva* and *Pramilarjuna Vijayam* he used contemporary Kannada only for prose/dialogue and at the time of writing *Seetha Swayamvara* he was very clear that even for poetry he was going to use what Bhashabhimani might call "rustic Kannada". His intention, as it is clear from the above preface, was to communicate to the audience and make them enjoy the play rather than show his expertise in using high sounding Kannada words or exhibit

his pedantry. It is also interesting the way language economy operates in the play. Each genre was associated with a particular kind of language and that would correspond to the social value of that genre - for dialogues new Kannada and for Poetry old Kannada was the principle on which that language economy was based. It is interesting that Sreekantesh Gowda adhered to this principle in writing *Pralapa Rudra Dcva* and at the time of writing *Seetha Swayamvara,* as seen in the above quote from its preface, had abandoned it. The reason for doing so. for him. was to make it closer to the audience, to make them grasp the meaning of the poetry, not just to make the audience appreciate the pedantry' of the poet in writing poems in an esoteric. un-communicative Kannada.

There is one more point that we have to understand here. In Mysore Sreekantesh Gowda is the first independent translator of plays. Let me make clear what I mean by this. Basavappa Shastri and others who translated from Sanskrit or Ananda Rao and others who translated from English did so, on the request or instructions of the Maharaja of Mysore or the Divan for the Palace Company. Sri Chamarajendra Karnataka Nataka Sabha established in 1882. The staging of plays by this company was mainly meant for the court audience. though it was performed outside the court for public, both in Mysore and Bangalore. So. naturally their language was pedantic and exhibits their scholarship. But Sreekantesh Gowda wrote for the Varadacharya Company and for his own company established at Nanjanagudu. Communicating to people was more important for such endeavors since these Companies depended on the patronage of people and not on that of the King.

In the light of the above evidence we can safely conclude that the comment made by Bhashabhimani on the language of Sreekantesh Gowda's translation of Shakespeare's plays indicates the debate between the two warring groups in Mysore. This particular issue is not just between two upper-caste groups, one, Sanskrit oriented and under court patronage and the other. English oriented and enjoying both court patronage and the patronage of the public sphere. but also

between an upper-caste person, who is still in his traditional domain of Sanskrit and court patronage unlike many others in his own caste, and a Shudra who has made it into the new elite position.

Let us turn to another important comment by Bhashabhimani. Sreekantesh Gowda has not just found local names for the characters in Shakespeare's play but has also modified several aspects of the play. Invoking the superiority of the original, Bhashabhimani objects to this saying how dare he change the play by Shakespeare and insists that the translator should apologize to Shakespeare.

Though Sreekantesh Gowda did not write any rejoinder to the criticism leveled against him by Bhashabhimani. Pandit Karibasava Shashtri defended him strongly in the same magazine. Pandit Karibasava Shastri was a good friend of Sreekantesh Gowda and a teacher of Sanskrit in a Mysore College. Karibasava Shastri argues that what Sreekantesh Gowda has done is not Bhashaanthara (translation) but Rupantara (transformation or in today's translation terminology adaptation/ transcreation); so there is no need to compare this with the original: Bhashabhimani has not looked at the *gunas* (positive merits) of the book. As he has picked up only the negative factors. he should be called Doshaabhimani (one who is fond of drawbacks, negative merits) instead of Bhashabhimani. Here ironically Karibasava Shastri invokes the "new" notion of translation (being faithful to the original) and its distinguishing other 'transcreation/adaptation' to defend Sreekantesh Gowda's translation.

Sreekantesh Gowda's preface to *Pratapa Rudra Deva* can be read as containing a possible answer to the remarks of Bhashabhimani though the preface was written earlier. His preface to *Pratapa Rudra Deva* acquires significance, as it is a document that engages itself with the new ways of negotiating with other cultures through language and is also one of the earliest to deliberate on these issues.[136]

The preface starts with an engagement with the Italian dictum that "Traduttori Traditari" (Translators are traitors). His main contention is that every translation activity tries to prove that this dictum is false. He argues that the premise of the above Italian saying is that of the impossibility of carrying an original meaning couched in one language to another. But the carrying of meaning from one language to another depends on the relationship between the two and the purpose of the translation. He takes up the example of translations from Sanskrit into Kannada and contends that it is very easy to translate from Sanskrit into Kannada due to the similarity between the languages as also the cultural ambience in which they appear. He further extends this argument to include the practice of translating from Indian languages (other than Sanskrit) into Kannada. At the end he discusses the act of translating from English into Kannada.

There are many things that are incidental (to the main argument of countering the Italian saying. but not to the context) in this preface that might have irked the Sanskrit scholars of the day. So in this sense we can read the comments of Bhashabhimani and Sreekantesh Gowda's preface to *Pratapa Rudra Dcva* as a dialogue on the issue. Let me take up the issues raised by Bhashabhimani that are contested by Sreekantesh Gowda in his preface. First the language of translation: that it is a mixture of Sanskrit. old Kannada and new Kannada (rural/rustic). We have to keep in mind that this was a time when the standard form of Modern Kannada was yet to appear and was in the making. Use of a heavily sanskritized form of Kannada was the literary language earlier with which many Sanskrit scholars were comfortable. But with the advent of popular theatre, other than the one established by the King in his court for which the Sanskrit scholars translated Sanskrit plays into Kannada. things changed. The other theatre companies did not have any patronage of the State or King and they were pan-Karnataka in their nature as they depended on the public. [1] There was a need for them to reach out to the audience and entertain them. apart from mesmerizing them by using tricks based on new technology.[138] Sreekantesh Gowda's engagement with the language and style of the play in relation to audience indicates the complex ways

in which the question of patronage, public (audience) and the style and content of the play are inter-linked. But analyzing all this goes beyond the scope of this chapter and I just limit myself to the debate between him and Bhashabhimani.

It is very interesting the way Sreekantesh Gowda frames his argument on the new usage of language in the play. He takes up the example of Shakespeare and says that

> ... the emperor of poets Shakespeare violated the limits set by his language on all fronts like grammar, prosody, meanings of the words and wrote according to his wish. But the scholars didn't dare to say that it is against the language, instead they termed his deviation as Shakespeare's language, Shakespeare's prosody. Shakespeare's grammar and Shakespeare's dictionary. To translate that kind of poetry which is seriously cross-cultural (vijaathi = not of same caste/classification) into the alliteration, meter, prosody of poor Kannada, one has to struggle. ... If I take up things that already exist in Kannada as equivalent to English, then people would accuse me of repeating what is already existing. To avoid this allegation, I have to use all kinds of Kannada such as what is available now. what was available then and also what is not available. It has become essential to court Sanskrit while writing Kannada and if 1 don't do it. 1 will not be respected (as atranslator) (1974:13-14).

We see in Sreekantesh Gowda a certain kind of awareness of historicity and the dynamic nature of language when he says. "I have to use all kinds of Kannada such as what is available now. what was available then and also what is not available". He doesn't view language as a finished product that which should not change, as Bhashabhimani would do. Sreekantesh Gowda is charged with using a mixture of language that goes against the then existing notion of literary language in Kannada. He is also aware of the taste of the audience that always looks out for new in whatever it views. He also justifies the use of old Kannada and

Sanskrit, along with contemporary Kannada in the same argument. He is not bothered about the literariness of the language of his translation since his focus is on how it gets performed on the stage, how audiences receive it, what its impact is on theatre, as its survival/existence depends on their patronage.

Now let us see what his preface says about the second important accusation made against him by Bhashabhimani - that Sreekantesh Gowda in his translation of *Macbeth* gave the play an Indian setting and for which Bhashabhimani demands an apology to Shakespeare from Sreekantesh Gowda. It has become our commonsensical understanding that the early translations of Shakespeare were adaptations, and that was the way Indian culture and nationalist elite appropriated the colonial culture to make it *his* own. Though they have every respect for Shakespeare and colonial culture as indicated in their choice of text itself. they change it to suit the Indian sensibility. So translations during this period varied from "eager adoption and assimilation on the one hand to what may be called literary subversion on the other with many moderate political shades being represented in between" (Trivedi. 1993: 23-43). Trivedi further points out that these positions can be found in the same writer at different historical points and in different writers of the same period. In his study he has analyzed a few Hindi versions of Shakespeare of late 19th and early 20th centuries. Ramachandra Deva. who has done a study of Shakespeare in Kannada culture, says that till the arrival of D.V. Gundappa"s *Macbeth* there were no direct translations of Shakespeare's plays and all other translations before that were adaptations (Ramachandra Deva. 1993:55). In fact other translations before and during the period of Sreekantesh Gowda also had transformed the play. In A. Ananda Rao's translation of *Merchant of Venice,* the conflict between the Jew - Shylock and Christian hero Antonio has been grafted on to the conflict between Buddhism and Hinduism.[139] Even Basavappa Shastri`s translation of *Othello* as *Shoora Sena Charitre* with the help of C. Subba Rao involves a similar transformation. Normally the scholars see these adaptations as appropriations of colonial literature by the nationalist elite, where the colonial discourse would be appropriated for nationalist discourse.

But there is not much discussion of the politics that prompted these adaptations or the politics these adaptations served. I will take up this issue again in the next section of this chapter.

The nationalist elite normally resorted to adaptations to diffuse the cultural elements of the colonial (modern) culture that might influence or modify "our" cultural elements. A similar thing was happening in the genre of the novel also. When Gubbi Murugaradhya wrote a novel *Shringaara Chaturollasini* in 1896, he says that he has translated the novel form into our culture in such a way that it does not violate the Maryaada of our culture (Murugaradhya, 1896).

But curiously the preface of Sreekantesh Gowda anticipates questions on the scenes that he has left unchanged but could be seen as against the customs of our country. This seems to run contrary to the allegations by Bhashabhimani that he has changed the original play. Let us look at what Sreekantesh Gowda has to say about this.

In the play when the king of Odra, Vijayadhvaja (Duncan), comes to the court of Virasena (Macbeth). Virasena's wife goes to receive him. This is so in Shakespeare's play too. Sreekantesh Gowda anticipates objections for not changing it.

> If this is the case in the original then that might go well with the customs of English people. But if it happens in a Kannada play, that is objectionable. In our country, women won't come out of the inner courtyard. Some people might say that Virasena's wife coming out like that might appear to be tomboyish. I am not going to reply to them here, due to lack of space. 1 leave the responsibility of replying to the *saraswathis* of our Girl's School and to their god (Sreekantesh Gowda, 1974: 19).

This statement by Sreekantesh Gowda very cleverly handles the question of why he has not retained the queen with in the inner courtyard. He knows that people, who are trying to negotiate modernity do so on "their terms". Here on "their terms" is a space marked by patriarchy. Here I would like to allude to the carving out of an "inner" space for women by the nationalist elite, while they set out to acquire the "outer" space created by colonial modernity (Chatterjee, 1989:246-247). Princely Mysore was supposed to be a progressive modern state being ruled by a King. It had opened schools for girls in the late 19th century itself. The school to which Sreekantesh Gowda refers to in the above quote was established in 1881 with 28 girls (Saraswathis - to use Sreekantesh Gowda's word)[140] studying in it. In 1894, just a year before Sreekantesh Gowda wrote his preface, the number of girls who were studying in the school had risen to around 600 (Naidu. 1996:96-98). Sreekantesh Gowda knew that the kind of objections that would come up for not retaining the queen within the inner courtyard, would be something similar to the argument against the education of girls. So he just indicates that this patriarchal comment would be best answered by the girls, who for the first time entered the new educational space.

He anticipates objections to showing the king and his court drinking openly in front of every one:

> In the third act I have depicted a party at the Kings" court. But while showing it. do the Kings and other royal people have to sit half-naked before the dining table! No problem. I ordered them one more round of drinks. The *Aachara Sheelaru* (conformists) of today might say that there is no need to worry if chandals (grave-diggers) or the sepoys (constables), as in *Othello,* are depicted like that, but depicting noble characters like that goes against Hindu customs. But I have marked this as nighttime. If I show it as nighttime these conformists seem to be objecting...(emphasis mine, 1974:19).

With this answer he is trying to expose the double standards of conformists and courtiers. There are two points on which he exposes them. First is their attitude towards other sections of the society. They think that drinking is bad, so only *chandals* should be shown drinking. *Chandal* is a word used to refer to the people who are at the bottom of our social hierarchy, who don't form part of the last strata too of Varna system. Secondly, he seems to be suggesting that their objection would be to setting the whole scene at night. What it would mean is that even the courtiers and noble people in Hindu culture used to have such drinking parties but only at night and that too clandestinely. He seems to be indicating that they will object to making this clandestine activity a public show through the play. The question of this anticipated debate is that of representation of *Aachara Sheelaru*. Sreekantesh Gowda anticipates that they might pick up a quarrel because their representation in the play would spoil their image. But they don't have any objections to representing chandals in the same light! In fact they prefer to do so.

But Sreekantesh Gowda has made certain changes too. Some are inevitable because of the actors and the audience, which might have spoiled the great poetry of the bard. for which he apologizes to Shakespeare (Sreekantesh Gowda. 1974: 15-16). He also regrets not being able to carry the essence (Rasa) of the play in spite of his best efforts (Sreekantesh Gowda, 1974: 14-15).

It is clear from the above evidence and discussion that the allegations against Sreekantesh Gowda by Bhashabhimani are untenable. The translator's use of language has been highly commended by later critics. He has apologized to the great bard in his preface itself. Then the question that springs up is why did Bhashabhimani write such a scathing review of the play and ask him to tender an apology to Shakespeare. It is interesting that the Bhashabhimani has not taken to task others who wrote in a similar style before Sreekantesh Gowda, either in the use of language or in changing the content of it. If we look at the discussion of his preface more carefully, there could be something else that might have

prompted Bhashabhimani to take up the task of writing "Sojigave Pele Kabba Gowdam". It could be the comments that Sreekantesh Gowda makes and the way he handles certain issue in his preface, such as,

- It is easier to translate from Sanskrit into Kannada than from English (4-8);
- His anticipation of questions on the representation of nobles and court people in the play and dragging the play *Othello* (translated by Basavappa Shastri) into it by saying that sepoys are represented like this in it;
- His representation of Virasena's wife in the play as one who steps out of the inner courtyard;
- His endorsement of Macaulay's comment that "the entire literature of Sanskrit is not equivalent to the single shelf of English books"', though with reservation that it is an exaggeration and self-praising (1974: 14).

The following reasons could also be responsible:

- That he seems to be not writing for the court theatre but for public and accordingly has made changes that were not found in the earlier translations made for the theatre established by the King:
- A Sudra (Gowda) commenting on Sanskrit and court people and coming out with a translation of Shakespeare for the new theatre that thrives on public patronage.

There is no doubt that Sreekantesh Gowda is in favor of English, the colonial modernity over Sanskrit, and occupies an important position in the new social, cultural and administrative institutions that came up in the context of modernity in princely Mysore. But both Sanskrit and the new spaces that had come up in the context of modernity were the sole privileges of the Brahmin community. When the Brahmin community was trying to translate / adapt colonial modernity into a nationalist one. how could anyone else lay claim to it? It is in this context that we have to look at the comments of Bhashabhimani. 1 will elaborate this point further at the end of this chapter after considering the second moment in the history of translation in Kannada in princely Mysore.

One thing becomes clear in this analysis that, the entry of modernity was marked by a kind of tension between the two literary elite groups (if at all we can consider, Sreekantesh Gowda's and Bhashabhimani's views not as individual views but as representative of two ways of looking at modernity) in princely Mysore. Gowda's views seems to be more secular in terms of his support to women stepping out of their confinement into Education and other fields.

III

Now let us take up what 1 have identified as the second moment in the history' of translations in Princely Mysore of the colonial period. This event took place in 1915 and the source of this event is Bhashaanthara Vairy's comments on the existing translation scenario in Princely Mysore/Kannada. Bhashaanthara Vairy is the pen name of the person who has translated Sir Walter Scott's book into Kannada as *Akindarane embha ghora kole paatakana jeeva charithre* (The biography of a deadly killer called Akindarane). This book was published by Srinivasa Mudrakshara Shaale (Srinivasa Printing Press) in Mysore. As the title page of the book suggests. it has been written by Aiatna Keers B.A. Literary historians in Kannada say that this name has to be read from right to left.[141] If we read it so it becomes A.B. Sreekantaia. In the title page itself he calls himself an English-Kannada Bhashaanthara Vairy, meaning an enemy of translations from English into Kannada. The preface runs into 17 foolscap pages in the typescript form.[142]

The preface is in a highly rhetorical. ironical language and is extremely satirical. It starts by addressing the readers. anticipating their comment on the title of the book and providing clarification. The author believes that the name of the book is going to repulse the audience and will make them throw away the book. He asks them to stop for a while and listen to them. He says that the readers are accustomed to reading books like *Ramavarma Leelavathi, Manoranjan!, Jayasimha Raja Charithre, Pratapa Rudra Deva* etc., so when they encounter a

name like Akindarane naturally the name itself will put them off. After calling their attention he claims that he has no dearth of words like *Chandi Mada Mardana (Taming of the Shrew). Chanda Maruiha (Tempest), Andhra Sena (Andersen), Alaka Sundara (Alexander),* all of which are translated texts from English, that have transformed the names. He reveals that while translating that book, he also thought of using titles like *Akasha Drona, Ahara Bhramana*, and *Akaala Marana* instead of retaining Akindarane as it is. But he is against this kind of translation. He is for direct translations. I am trying to demonstrate here that the so-called colonial notion of translation gets invoked in this particular context to serve the nationalist urges of the translator than to perpetuate the colonial hegemony. In this context let us closely look at why Bhashaanthara Vairy is against translations that write colonial modernity as national modernity. I would also like to explore the kind of politics this anti-colonial invocation of colonial notion of translation is performing. by examining the arguments put forth by Bhashanthara Vairy. Let us look at the reasons offered by him against Kannadising or Indianising the European / English texts.

In *Ramavarma Leelavathi* (translation *of Romeo and Juliet),* Leelavathi. who is eighteen years old and unmarried. dances with Ramavarma, who is twenty-five years old. Bhashaanthara Vairy says that he can't imagine such a thing in India that a girl is eighteen years old and unmarried and added to that is dancing with a man. He also asks how the translator of this text can show Ramavarma sneaking into the bedroom of Leelavathi with the help of a rope ladder in the night. How can we tolerate an unmarried Hindu girl going to a (Christian) religious place to have a symbolic marriage? He is rather interested in retaining their own religion and name, so that when "our" people look at it. they will see it as an alien culture. He says that it would be against "our" values to show them as part of "our" culture (Aiatna Keers, 1915:1-2).

He challenges translators saying that if English authors write Elephant Stone for Anekal (A taluk near Bangalore). Stone bazaar fruit for Kallangadi (Water

Melon). Blue neck for Neela Kanta, Ram for Rama and if they accept this kind of translation, then he is ready to translate Akindarane as *Acharya Drona.* Though doing so would mean giving *Deeksha Snaana* to Akindarane by a Hindu padre (Father) to convert him into a Hindu and equating the world-renowned warrior of *Mahabharatha* to a head-hunter and *paapi* (sinned one) like Akindarane (1915:5). He invokes translations from Sanskrit into English and asks the translators when the English people have not changed the settings of those texts, retained the names as they are, then why don't we also adopt the same kind of translation technique and keep their and our culture intact (1915:4).

After reviewing the translations from English into Kannada he says that these translations are like rearing a ram only to get rammed in the heart by it. Why waste our energy in writing a book that will pierce our heart tomorrow? Then he asks a series of rhetorical questions:

> Why should we make Christians. Parsis and Greeks into Kshatriyas? Why make them Brahmins? Why should we relieve them of their customs and tie our customs to their head? Why spoil our Sanathana Dharma by doing so? When already caste-transgressions are under way, why should we contribute to it through our translations? Why give Brahmins and Kshatriyas to Mlecchas? (1915:14)

It is very clear from this quote that he is against writing colonial modernity as national modernity. He is also making an argument that writing colonial modernity, as national modernity is a mode of accepting the superiority of the colonial text. He would rather opt for a translation of *Romeo and Juliet* as *Romeo and Juliet.* He would like to know about the customs and condition of the English/Italian people of the period in which it has been written. Just because Kannada lacks certain concepts to represent western culture, we should not replace the same by our concepts. We should retain their concepts as they are, only then Kannada can become rich with the addition of new concepts and will be

able to represent other cultures. It seems that he is arguing for a case of reverse orientalism, acquiring knowledge of the west to gain power over it and to differentiate it from our context. He is moving to a position of cultural difference sans hierarchy between the two cultures, than accepting the hierarchy and trying to reproduce it. Look at the following statement by him, which metaphorically demonstrates the cultural colonization of India:

> In my translation I won't add anything or hide anything. I won't put *janivara* (sacred thread worn by Brahmins) on a Christian, dress him up in *panche* (a long cloth covering the lower portion of the body) and put *vibhuthi* (sacred ash) and *dvadashanama* to him. I won't tie *linga* to a Greek, and perform *Gokulashtami* (a festival related to Lord Krishna) for a Mohammedan. I won't divide this Hindu land into pieces and distribute it to Liatusm, Thesius, Macbeth, Pericles, Cymbeline, Ulysses, Othello etc. I will tie them to their proper positions. I will give them only the work they deserve. I will make them stick to their religious customs (1915: 14-15).

Changing the names of English kings and their kingdom into Indian ones would mean for him the distribution of Hindu land among them. Look at the following passage. He claims that he became a bird to survey the districts of Princely Mysore and see whether the people of his country are awake and defending their country, culture and language against the invasion of the aliens. He was horrified to see only a handful of translations like *Arya Kirthi, Shivaji and Ananda Math.* He says that these translations are like sumangalis (Married women whose husband is alive) among widows. *Arya Kirthi* (1893) is a book by Ch. Vasudevayya, containing biographies of Hindus distinguished in History and is based chiefly upon Tod's *Annals of Rajasthan,* which forms part of appropriation of orientalist discourse for a Hindu nationalistic revival. *Ananda Math* is Bankimchandra's novel translated into Kannada by B.Venkatacharya in 1899.[143] It is very clear that B.Venkatacharya is for translations, which would form part of

Hindu nationalist discourse. Later on in his aerial survey Bhashaanthara Vairy encounters certain people, and seeing their "pathetic" condition, he comes down to meet them:

> Their eyes were like burning cinders due to anger mixed with *weakness.* I was horrified at their look. I tried to cool them down. But to my misfortune, as soon as I met them they surrounded me shouting 'hit him, pierce him, chop him". I was perplexed. After some time I asked them who they were. They came down on me like a thunderbolt 'You don't know us, we were kings once upon a time of countries like Britain, Tyre. Cicere. We became outcastes and now we are Hindus. Born Christians but married Hindu women. By using Hindu kings like Maniratha, Parikala. Jayasimha we relieved other Hindu kings of their kingdom. We looted the country of Kosala. We suppressed...(name not visible) the king of North western province of I la Continent. We robbed the Kingdom of Magadh. Exiled Kasi Raja the king of Nilapuri. It is astonishing that you don't know us! You are looking at us scornfully because we are outcastes! If you don't know us then read our biographies (emphasis mine. 1915:13).

Then they give him a list of books, which is nothing but books that are translated into Kannada from English. The above passage is very satirical both about the people who looted the Hindu nation and married Hindu women and who now have no religion/caste, and those who represented it in translation. The translation (in the sense of adaptation, the so-called pre-colonial notion) becomes a metaphor for toss of nation and its women. While the new notion, the colonial one, becomes a metaphor of keeping the cultural differences intact, without accepting the hegemony of the colonizer. The representation of Hinduized kings' eyes in the above passage shows it. They are angry, they want to kill the narrator of the preface but they are also feeble.

Let me summarize the arguments of the preface just discussed.

- For Bhashaanthara Vairy. translating in the sense of adapting English texts to Kannada/Indian settings is colonial and playing into the hands of the colonizer.
- Such translations instead of keeping the caste/religious distinctions intact will only help in weakening the caste system.
- Adaptations will create havoc in our culture, as we will be demonstrating the colonizer's values through our bodies.
- To check the entry of the colonizer's values into our culture, it is better to show the elements of their culture as alien.
- He is worried about the mindless adaptations, which have made the condition of the Kannada language worse.

I am not going to deliberate on whether his way of negotiating with the colonial culture/modernity is appropriate or not. The point that 1 am trying to make here is that the "colonial notion of translation" that insists on being faithful to the original is invoked as a strategy for anti-colonial struggle and in the formulation of a pro Hindu-nationalist discourse.

IV

It is not enough just to claim that the dominant notion of translation with which we operate today is colonial and we had a more dynamic notion of transferring texts from one language to another in the pre-colonial period. What we need to do is look more carefully at these early instances of the use of the colonial notion of translation and study the function these invocations have performed in that historical context. Then it becomes clear that both the old and the new notions of translation have served as strategies for nationalist and anti-colonial struggles. I have used both the old notion of translation - which is supposed to be pre-colonial and dynamic, and is something akin to what we call today as adaptation - and the new notion of translation- which is colonial and not so dynamic, something that

insists on being faithful to the original text and author- in my argument unproblematically. I have done so to point out that though the strategies might be different, their politics could be the same. Now let me take up the arguments presented by the people who make such distinction for more careful analysis.

There are two problems with the theories that posit a pre-colonial notion of translation:

1. They operate with a binary opposition between western and Indian. This gets transformed into colonial and anti-colonial and gets multiplied through association of concepts. Characteristics of one get transferred to another. Thus we get the binary called pre-colonial, dynamic notion of translation that enables one to appropriate any thing from one culture to another culture and colonial notion of translation that ties you down to original and its author.

But if we accept the binary opposite notions of translation i.e., colonial and pre-colonial and then look at the history of translations into Kannada both from Sanskrit and Kannada we find astonishing results. There were very few translations from Sanskrit into Kannada earlier. And many of them were not at all considered translations but as rewriting as discussed earlier. Suddenly during the colonial period there is a spurt of translation activity from Sanskrit into Kannada and when that happens, there is no rewriting but direct translation! Though we find abridged versions, prose versions of Sanskrit texts in Kannada translations, which also change the Sanskrit text drastically, these changes were not part of the politics of "negotiating the hegemony of Sanskrit by Kannada". But in English into Kannada translation activity of the colonial period the translators rewrite "hegemonic English texts" to suit nationalist politics and which amount to operating with the "old notion of translation". What 1 am trying to point out here is that in the 19th century translators from Sanskrit into Kannada operated with the "new notion of translation" and translators from English into Kannada operated with the "old notion of translation". This would mean that Sanskrit translators

were colonial and English translators were anti-colonial. Thus the acceptance of such binary opposites would lead us to unreasonable formulations.

2. These formulations are the result of using West v/s India/Kannada and colonial/pre-colonial as analytical categories to study translation patterns. If we analyze the translation patterns in terms of the politics by which they are shaped and the politics that they have shaped, we will be able to overcome the problem of such formulations. In theories which construct a model of hierarchy only in terms of Sanskrit v/s Kannada or English v/s Kannada, other kinds of complex relations in which people and language are involved gets ironed out. Instead. if we ask what is the politics performed by such deployment of translation, then it would be more fruitful. Shivaram Padikkal, writing about the translation of novels in late 19th and early 20* century, has classified the translations, whether they are direct translations or re-writings, into three categories. The first category is of those translations that rewrite tradition, the second one is of those translations that transform modernity and the third is of those translations that translate the nationalist ethical stand (Padikkal. 2001: 158). These categories correspond with languages from which translations occur. The first category of rewriting tradition corresponds with translations from Sanskrit, the second one of transforming modernity corresponds with translations from English and the third one, translating nationalist ethical stand corresponds with translations from Indian languages like Bengali, Marathi, Tamil and Telugu. I am not going to discuss these categories here as my purpose is to show that other ways of looking at, categorizing translations possible to understand the cultural politics of the day.

Before discussing the issue of modernity and caste it is better to know whom Bhashaanthara Vairy is addressing, as it is linked to what kind of subjects his readers are and what kind of subject-position he wants them to take up. He starts his preface addressing "Paataka Mahashaya" (The Gentleman reader) (1915: 1 and 4). Now let us see who this Gentleman reader is. This reader is

someone who has passed B.A. He modifies it later when he cautions writers and translators of Kannada that if they continue to write and translate in this style no one would read their book (1915: 8).

He says that there are hardly 15 writers/translators among our native people (desiyaru). He says that in Andhra, which lies north west to our country we find at least 15 writers/translators in each district, and among them we find students, teachers, Government servants and lawyers including non-Brahmin Telugu speakers. It is important to note that he clarifies that in Andhra those who are teachers, students. Government servants, lawyers there are non-Brahmins too. Let us ask the question why this clarification. If we assume that being students, teachers, Government servants and lawyers is occupying certain spaces that have come up in the context of modernity then things would fall into place. It was natural that given the cultural capital the Brahmin community had. they filled most of the modern spaces. May be that was the case in princely Mysore. But when he is explaining the situation in Andhra, for clarification to people who have seen only Brahmins in modern spaces. he adds "including non-Brahmins too" (1915:9).

He chides the graduates of Mysore princely state for having forgotten their mother tongue:

> In our country (desa) for the English educated pandits filling their stomach has become the most important thing and they are steeped in their family ocean forgetting the development of the mother tongue. What should I say when laziness, fragility and well-to-do situation join their indifferent attitude towards mother tongue? Oh! English educated people! Graduates! What happened to your degree? Where did your promise go? Did you throw away your degree into Bay of Bengal while coming back from Madras? Or do you think that your certificate is a food-earning card (Hittina cheeti[144])? Do you think the University of

> Madras (Sarva Kala Shaale of Chenna Pattana[145]) is a food pass giving Government Chatra (free boarding house)? Yes, True. You will get Rs. 25 Brahmanartha somewhere! [146] Say enough! Chant 'English Stothra' (composition praising English)! Read 'Gardhabha Stothra" (composition praising Donkey)! Follow the dictates of 'Arishadvarga Kumara Swamy![147] ... This is British Empire. We have given you full freedom in social issues. Odorless flowers! Wear Coat. Boot and Pants! Wear spectacles! Imitate Europeans like Monkeys! What else! Eat opium tablets! Sleep Well! By leaving the responsibility of writing books to people like Kannada munshis and Hobali schoolteachers, it is natural that English pandits like you should sleep! Sleep well! I will spread a nice Bed for you people! (1915: 9-10)

The above passage from Bhashabhimani makes it clear that he is addressing a class that is English educated. He wants them to take up the task of modernizing Kannada and not to imitate the Europeans. He firmly believes that English, education. university. writing books (the creations of modernity) are there for us to strengthen "our" Kannada. He also knows as seen in the previous section that caste distinctions are getting eroded in the context of modernity. He firmly believes that we (the English educated elite) have to use new spaces created by modernity to contain modernity and tame it to be the way we want it to be. That is. he was constructing a certain kind of subject position for upper caste, English educated elite through his preface that would help them to translate colonial modernity as nationalist modernity. What is the problem with nationalist modernity?

It is also clear that this class consists of Brahmins, as seen from the above passage and also from his use of word ' Brahmanartha' for salary. If salary for occupying modern spaces is equivalent to 'Brahmanartha' which literally means money given for a Brahmin for his livelihood. then we can imagine that the modern jobs

were exclusively reserved for Brahmins and they also thought that was meant for them.

If we go back to the debate on Sreekantesh Gowda's translation keeping this in mind, things would become clear. If the readership and authorship of that period in Mysore was constituted of English educated Brahmins, then Sreekantesh Gowda's appearance on the scene is an anomaly. Though he was not anti-Sanskrit, it is clear from his endorsement of Macaulay's oft-quoted passage on Sanskrit literature that he is pro-English. The way modernity gets reconfigured in Sreekantesh Gowda's representations (remember the scene in which the queen steps out of inner courtyard) is something that the nationalist elite doesn't want to happen. It is quite natural that people like Bhashabhimani - who have not entered the modern spaces and still depend on their Sanskrit scholarship and Royal patronage, but believe that both Sanskrit and modern spaces rightfully belong to them - see Sreekantesh Gowda's entry into those spaces and the way he is reconfiguring modernity as threatening. But they cannot say, as they would have done earlier, that a Gowda should not enter modern spaces as he is a Sudra, or that these spaces belong solely to Brahmins, because the logic of modernity treats them as individuals rather than members of a particular community. So it is not possible for Bhashabhimani to use the concept of caste as it existed earlier. Caste signified a whole lot of things like occupation, class position, attire and language. But when Sreekantesh Gowda enters the modern space, his occupation, class position, attire and language changes completely. If the Brahmins have to keep intact the caste distinctions in the face of a changing world, they have to find new ways of articulating those distinctions and thereby transform what the caste system is and what it signifies. Bhashabimani's attack on Sreekantesh Gowda is one such new articulation of caste. In this process genre divisions acquire caste overtone. While prose can be democratized, poetry gets marked for people who can use language subtly without mixing rural/rustic words and by default they are Brahmins.

Bhashabhimani's comment that Sreekantesh Gowda should apologize to Shakespeare for changing the play without his permission is also a new mode of caste articulation. We have seen that almost all translations of that period changed the original play. If this is so, why only Sreekantesh Gowda gets marked out for criticism and why does Bhashabhimani wonder at Gowda writing poetry? What happens here is a certain notion of translation that privileges the author and the original text gets invoked to articulate caste and there by to maintain the caste distinctions in modern space too. Even Pandit Karibasava Shastri's defense of Sreekantesh Gowda that Gowda has not translated but adapted the play operates with the same notion of translation that a translation has to be faithful to the original text and the author, but an adaptation need not be. Here again if we assume that the distinction between translation and adaptation is modem in the Kannada / princely Mysore context, then it is modernity that comes to the defense of Sreekantesh Gowda against a modem articulation of caste. 1 am trying to point out here that modernity in itself is not casteist but it can be mobilized either for it or against it. And whatever the mobilization pattern is, caste gets transformed in the process.

Thus it is not the language of the translation that prompted Bhashabhimani to write a review of Sreekantesh Gowda's translation, but as the foregone analysis shows it is the symptom of the conflict between two ways of scripting modernity in Kannada. It is also an instance of how the old communities transform themselves to acquire new significations for their community in the context of modernity and the challenge that it has to face by the caste hierarchy. The caste hierarchy in the process of challenging the changes within it tries to mobilize modernity to acquire a new signification for it.

6

A Conclusion?

Analyzing the early modern Kannada literature has helped us in establishing that the existing theoretical literature on colonialism and nationalism in India is inadequate and needs to be nuanced to understand the encounter of cultures. as witnessed through the writings and translations of B.M. Srikantia. In this chapter. I will summarize the differences this analysis has shown between the situation that existed in Princely Mysore and that described by the theoretical literature on colonialism and nationalism in India. and make a few tentative theoretical arguments.

If we look at the characteristics of cultural nationalism as manifested in Kannada literature. analysed in the preceding chapters, we see the presence of both Kannada nationalism as well as Indian nationalism. The relationship between these two nationalisms has varied over time. In Chapter Two where 1 have documented the various modes of negotiation carried out b\ the elite to come to terms with the anxiety of lacking certain cultural forms in the colonized culture viz.. tragedy, we see that the characteristics of the discourse informing the negotiation. in a way, forms part of pan-Indian nationalism. There seems to be a construction of an Indian self, drawing certain aspects of the orientalist discourse and accepting many a premise of their construction of "India", as the Other. The English educated elite tries to change certain aspects in the orientalist discourse to suit a certain politics. but this was not a smooth operation and was imbued with certain tensions; what I have called "genre politics" and the debate around it exemplifies one such area. When the English educated elite couldn't change certain aspects of the orientalist discourse. which were not in accordance with their own perception of "self, they tried to come to terms with those aspects of the orientalist discourse. In "genre politics", this drama of western construction of Sanskrit tradition, the nationalist's acceptance of the same and the resultant anxiety and an attempt by the elite to overcome that anxiety was played out. In

this analysis, we see that there is not much difference between an English educated elite writing in Kannada/Princely Mysore and someone writing in other regions. This phenomenon in Kannada literature can be accounted for easily within the framework developed by Partha Chatterjee, by dividing the discourse into thematic and problematic, to which I have referred to in the introductory chapter. The response and the strategies of negotiation adopted by the nationalist elite. though varying over time and across individuals/groups/ communities falls well within Chatterjee's framework.

The debate is actually around the absence of tragedy in Sanskrit theatre tradition. But the debate is carried out in Kannada. Here the Kannada elite is trying to come to terms with the orientalist construction of Sanskrit tradition and the arguments that they propose or the translations they undertake is on behalf of the Sanskrit tradition, but in the name of Indian tradition. Consequently Sanskrit tradition/Indian tradition becomes part of the discourse available in Kannada. In that sense the elite in Princely Mysore actively participates in this pan-Indian discussion, but for a language-region-specific audience.

In T.N. Srikantia's discussion of "Indian Poetics", the Kannada elite is up to something else. Though he is writing a history of Sanskrit poetics, T.N. Srikantia titles it as "Bharatiya Kavya Mimamse" (Indian poetics). Is this act of stretching the narrow identity of Sanskrit towards the broader umbrella term India similar to the orientalists' indiscriminate equation of Sanskrit. Hindu and Indian traditions or is it something else? I would say that it is much more than the simple equation made by the orientalists. Kannada literature didn't have any work related to poetics in it. So the Kannada elite, if they believed that poetics is a must for any literature, had to have a poetics for their literature. In this process of owning a poetics Sanskrit poetics came to stand for Indian poetics so as to be part of a common pool, from which even Kannada literature could draw some elements for its own cultural politics. Thus the Kannada elite operated with a sense of Indian tradition being something more than Kannada tradition.

If we take up the pre-conditions enunciated by Anderson for a nationalism to emerge, then all those pre-conditions did exist in Princely Mysore/Karnataka and a community called Kannadigas was being imagined, as shown elaborately in Chapter Three. But at the same time we also see examples like the above in Kannada literature, where in the context of cultural nationalism a certain kind of pan-Indian community is also being imagined. So there were two communities being imagined, each one claiming to be a nation.

Sudipta Kaviraj refers to a similar situation in Bengal of the 19th century. In Bengal, according to Kaviraj. this Bengali identity which he calls "regional", was later subsumed by the larger national identity. He accounts for this "gerrymandering of the boundaries of selfhood or collective identity" thus:

> If the Bengali *jati* (nation) is an unlikely candidate for successful struggle against the might of British imperialism, the search for a viable nation has to look in other directions. Bengalis did not constitute the stuff of a good nation not because they were lacking in sentiments of solidarity, but because they could not provide a credible opposition to the British empire... (Kaviraj. 1997: 318, italics in original and the words in parenthesis are mine).

But in Karnataka, the Kannada identity was more vocal and did not get easily subsumed under a pan-Indian national identity. The question of need for devising a credible opposition to the British Empire did not arise at all in Princely Mysore. Even when it arose, with the visibility of pan-Indian nationalism in Karnataka, that is after the 1930s, talk of Kannada nationalism continued to exist alongside Indian nationalism. This led to repeated clarifications from Alur Venkatarao, the prominent leader of Karnataka nationalism regarding the relationship between Kannada nationalism. which he calls "Karnatakatwa" (Karnatakism) or "Karnataka Rashtriyate" (Karnataka nationalism) and the Indian national

movement launched by the Congress. The kind and range of imagery used to define this relationship is very interesting:

> Karnataka is a lens through which we look at India and the world...
>
> Indian culture is internalized in Kannada culture and Kannada culture is internalized in Indian culture. Karnataka is a living part of an organic India, Karnataka devi (the goddess of Karnataka) is the daughter of Bharata devi (the goddess of India)...
>
> Indian culture is also Karnataka culture...
>
> Karnataka culture has been nourishing Indian culture since ages and it is a unique culture...
>
> Karnatakism is not against nationalism and nationalism that is against Karnatakism is not nationalism...
>
> The feeling that 1 am first Indian and then a Karnatakian is wrong. There is no question of first and second in this. they are not two opposing things...
>
> Karnataka is the first to save India from the danger of a foreign rule and for it India should be grateful to Karnataka forever...
>
> Kannada language and land is our inner courtyard and India is our outer courtyard in the map of the World...
>
> Bharati devi is the *utsavamurthy*[148] of the world and Karnataka devi is the *utsavamuthy* of Bharati devi... (Venkatarao, 1999: 190-199).

While looking at the above description of the relationship between Karnataka and India by Venkatarao. we have to keep in mind that it was written as "Karnatakakatwada Sootragalu" (formulas of Karnatakatwa) in 1957 after independence and the formation of Karnataka state with the unification of Kannada speaking regions. So it can be argued that it was inevitable for Alur Venkatarao to accept the existing political formation and assert Kannada

nationalism within it and also define the relationship in such a way that it doesn't question the existing accepted political order. But even earlier he was not against the Indian national movement. He did participate in the non-cooperation movement launched by Gandhi; he did serve as the vice-president of the local Congress committee but resigned by stating that he didn't share the views of Gandhi opposing the insertion of social reforms into political struggles against the British (Venkatarao. 1974: 166-167).

What is interesting in the above quote and in his formula of Karnatakatwa is that he presents a system invoking three concentric circles in his mind: one is a global order, the other is India and then Karnataka. But he is not setting up a hierarchy here. For him they are concentric: Karnataka is in the middle, surrounded by India and then the world. It is only by firmly locating oneself in Karnatakatwa that a Kannadiga can look at India and the world. Karnatakatwa is the lens through which we can realize the essence of India and the world. The concrete realization of a world order happens only through India and one encounters India only through Karnatakatwa. In one of his English letters written in 1929 he defines Kamatakatwa like this:

> From my experience of public life in Karnatak (sic) and also from my experience in other fields. I have come to the conclusion that no movement political or otherwise is possible unless there is this Kamatakatwa in us. By Karnatakatwa, I mean the sum total of all our feelings and duties towards Karnatak (like Hindutwa). So it is that from the political field, I turned to this less ambitious but more solid work. My Karnatakatwa is somewhat different from 'Pravincialism' (sic) (Venkatarao. 1999: 9, words in parenthesis are in original).

He clearly defines Karnatakatwa as a commitment to the land and its people and compares it with Hindutwa. He dismisses the idea that it is provincialism or regionalism. For him it is a religion on which the Kannada nation should be built.

This becomes clearer if we look at how he defines the essence of the world and India in particular. His notion of the essence of the world and India is quite interesting:

> The World culture is Sanatana culture that defies any dating, a ubiquitous culture. It has two forms: one is its general form and the other is a specific form. Our Great saints have promoted both the forms and both are found in our India. India, that gave space to all castes. religions, sects, races and nationalities without any discrimination. is the sign of this general form. ...Our saints have molded this general essence into a specific form by establishing a specific religion. tradition and system of rituals. It is the responsibility of all Indians to protect this specific form of India. This specific form is a model that the whole world can follow. ... Only those who don"t accept the general form are our enemies. Those who don't accept this specific form are not our enemies. This specific form can be termed Hindutwa or Hinditwa, the name is not important but the meaning is (Venkatarao, 1999: 190-191).

His problem with Indian nationalists in Karnataka was that some of them did not support his Karnatakatwa and they thought that it was against the Indian national struggle. He further says that if they had not fought for Karnatakatwa and the reunification of Kannada-speaking regions during the colonial period, then there would have been no Karnataka in post-independent India (Venkatarao, 1999: 12-13). This statement, though coming from the vantage point of the post-reunification of Karnataka in 1957, clearly shows the commitment to Kannada nationalism that certain elite groups had during the colonial period.

He gives an important place to literature in the task of evolving Kannada nationalism:

> Literature is the life-force that sustains the nation. Literature is not just a discourse. ... Unless there is an awakened consciousness about the language there can be no awakened consciousness about the land. (Venkatarao, 1999: 198).

For him it is not just enough to have a political reunification of the Kannada-speaking regions, the pre-condition is cultural unification. This task of cultural reunification can be best carried out by literature. To support literature new institutions are needed. So he supported the formation of Mysore University, and attempted to have a University for entire Karnataka. He also played a key role in the activities of Vidyavardhaka Sangha of Dharwad and the Kannada Sahitya Parishat. He resigned from Kannada Sahitya Parishat in 1938 protesting against the attitude of the members of Princely Mysore who he felt were not heeding to the voice of the members of North Karnataka.

As we witness in Chapter Four, literature and litterateurs. especially B.M. Srikantia. played a key role in Kannada cultural nationalism. But there is a difference between Alur Venkatarao who hails from the erstwhile Bombay-presidency i.e., today's North Karnataka and the litterateurs of Princely Mysore region in their conception of Kannada nationalism. In Princely Mysore, people like B.M. Srikantia who contributed much through their writings and activities towards cultural nationalism were not so comfortable with political reunification. This brings us to the question of the then existing political entities and their relationship with the choices made by different social groups.

In Princely Mysore, which was a modern state (nation) in all practical senses in spite of a monarchy and the high handedness of the Madras presidency headed by

the British, people like B.M. Srikantia couldn't think of a state without the King of Mysore. Their loyalty to the King was unquestionable and in fact B.M. Srikantia is often remembered by his title *Rajasevasakta* (An ardent server of the King). Though people like B.M. Srikantia were for cultural nationalism, the political reunification of Kannada-speaking regions posed a challenge to them, as it meant either bringing Princely Mysore under a new political entity called Karnataka either under colonial rule or as a sovereign nation without a monarch. The people of North Karnataka, like Alur Venkatarao, who were for both cultural and political reunification of Karnataka were ready for either option - bringing Kannada regions under a single colonial administration or fighting against the colonial rule for a sovereign nation called Karnataka. The former choice would have brought about the reunification of Karnataka, a task that might have continued to become a struggle for freedom from colonial rule. The latter choice would have brought both reunification and freedom together. People like B.M. Srikantia would have agreed with the idea of a political reunification under the rule of the King of Mysore. But this was not acceptable to the Kannada nationalists of North Karnataka who were simultaneously engaged in the struggle against British, by aligning with the Indian National Congress.

But litterateurs like D.V. Gundappa, after the 1920s became more vocal about the demand for responsible government in Princely Mysore, although this demand did not gain much force then. Even the Congress did not demand the removal of the King, but expected that the King be more lenient towards the Congress. It was because of this that, as mentioned earlier, they never felt the direct impact of colonial rule, nor did they feel that the ruler was oppressive, though the King was expected by the colonial state in Madras Presidency to curb the national movement in Mysore. But this national movement itself was very mild. The demand for responsible government in Princely Mysore acquired currency only on the eve of the independence of India.

The Backward Class movement in Princely Mysore also sought to distance itself from the Indian National Congress dubbing it as a Brahmin lobby. They were loyal to the King of Mysore as he implemented reservations in public sector as demanded by the Backward Class movement, though the Brahmins opposed this move. The implementation of reservation was along the lines recommended by the Miller Committee appointed by the King. Thus the King had the suppon of this Backward Class movement till the 1940s, when the movement and the political party carved out of it merged with the Indian National Congress. This Backward Class movement was not so particularly interested in the reunification of Karnataka, and was certainly looking at Congress with suspicion. When it came to cultural nationalism none of these groups hesitated to be a part of both the imagined communities - Kannada and Indian, but sans the political dimension of these imagined communities, as these groups wanted to stay well within their existing political order or the one that they desired.

Thus though there was a notion of a community called 'India' operating in Kannada literature it was limited only to cultural nationalism and did not, at least in Princely Mysore region, translate into a political one. As noted earlier, the Kannada elite strategically needed a certain common cultural pool for enriching Kannada cultural nationalism vis-a-vis the West and it necessitated being part of the imagined community of India too. The increasing number of translations from Sanskrit during this period indicates this. 19th century is full of not only translations from English, but also from Sanskrit.

The kind of relationship that Kannada and Sanskrit had earlier was also re-mapped with the encounter of Kannada with colonialism. It is said that in the pre-colonial period, the relation between Kannada and Sanskrit was one of dominance of one culture (Sanskrit) over the other (Kannada). And Kannada tried to negotiate with it by appropriating Sanskrit cultural elements, not through direct translations but through adaptations from Sanskrit, so as not to acknowledge the debt to Sanskrit. It is appropriate to probe what is meant by Kannada here. The

appropriation of Sanskrit texts or emergence of literature in Kannada in the 9th century is not simply a story of Kannada v/s Sanskrit but one of Jaina religion trying to reach out to the aristocracy and mercantile class of the Kannada speaking regions. One of the strategies adopted by these writers was to borrow from Vedic / Sanskrit literature and change it to suit either the needs of their religion or the needs of their own time. Similarly in the 12* century Veerashaiva religion used Kannada to reach out to the artisan class in an oral form. But later since the 15th century. Brahmins have also used Kannada effectively to propagate both Bhakti traditions and Vedic traditions. So the pre-colonial relationship between Kannada and Sanskrit is not a simple case of Kannada v/s Sanskrit. where the latter was hegemonic and the former was challenging that hegemony. The relationship between Sanskrit and Kannada again undergoes a change in the colonial period. As seen in Chapter Three. B.M. Srikantia and others believed that Sanskrit was the language of our ancestors. the Aryans. Even Alur Venkatarao subscribes to this view; for him "'Sanskrit is our sacred language" and "it should become the language of our scholars" (Venkatarao, 1999: 198). Thus the Kannada elite who was trying to challenge the hegemony of Sanskrit till then. though for various religious reasons. on encountering colonialism stops seeing Sanskrit as a hegemonic language: it becomes their own language, the mother of Kannada language. So we find an attempt to strike an alliance with Sanskrit and a pan-Indian community to face the challenge posed by the colonial culture. This alliance comes to be imagined through images drawn from family, and through the use of kinship terms.

It is not only the question of having a strategic alliance with an Indian community and Sanskrit that gave a fillip to the notion of an Indian community. Translations from other language texts that were part of the Indian nationalist discourse also helped put that discourse into circulation. Since the beginning of the 20th century we witness pan-Indian nationalist texts getting translated into Kannada, mainly from Bengali and Marathi. Texts such as Bankimchandra's novel and novels from Marathi got translated into Kannada. Though there was a political necessity for

these texts in North Karnataka, these texts were also read in other regions. Thus a new subject position, that of a pan-Indian subject, also gained currency.

To make a few tentative remarks on the relationship between Kannada nationalism and Indian nationalism, let us define the concept of nationalism. I would agree with the formulation of Anderson that nation is an imagined community. But I would further qualify it thus: since nationalism strives to achieve the nation, a geographical region with marked boundaries by claiming that the region has "a specific culture" since ages, it needs its own modern political entity called the nation-state. The basis for constructing a specific culture with a history for it could be different: if it is mainly language in Europe, it could be different in different places. As Partha Chatterjee would argue, nationalism in India is driven primarily by colonialism. Or it could be religion in the case of the formation of Pakistan, apart from colonialism. The question is. though the imagined communities based on languages evolved in India. why did not a full-fledged nationalism. which eventually could claim a nation and a nation-state for a particular linguistic region that it claimed as its own. evolve in India? Sanskrit. which was a dead language or had a limited use in the present context, was associated with the notion of the Indian nation. And an alien language like English fused the elites of different linguistic regions, though they constituted a marginal group in terms of numbers. This is quite contrary to the principle that Anderson states; it is the standardization of vernacular languages and emergence of literature in those languages coupled with the development of print capitalism that sowed the seeds of nationalism in Europe. In that sense it was a popular move, which shaped the imagination of the population. But in India it was either a "dead language" like Sanskrit or an alien language (that too the language of the colonizer) that played a key role in Indian nationalism. Though Hindi came to be associated with Indian nationalism that was only in the 1930s, and till now that language too is contested as the national language.[149] It was the English-knowing elite who spearheaded nationalism and mediated between the

masses and the nation that was emerging. Sudipta Kaviraj has discussed this diglossia that prevailed in the colonial period (Kaviraj, 1998).

The explanation provided by Sudipta Kaviraj in the context of 19th century Bengal, that for a viable alternative it was necessary for the Bengali elite to forge a larger identity to oppose the mighty colonizer, doesn't satisfactorily explain the situation in Karnataka. First of all what happens in Karnataka is not a gerrymandering of the boundaries of self. For the Bengali elite there was not much of a difference between a Bengali self and an Indian self, only the boundaries used to change but the content remained the same. But our analysis has shown that in Karnataka, the boundaries of Kannada and India are clearly demarcated and are two distinct identities though they perceive a relationship between the two in terms of kinship. The task of imagining a Kannada self was carried out alongside a construction of the Indian self, and the task was far from over even in the middle of 20th century. But in Bengal the question seems to have been resolved in the 19th century itself.

By looking at the context of Karnataka, mainly Princely Mysore, and Kannada literature. I would say that Kannada nationalism, though it emerged and succeeded in imagining a Kannada community, could not articulate itself in terms of a nation or a nation-state for the geographic region, which it identified as its own. It was due to the historical-political situation in which the region was caught up and the influence of political entities that the Kannadigas inhabited on the choices they could make or the choices that were thrown up to them, as I have explained earlier. Thus the peculiar situation in which the region claimed by Kannada nationalism as its own was caught up during the colonial period constrained the articulation of Kannada nationalism. It could never articulate a nation-state of its own. In that sense I would tentatively call Kannada nationalism in the colonial context a "retarded nationalism".

This point of similarity, difference and relationship between Kannada nationalism and Indian nationalism, which were imagining Kannada and Indian communities respectively, begs another question that I have pointed out in Chapter Three. If there were other communities, apart from Kannada and Indian, being imagined, or if old communities were re-imagining themselves in the context of modernity, then what kind of relationship did these communities have with Kannada nationalism and with Indian nationalism? Though I have not taken up this question for examination, and although I am not competent to elaborate on this issue, I wish to make a few tentative remarks.

As discussed in Chapter Three, certain pre-colonial communities like the Lingayats were trying to reshape the community in the context of modernity. 1 am not suggesting here that this happened because these communities were enumerated by the colonial state. Though it was the new historical challenge/opportunity thrown up by the rapidly changing socio-political scenario brought about by colonialism and modernity that might have been the driving force behind the new imagination that was reshaping the community, it is not simply one of the colonial state apparatus enumerating the existing caste/communities. Though I would agree that these communities did try to align with the new power (colonial state) that was emerging, it is not simply a case of collaboration. I would rather see it as a community trying to re-imagine itself in the context of the changed socio-economic scenario. Any community in order to survive has to reinvent its boundaries, content and symbols in order to keep pace with the challenges thrown from outside it. Moreover, a community might change itself because of the dynamics of contradictions that exist within it or as a response to the changes happening outside its fold. Many a times the reshaping of the communities would be the result of both these forces i.e., internal dynamics as well as external changes.

In the case of new communities, it is not just language and nation-based communities that were emerging; other communities like the Backward Classes

were also emerging at this point of time. In Princely Mysore with the changed socio-economic scenario, certain castes and religions like Vokkaligas, Lingayats, Kuruba and Muslim, formed a kind of alliance which in turn gave rise to this new community - the Backward Classes, at least in the political sphere, to push themselves towards modernity. In order to pressurize the state in Princely Mysore they formed a broad political base. There may not have been any significant corresponding cultural homogenization that occurred with this political alliance of these castes and religion. But anyhow we can say that at least this group behaved like a political community for all practical purposes in its relation vis-a-vis the state and also vis-a-vis the Brahmins, who had garnered a majority of the positions in the state machinery and the new institutions that were coming up in the context of the modernization of Princely Mysore.

It would be interesting to see what kind of relationship these other communities which did not mark a geographical region as their own and claim ownership of it. had with the communities that were marking a specific geographical region as their own and claiming its ownership, such as the Kannada community and the Indian community. As mentioned earlier the Backward Class movement did not favorably look upon the Indian national movement led by Congress. as it suspected it to be a part of "Brahmin conspiracy". With regard to Kannada nationalism, which was led mainly by the literati, the Backward Classes had no role to play, though they were not hostile to the ideals of Kannada nationalism. Here we are discussing as if these communities are clearly demarcated from each other. But in reality it is not so; the Kannada community would encompass Backward Classes and others within its fold. Indian community too would encompass Backward Classes in its fold at least in definition. Or an individual of the Backward Class, though the movement looked at the Congress with suspicion for all practical purposes, might believe in the discourse of Indian nationalism or Kannada nationalism. So these communities were not mutually exclusive but mutually coexisting.

The Lingayat community, which was initially cold to the Indian national movement and the Kannada movement, later on started participating in both the movements. Likewise the Backward Class movement later on towards the **end** of the 1930s merged with the Indian National Congress and actively participated in the struggle for responsible government in Princely Mysore. Can we say then **that** the discourse of nationalism (both Kannada and Indian) hegemonised other discourses that were challenging it earlier? Or is it that these communities thought that their entry into the nationalist movement would alter the discourse and **tilt it** towards them?

If we look at how Kannada nationalism and Indian nationalism responded to these communities, then that might also give us some hint about the kind of relationship that they might have had. As I tried to show while analyzing the canonization of B.M. Srikantia"s *English Geetagalu* in Chapter Four, the English educated elite which was in the forefront of the nationalist movement successfully tried to co-opt others into the movement by negotiating with these communities through a discourse of Kannada literature and tradition, that would accommodate them. This brings us to the question of what was the Other that this dominant discourse constructed for itself, to fashion the nationalist self? Let me here also look at the question of the Other as discussed in some of the writings on colonialism and nationalism in India.

We have seen in Chapter Two that the West tried to fashion its self when it encountered what it perceived as "Indian culture". In that process it constructed an Other, "the Indian", in a manner which is well identified now as orientalist discourse. While doing so it not only drew sustenance from the resources that were available within Anglo-Saxon culture but also drew from Greco-Roman resources as I tried to show in Chapter Two. And in the same way, we have seen how the nationalist elite in Princely Mysore drew not only from the resources available in Kannada but also from Sanskrit by casting it as Indian and keeping the West as the Other. But for construction of a self, the Other need not be a

single one. A Self gets fashioned when h encounters what it perceives as other cultures and it need not always be a unitary culture that it encounters. Scholars have also talked about how for the nationalist self in India it was not just the West that was the Other but also Muslims and so on.

Javed Alam tries to show by reading the late 19th century Bengali texts of Bankimachandra and Vivekananda that for the modern Indian self, which was based on religion, the Other became Islam as representing non-West, while they tried to prove that Hindu religion was modern in its tenets (Alam, 1999).[150] While analyzing the poems of B.M. Srikantia we have seen, how he hails Queen Britannia, the elder sister of India. who came on request to rescue the nation which was dominated by the "Muslima Kula" (the clan of Muslim) by winning over them and uniting the nation. Thus in the Mysore context also, though not as overtly as in northern India, the nationalist discourse had Muslims as the Other. Not to mention the translations of Galaganatha from Marathi in North Karnataka, which explicitly depict Muslims as villains.[151] In feet it is part of a common narrative that existed in the nationalist writing in India to depict Muslim rule as an alien rule. Sudipta Kaviraj, while talking about the depiction of Muslims as villains in Bankimachandra's fiction and Hindu kings as heroes fighting them says, "These episodes can also be taken symbolically, non-literally, in which case, of course, when he (Bankimachandra) pointed his finger at the Muslim he may have actually meant the British" (Kaviraj, 1995: 319). Javed Alam refuses to read this as a stylistic device of Bankimachandra or as a symbolic representation of the British and says "with the extended history of domination (extending to the pre-colonial period), the foreigner now becomes not only the British but also those, like Muslims, who had made India their home" and sees it as the construction of the Muslim as the Other in nationalist discourse (Alam, 1999: 104). In B.M. Srikantia, as we have seen, it is the Muslim who is treated as an enemy and strangely the colonizer is seen as an ally who helps in getting rid of this enemy. This is not to suggest that the discourse fashioned by B.M. Srikantia, Kannada nationalist discourse doesn't have "West" as the Other, but what I am trying to

suggest here is that this discourse has multiple Others. This point will become clearer as we explore its implications further.

Sudipta Kaviraj talks about an external Other and an internal Other of modernity. He says that the external other was the colonizer and the internal other was the metropolitan proletariat, while talking about the understanding of the colonizer in the second stage of nationalism (Kaviraj, 1995: 326).[152] He also talks about a distinction emerging between high and low culture. He is quick to point out that this distinction "was no new thing in Indian History; but the new distinction was not between high and low in the same register; rather, it became two incommensurable registers resisting mutual translation" (Kaviraj. 1995: 322). He further argues that Gandhi tried to articulate his resistance in such a manner that it was intelligible in both the registers though he did not "become the creator of a culture of mutual translation". As we see in Chapter Three, where we have looked at the standardization of language, a distinction between language of the people and the language of the elite emerges within Kannada. And also we see in Chapter Four, while discussing the notion of modern Kannada literature as conceived by B.M. Srikantia, that a similar distinction is posited between popularly read/listened (folk) texts and the new literature that was emerging. So the modern self that was being fashioned then, not only had the colonizer and also the Muslim as the Other, but also other groups as the Other. What we see here are multiple Others. Partha Chatterjee calls this aspect of nationalism as elitist in its approach and calls the groups that get constituted as internal Others as fragments left out of the nation, when it arrived. It would be easy to reach the same conclusion here that the self that was fashioned in Kannada literature did not include non-elite groups and they were relegated to being fragments of the nation. But I wouldn't subscribe to this fully in the context of Princely Mysore.

For example the Backward Class was able to enter the institutions of the modern state that were then emerging through a popular movement. So they can never be considered mere fragments of a nation. But I was not able to fully demonstrate

this aspect here as there is no powerful representation of this movement in Kannada literature. If I had taken up for study the discourse of the Backward Class movement in Karnataka, I would have been able to demonstrate it, but now I can only fall back on the work of other scholars. M.S.S. Pandian, who has worked on a similar context in Tamil Nadu, where anti-Brahmin movement led by E.V. Ramaswamy was prominent during the colonial period, says:

> Freed from the nationalist binary of nationalism versus colonialism. anchored in history and rationality as progress troubled all the time about notions of citizenship. E.V. Ramaswamy's concept of nation denied its origin in an invented 'classical' Indian/Tamil past and envisaged it fully in the anticipatory. More importantly, it constantly violated any certitude about boundaries. identities and political agency; and also represented itself as not constrained by the rigid territoriality of the nation-space (Pandian, 1999: 286).

The movement fashioned by Ramaswamy was seeking equality, a more democratic notion of citizenship than inventing a classical past. which is why it was looking for a golden age in the future. Perhaps the Backward Class movement in Mysore was also working towards a similar goal and that is why we don't find them taking recourse to literature to construct a glorious past.

Further while talking about the programmes of E.V.Ramaswamy like demanding reservation for backward castes, satyagraha in front of a temple demanding entry for the lower castes into the temple and opposing separate dining system for Brahmins and non-Brahmins in a Gurukulam Pandian says:

> ...These moves by E.V. Ramaswamy refused the possibility of national subjects being constituted within the delimiting binary of nationalism versus colonialism or through the mere process of Othering the colonizers. Instead his attempt was to stage a

> contestatory dialogue among different subject positions ...already inscribed by power and powerlessness. within the nation-space. In other words for him, the community of national subjects could not be a non-negotiated given from above, but had to be negotiated from below (Pandian, 1999: 288-289).

Further Pandian says that EVR "implicated both colonialism and the indigenous as upholders of Manu Dhanna instead of full fledged Manitha Dhanna" and EVR "implicated British as unwilling modernists" (p. 293-294). We see here that the Backward Class movement was not interested in fashioning the self vis-a-vis the colonizer but was trying to fashion its self as modern citizens vis-a-vis Brahmins, who were trying to posit an elite discourse of nationalism.

Here it would be appropriate to mention the text by Swami Dhanna Theertha, *History of Hindu Imperialism* (1941). where he also constructs a nationalist discourse that presents Brahmins as the Other. So I wouldn't consider these groups which were left out of the discourse of nationalism, evident in Kannada literature. as mere fragments of a nation or as subaltern groups without any voice. 1 would say that they had an active agency. which tried to configure the nation and the state in a way that was different from the way the Brahmin elite was configuring it. The context is not simply one of the colonizer versus the colonized, as Pandian warns us; it is the context of multiple discourses each having multiple Others. Here I would reiterate my earlier point that the discourses produced by other non-nationalist or nationalist-non elite groups are also translations of the colonial discourse. but as they have a different politics to perform and a different subject position to offer to their subscribers, translate into a discourse different from their elitist counterpart's. But what finally became a hegemonic discourse is a different issue and what happened to these alternate voices is a matter of further investigation.

The question of why the Backward Class movement receded with the ascendancy of Kannada nationalism is a matter for future research. Is it just a coincidence or is there a relationship between the two phenomena, is yet to be ascertained. Other questions that are yet to be answered are: Why did the political party carved out of the Backward Class movement merge with the Indian National Congress? Is it merely a case of the sway of the hegemonic Indian nationalist discourse over these groups? Was there any active agency that prompted Backward Class leaders to take up the subject position offered by the nationalist discourse?

The point that using the simple binary of colonizer and colonized doesn't work in analyzing the cultural transactions of the colonial period is demonstrated through analyzing two moments in the history of translation and debate around the notion of translation in Princely Mysore in Chapter Five. In the same chapter I have tried to show how the caste system which was a pre-colonial social institution had to shed its old significations, and acquire new ones by ascribing new caste distinctions to the genres in the colonial context in Princely Mysore. The larger issue that gets indicated, through the analysis of the two moments in the history of translation activity in Princely Mysore, is that aspects of modernity get appropriated by different groups/communities for different politics.

The non-hegemonic versions of modernity that is not visible in mainstream Kannada literature are in a way contestatory, though articulated in a different period. The emergence of Bandaya and Dalit literature in the 1970s and 1980s in Kannada literature seem to have challenged the hegemonic notion of the nationalist self and the Kannada self that were configured in the colonial period, and have tried to reconfigure them in a different way. But this aspect needs to be further investigated. Here I have limited myself to analyzing Kannada literature of the colonial period.

Thus the question of colonialism, nationalism and "English" in Princely Mysore as evident in Kannada literature is a very complex one and different from the way

these questions have been articulated in other places. In this dissertation I have hinted at the specific way questions of colonialism and nationalism arose in Princely Mysore. The theoretical remarks that 1 have made are tentative in nature in the absence of already formulated theoretical models and tools to explain such a situation.

One more caution about my formulations in this concluding chapter: 1 have used non-literary events and texts to understand colonialism and nationalism in Princely Mysore only as a background to highlight the significations of the analysis of literary/translated texts that I was examining. Instead, if 1 had made a comparative study of these non-literary activities and the literary/translation activity, I feel that it would have made my claims stronger. If I had taken up literary personalities like K.V. Puttappa. who hails from the Vokkaliga community, that at least to some extent might have shown a different configuration of modernity. I have limited myself to the period upto the 1940s. partly because after this period we find a different kind of politics. After 1940s the pan-Indian national struggle put the question of Kannada nationalism on the backburner until the 1950s when Kannada nationalism strongly reappeared. Further, looking at D.V. Gundappa's non-literary writings might have helped me in tackling the post 1940s scenario. as he played a key role in articulating the demand for responsible government not only in Princely Mysore but also tried to fashion similar demands in other princely states. The demand for responsible government indicates the move from monarchy to democracy, which was similar to the demands made by the Indian National Congress in the context of colonial India. This further indicates the waning of the legitimacy of princely states vis-à-vis the Indian National Congress. As my intention was to demonstrate the difference between the pan-Indian situation and Princely Mysore situation in terms of questions of colonialism and nationalism, I focussed on the pre-1940s period leaving the question of other dimensions of the process of hegemony of pan-Indian nationalist discourse over the Kannada nationalist discourse to future research.

Notes:

Chapter One:

[1] The following are some of the seminars held on the issue of crisis in English studies all over India: In Hyderabad, in addition to the "'Provocations" seminar, there was one more seminar in 1995 organized by the Department of English, University of Hyderabad. The papers presented in the seminar were not published but available in Department of English, University of Hyderabad. In Baroda. MS. University of Baroda organized a seminar "The Compulsions and Possibilities of Genera] English" in November 1998. One more conference "New Directions in English Studies" was organized at the Central Institute of Indian Languages, Hyderabad as part of the annual conference of Indian Association of English Teachers in February 2001. In Bangalore a UGC sponsored seminar "Crisis in English Literature and Language Teaching" was held at the Regional Institute of English by APS College. Bangalore. Even the undergraduate students of Mount Carmel College, Bangalore organized a seminar around this issue "Issues and Prospects in English Studies" in February 2001. Another UGC sponsored seminar "Re/thinking English in India", was held at Rajkot in February 2002, organized by Shri H.B. Jasani Arts and N.K. Jasani Commerce College. I have presented papers or participated in discussion in almost all the seminars held after 1995.

[2] I am using the category dominant castes in the sense M.N. Srinivas has used it to refer to Vokkaligas and Lingayats who own lands.

[3] Renaissance is often the word employed in traditional literary historiography to denote the emergence of new literature in Indian languages by their coming into contact with western literature. But I would call it as modern literature instead of using the term Renaissance in my study.

[4] On survival of culture and translation in the colonial and postcolonial context, see Homi Bhaba's 'The Postcolonial and the postmodern: The Question of Agency" (171-97) and "How newness enters the World: Postmodern space, postcolonial times and the trials of cultural translation" (212-35) in *Location of Culture* (1994).

[5] Inden has talked about this aspect in his article "Orientalist Construction of India" (1986).

Chapter Two:

[6] On Shakespeare in Indian during colonial days see, Trivedi (1993: 23-43).

[7] 1 am using the version translated by M.E. Hubbard (1989). All the page references are to the 1989 edition.

[8] It is important to note that 1 use words like "British" and "West" interchangeably in this chapter. Though making a distinction between them and exploring their relationship may be useful elsewhere, it is not so in the context of my argument presented in this chapter.

[9] I have culled out this information from the introductions that these scholars have written to their translations, such as *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus* (1827) by Horace Wilson.

[10] 1 thought of consulting the original work of William Carey for this quote, but Muttanna's book does not mention the name of the book, so 1 had to rely on the practice of quoting from the quote.

[1] It is to be mentioned that for these scholars, Sanskrit, Indian and Hindu were synonymous terms, though people like Wilson were aware of the feet that the Sanskrit theatre was the monopoly of Brahmins and part of only the upper strata of society and that there were popular plays for the public like Yatras of Bengal.

[2] "Castra" is the spelling used by the author with diacritical marks. While quoting however, I have changed it into the way I am transliterating the non-English words into English in this dissertation.

[13] It is claimed by today's literary theoreticians such as Tarikere (2001), that Kannada has its own poetics that is different from Sanskrit and which is implicit in prefaces, occasional writings and in opening verses of Kannada writings, and this poetics needs to be culled out from them. That is why I have used the word 'explicit' in my reference. In feet T.N. Srikantia in the appendix to his book lists out the Kannada texts that have come on characteristics of poetry. But these books basically use theoretical concepts proposed in Sanskrit texts and stop at the level of providing examples from Kannada texts. Though many of these texts are influenced by certain Sanskrit texts, they are not exact translations of the Sanskrit texts. And often in their enthusiasm to prove that "our" traditions had poetics, some of the scholars collapse the distinction between rhetoric and poetics.

[14] Originally it was delivered as a lecture at Mythic Society and later published in the journal.

[15] According to Indian mythology time is divided into four yugas and runs cyclically; they are Krita yuga, Tretaa yuga, Dwapara yuga and Kali yuga.

I have avoided the use of the word caste, as Varna and castes are not one and the same. The word Sudra that appears in *Natya Shastra* refers to the Varna system not to Caste. But this is not to say that there is no relationship between the two.

[17] Pampa is the first great poet known to us in Kannada literature, who wrote two epics viz., *Adi Purana* and *Vikramarjuna Vijaya* (popularly known as Pampa Bharatha) in Champu form a mixture of prose and poetry. He belongs to 10th century AD. See on him Mugali (1975: 21-29). Nagachandra called himself as Abhinava Pampa, claiming to be or aspiring to be as great as Pampa.

[18] Reference here is to the birth of poetry/epic in India. It is said that when Valmiki was doing penance a hunter killed a female krouncha bird when it was with its male; seeing this he wept and out of that cry the first verse came out of his mouth and that formed the first epic of India called *Ramayana*.

[19] The debate on modernity v/s tradition has been researched extensively, as the debate constituted one of the fundamental ways of making sense of the changes that were effected in the context of colonialism. For example see, Chandra (1994), Chatterjee (1993b) and Panikkar (1998). This debate played out in the context of colonialism, saw these two categories as mutually exclusive. For an early

problematization of these categories see Rudolph and Rudolph (1987). There are several studies on Modernity which have abandoned such a dichotomous position such as Alam, (1999), Niranjana, Sudhir P. and Dhareshwar eds. (1993) and Joshi (2001).

[20] Sudras were not supposed to indulge in penance, their duty was to serve the three upper strata of people viz., Brahmin (Priestly class), Kshatriya (Warrior or Ruling class) and Vaishya (Merchant class).

[21] The politics of using Kannada for social plays and English to rework the characters from Mahabharata is explored in Boratti (1998) and on Kailasam's plays in general, see Maithreyi M.R. (1997).

[2] C.R. Reddy is founder of Andhra University and later became the pro-chancellor of Mysore University.

[23] This play is not included in his collected works.

[24] Samsa committed suicide in 1939. He was the first independent playwright in Kannada to sketch historical tragedies. His works eluded scholars for a long time and he was rediscovered only in the 1980s (Samsa, 1988).

[5] This quotation is from Seshagiri Rao"s article in *BMS: The Man and His Mission* brought out by BMS Memorial Foundation and contains no publication date. As this book was brought out to celebrate the centenary of his birth we can assume that it might be in 1984, so in the text I have mentioned 1984 as the date ofpublication.

[26] An imaginary sister of Parashurama and wife of Drona and in the play mother of Ashwaththama.

[27] His own invention.

[28] See the chapter in this thesis on "Translation in Translation: Caste. Colonialism. Nationalism in Princely Mysore" for more discussion on this text and related issues.

Chapter Three:

[29] An elaborate discussion of canonization of this text is taken up in another chapter.

[30] See the discussion on this by Partha Chatterjee in his *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse?* (1985) and also the chapter "Whose Imagined Community" in *Nation and Its Fragments* (1993a) where he establishes the difference between western nationalism, which was popular and Indian nationalism, which was elitist in its attitude.

[31] See on the question of language and colonialism Cohn (1985) and (1997), Sudhir P (1993). And also on the economy of language under colonialism in Western India see Naregal (2000). Another note has to be added here that scholars like Sudipta Kaviraj and Veena Naregal are aware of language-based identity formation during the colonial period on the languages, they have worked, Bengali and Marathi respectively, but the language- based identity has soon given way to a pan-Indian national identity. 1 shall take up this point in the concluding chapter of this work.

[32] Kaviraj has analyzed the question of identity and language but the thrust of his work has been to understand the question of language in the context of colonialism and nationalism. His focus is on Bengali identity formation.

It is also variously called as Vachana movement, Basava movement, Lingayat movement etc.

[34] What was the need to consider it as literature in 20th century is a different story altogether. Three are speculations that it is part of a move to integrate Lingayats with Kannada movement in the mid 20* century, but needs to be substantiated yet.

" For an argument of this sort see Shankara Bhat (2000).

[36] The names of books and other details are taken from an article on Assamese literature for *Anthology of Indian literature* by Maheshwara Niyoga (Niyoga, 1983). I have used the Kannada translation of this article.

[37] I use the word pre-modern instead of the words like pre-colonial and traditional used by others, for example Kaviraj whom I quote below uses the word traditional community (see the following quotation and pre-colonial world used in his other article. Kaviraj. 1989: 40). 1 use "pre-modern" because 1. Tradition is a modem construction and to name something as traditional is to inhabit the space of that construction. 2. Though it is through colonialism that modernity appeared in India. colonialism and modernity are not inter-changeable. Also even in Europe the community that existed before modernity was also one without maps and enumeration (see Anderson. 1983). Even if we assume vice-versa, that is, that it is modernity that bred colonialism then also they are not interchangeable.

[38] Also see Kaviraj (1989: 39-41).

[39] Bankimchandra Chattopadhyay is one of the early Modern Bengali writers, who is often studied as the first writer with nationalist moorings.

[40] As an example of such writings I here give just the books that are published last year, K.V. Subbanna's *Kaviraja Maarga Mattu Kannada Jagattu* (Kaviraja Maarga and the Kannada World) (Subbanna. 2000), Jayaprakash Banjagere"s *Kannada Rastriyate* (Kannada Nationalism) (Jayaprakash, 2000) and also some of the essays in Rahamath Tarikere edited *Kaviraja Maarga: Saamskritika Mukhamukhi* (Kaviraja Maarga: A Cultural interface) (Tarikere, 2000).

[41] Some of these facts and figures are taken from the book *Srirangapattanadalli Mattu Suttamuttalalli Christa Dharmada Ugama* by Anthappa I (1994).

[42] Roughly two kinds of missionaries can be seen during this period. Some missionaries thought if they first convert high caste people the rest will follow them. and accordingly they dressed themselves like Brahmin sanyasis. The other group of missionaries was called Pandari Swamis, who dressed like the OBC sanyasis and mainly worked among lower castes as they were more vulnerable to conversion.

[43] For them it was a nightmare to pass the native language examination. If we look at the archival materials of colonial administration at Fort St. George, we commonly encounter petitions by trainee administrators to extend time to pass the native language examination.

[44] This information is based on an article written by Sham in *Kannada Nudi* (Vol.29, No. 2) which in turn is based on an article written by Priyaranjan Sen in *Calcutta Review* (May, 1942).

[45] Another spelling is also used for Fr. Cinnami, i.e. Fr. Sinnamo

[46] Kesiraja's *Shabdhamanidarpana* was a 13th century text. It is said that he is a Jaina writer, but in his text we find borrowings from Hindu mythology and also naming certain vrittas after the names of Hindu gods such as Shiva. So people have tried to call him also a Shaivite but as his king was a Shaivite, it is natural that he might have tried to please him by such acts.

For more details on this Dictionary see *A Dictionary with a Mission: Papers of the International Conference on the Occasion of the Centenary Celebrations of Kittel 's Kannada-English Dictionary* (1998).

See for contribution of Christian Missionaries to Kannada Religious Literature Edward Noronha`s *Kannada Dharmika Sahityakke Kraista Mishanarigala Koduge* (1996). And on service of Kittel to Kannada literature K.M. Mathew's *Rev. Fr. Kittel: Ondu Adhyayana* (1994).

[49] Another spelling for Srirampur is Serirampoor.

[50] Sarvajna was supposed to be wandering poet who might have lived in 17th century. It is said that his poetry has elements of both Shaivism and Vaishnavism. One of the researchers on Christian missionaries in 17th century opines that he might have converted to Christianity at Srirangapattnam, but he is not sure about this, see (Anthappa, 1994: 185-197).

[51] This essay is included in English version, in the English translation of the book *Hermann Moegling* (1997) written by Dr. Hermann Gundert in 1882.

[52] Vachanas are sayings of Veerashaiva cult followers, which came as a reaction to orthodox Brahminism in 12th century. Basava spearheaded this movement which later converted itself into a cult and now has become a caste within Hindu religion.

[53] Vaishnava Bhakti literature that was popular since the middle ages.

[54] A form of Folk play but with classical movements performed in Coastal region of Karnataka.

Some of the texts in this genre are:

1. *The Last Seige of Seringpatam: An Account of the Final Assault: May 4th 1799- Of the Death and Burial of Tippu Sultan; and of the Imprisonment of British Officers and Men; Taken from the Narratives of Official Present at the Seige and of those who Sun'ived Their Captivity* compiled by Rev. E.W. Thompson (1923),
2. *Tippoo Sultan: A Tale of the Mysore War* by Meadows Taylor (nd)
3. *A View of the Origin and Conduct of the War with Tipoo Sultan; Comprising a Narrative of the Operations of the Army under the Command of Lieutenant General George Harris and of the Siege of Seringapatam* by Lieutenant Colonel Alenande Beatson in 1800
4. *A Narrative of the Sufferings of James Bristow belonging to the Bengal Artillery During Ten Years Captivity with Hyder Ally and Tipoo Saheb* by Bristow (1794)

5. *A Review of the Origin, Progress and Result of the Decisive War with the Late Tipoo Sultan in Mysore* by James Salmond (1800)

6. *The Captivity, Sufferings and Escape of James Scurry, Who Was Detained a Prisoner During Ten Years in the Dominions of Haider Ali and Tipu Sahib* by James Scurry (1824)

[56] The details of these writings are collected from various sources.

The Kaifiyats related to Karnataka are now available in a book form, see *Karnatakada Kaifiyattugalu* (Kannada) ed. M.M. Kalburgi (1994).

[58] Devachandra later added a few more chapters in praise of the Mysore king and read out the text to the Queen to obtain some favors.

[59] On the survey of Nepal, Assam and other regions of extreme north, see the chapter "Misinformation and Failure on the Fringes of Empire" in Bayly C.A. (1999)

[60] Even today these volumes are seen as sources of information for people working on the colonial history of Princely Mysore or of Kannada speaking regions than as a certain form of colonial discourse, which tried to represent the orient in a particular way.

[61] A Queen who fought the British Army against their policy that adopted children had no right to rule.

[62] There were nearly 21 small such princely states in Kannada speaking regions. The Kannada speaking region of Bombay presidency was called then Southern Maratha Country.

[63] See "A Selection of Canarese Ballads" in Fleet (1885), (1886), (1887). (1889), and (1890).

[64] See for more detailed information on use of Kannada in British Administration, Banakar(1986).

[65] Sources are *Sirigannada Granthakartara Charitra Kosha* (1850-1920) by Venkatesh Sangali (2000); *Kannada Granthasuchi* (1972-1977) brought out by Prasaranga. Mysore University: the Catalogue of Kannada Books in the British Library compiled in 1910 and a *Supplementary Catalogue of Kannada Books in the British Library* compiled by Albertine Gaur with the assistance of Srinivasa Havanur in 1985 and the Kannada book collection of Oriental and India Office Library available online at the link http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dsal.css.

[66] Kannada University was established here in 1991 for the same reason.

[67] See *S.S. Malimat* (1989), *A/lam Sumangalamm* (1999), *Mugi Dodda Bhaveppa* (2000), *Sir Sahebaru* (1982), *Doddappa Appa* (1988), *Hosamani Siddappa* (1984) *and Mysore Basavaiah* (1985).

[68] The word diglossia is used to refer to two varieties of a language but Kaviraj uses it to refer to the use of two languages within a nationalist language economy. I have used the word diglossia in the sense Kaviraj uses it, though bilingualism is the technical word for such a situation in linguistics.

[69] Kattu means, construct, fix, boundary, rule. I think this is used in all its senses here.

[70] This point about the language of Srikantia being the upper caste language of Mysore regions is also pointed out by H.S. Raghavendra Rao (1995)

It would be interesting to work on Bandaya - Dalit notions of Kannada community to see how it is different from the one fashioned by nationalist elite like Srikantia.

Chapter Four:

[72] Sirigannada is Kannada with the adjective rich.

This tribute to Srikantia is in Sonnet form. It is interesting to look at the emergence of Sonnet form in Kannada in the context of colonialism and nationalism. The present collection in which this sonnet appears was published in 1934 and it is the first collection that comprises only Sonnets. There were others who had written sonnets before like K.V. Puttappa and Narasimhachar. *Malara* makes interesting reading in terms of analyzing the literary situation that existed then in Mysore. Some of the sonnets at the beginning of this collection are about the then existing literary situation in Kannada. They are addressed to Kannada literature in general. to elders who criticize the new kind of writing and also to youngsters who are coming up. This collection also addresses a few stalwarts of literature like Shakespeare, Kalidasa, Kumaravyasa (Kannada poet) along with B.M. Srikantia. Bendre and Shivarama Karanth, who were writing in the new mode and were contemporaries of Masti Venkatesh Iyengar.

[74] *SriGandha* (1984), *Sreenidhi* (1984), *BMS: The Man and His Mission* (1984) by B.M.Sri Smaraka Pratistana and *Srismarane* (1984) by JSS College, Dharwad, *SriNamana* by R. Dharwadkar. Dharwad. Apart from these centenary year celebration volumes, many journals came out with special issues devoted to B.M. Srikantia's writings.

[75] Dasa literature came as part of Vaishnava movement after 16th century. Kanaka Dasa and Purandara Dasa are the main exponents of this genre. It continued till the 19th century.

[6] According to Havanur this hand prepared text is still available in United Theological College Library, Bangalore.

[77] This suggestion is made by Srinivasa Havanur (Havanur. 2000: 369).

[78] R. Narasimachar dates it as 1873, but Havanur says it cannot be earlier than 1879, as it includes poems from the Kannada translation of *Shakuntala* by Churamuri, published in 1879.

[79] Parts of the poem are quoted in (Havanur, 2000:378).

[80] Excerpts of the poems are quoted in Ananatanarayana (1991: 46-60).

[81] *Arati* is a religious/auspicious ritual wherein a light is used to welcome or worship god or someone.

[82] The one who had translated *Shakuntala* into Kannada.

[83] Mystic poets, a detailed list and analysis of most of these poets are given in Dharwadkara, 1975: 107-184).

[84] Halasangi is a village in Bijapur district of Karnataka. It is a very remote village that had only a small number of people who were educated up to the mulki exam (7th standard) during the early 20 century.

Gadhadhara must have been a pseudo name of the writer. This poem "Prasanindakange Katuvani" (Scolding the abuser of Alliteration) is quoted in Ananthanarayana, 1991: 41.

1 am using the male gender pronouns consciously as we hardly find any women poets.

[7] See Wordsworth's preface to the second edition of *Lyrical Ballads* (1800). edited *in The English Critical Tradition: An Anthology of English Literary Criticism,* Vol 1, eds: S. Ramaswamy and V.S. Sethuraman, Macmillan: Madras. 1986. P. 289-311.

[88] This poem is quoted in Havanur, 2000: 394-395.

[89] This poem is quoted in Havanur, 2000: 395-396.

[90] Reprinted with an introduction by M.N.V. Panditaradhya in 1985.

The reason for changing the name is interesting. There was a big debate during the period about the correct form of the word Karnataka, whether it should be Karnataka or KarNataka. It is known as naNa controversy! Unable to resolve the issue. the name was changed to Kannada Sahitya Parishat by Srikantia.

[92] 1 am using the term modern in the sense of denoting a time period. So I have used the term non-modern to denote the period prior to modern.

[3] See Javaregowda (1970) for the efforts of Mysore University towards rejuvenating Kannada and Karnataka culture.

[94] See Chowdappa (1970) for a brief history of Kannada Sahitya Parishat.

[95] See Joshi (1998) for British novel in India; and Padikkal (2001) for the emergence of Kannada novel and the reading public.

[96] See *HosagannadaArunodaya* (Havanur. 2000) and *Hosagannada Sahityada Udayakala* (Dharawadakara, 1975).

[97] These reviews have been edited in Appendix -2 of Panditaradhya's book. The magazine *Swadeshabhimani* on April 11, 1919 has listed the book in the section "accepted for review" saying that in the next edition the book we will be reviewed. A review appeared in *Kannada Kogile*, July 1999, Vol.4, No.4 , P. 103:104. Another review appeared in *Karnataka Sahitya Parishatpatrike*, October 1919. P. 185-186.

[98] Dravidian refers to South India in general and specifically to the non-Aryan race. here it is used to refer to Kodavas.

[99] Purusharthas are the goals of life and the vedic texts have identified four of them as important for the life viz., Dhanna (Being religious), Artha (Material aspect of life), Kama (Want, desire) and Moksha (escape from the cycle of birth).

See Naregal (2001a), "Figuring the Political as Pedagogy: Colonial Intellectuals, Mediation and Modernity in Western India".

[101] Today the influence of Sahitya Parishat is not so all-pervasive with alternative institutional structures coming up for the sake of Kannada language and literature. But during those days it was very crucial for the issues which dogged Kannada language such as Re-unification of Kannada speaking regions. This year (2002) Dr. U.R. Anantamurthy, the Jnana Peet Awardee was the Chairperson for the conference.

[102] This wish of B.M. Srikantia seems to have been fulfilled in the 1980s, when Muslim writers started writing in Kannada. The critics, who were shaped by the

sensibility created by B.M. Srikantia, hailed it as expanding the horizon of Kannada literature as they brought experiences of Muslims into Kannada for the first time. Also it is apt to remember here that B.M. Srikantia translated Mohammad Abbas's *Islam Culture* into Kannada as *Islam Samskriti* in 1948.

[103] Usually kula is used to refer to clan, but here B.M. Srikantia is using it in the sense of caste. Thus caste becomes a category that can also be used interchangeably with clan like categories.

Gotra denotes lineage of a particular clan and is normally used to refer to subcastes or sects within a subcaste.

Bharatambe is the goddess of India and literally means mother India.

[106] See for example "Honganasugalu" by Harishankar in *Sri Utsava* (1986), "Swatantra Kavitegalu" by H.S. Venkaeshamurthy in *SriNidhi* (1985). "Hongansugalu" by M.V. Seettharamiah in *BMS: The Man and His Mission* and "Honganusugalu" by M.H. Krishnaiah in *Srigandha* (1985).

[107] This information by V. Seetaramaiah is based on Srikantia's introduction to the collected version (Srikantia, 1983: 57).

[108] A similar opinion is articulated by Viranna (2001) about B.M. Sri's patriotism. His main contention is that the leader of the Navodaya movement in Kannada is not B.M. Sri but Panje Mangesha Rao. Similar discontent about giving exclusive importance to B.M. Sri has been aired in Nayak (1988).

[109] This article is in English. 1 have left unchanged the transcription of names, which are not consistent with my transcription of the same.

[110] It is similar to the argument that Bhashanthara Vairy makes. I have discussed this issue of translation and transcreation (adaptation) in the next chapter "Translation in Translation".

[111] Coronach means elegy in Ireland and Scotland.

[112] I have used *English Geetagalu: Mula Angla Kavanagalondige* (English Geetagalu: With Original Poems) as the source to quote English poems, See Srikantia, 1985 for details.

[113] This modification is also pointed and commented by Ramachandra Sharma in an article. But he cites it just as the best example of good translation. He has translated the Kannada version back into English thus:

> Oh, where in hiding
> Is the tenderness
> Of the noble faith.
> And where, the compassion
> Of the noble clan-
> Only the burning one knows! (Ramachandra Sharma. 1985: 72).

We can clearly see here that Ramachandra Sharma instead of trying to draw our attention to the factors that shape the politics of mediation, by translating Aryan religion and Aryan people as "noble faith" and "noble clan" respectively, tries to hide it by mediating it back into English in a different way.

[114] See for modernization of Hindu religion or construction of Hindu religion during colonial period essays edited in Dalmia and Stietencron (1995).

Though Srikantia had translated one or two Tamil texts into Kannada, none of them were published. And the scripts have been destroyed over time and only some pieces remain.

[116] See Venkateshamurthy (1985: 190).

It would be interesting to analyze all these writings that have come up on Vijayanagara Empire during this period.

Bhuvaneshwari Devi is equated with mother-Kannada in the 20* century writings. Bhuvaneshwari Devi is a goddess in Hampi.

[119] See Manor (1977) for this event and the immediate reason for it. But the immediate reason alone cannot explain the coming together of Backward class movement leaders and the Congress party, as till then Backward class movement was accusing the Congress of being a Brahmin group. This aspect is yet to be researched.

Chapter Five:

In another seminar in August 1999 organized by the Kannada Language and Literature Department of Kannada University on *Kaviraja Maarga* - the first available Kannada text, a treatise on literature and language- most of the speakers echoed a similar opinion that Kannada texts though inspired by Sanskrit texts are not translations but recreations, through which Kannada tries to negotiate the hegemony of Sanskrit on it. The speakers who aired their views on this issue were again K.V. Narayana, Basavaraja Kalgudi. Ki.Rum. Nagaraj and K.V. Subbanna. Some of these papers in English have appeared in the special issue on *Kaviraja Maarga* of *Aniketana* (1999, Vol. X-4, XI-1).

[1] There are as many as 29 such translations of stories of Shakespeare's plays published in Kannada till 1968. And quite a few of them are not direct translations from English but either from Bengali or Telugu.

[2] These details about the family background of M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda is as narrated by Hakki Gowda of Desha halli in 1970 to H.K. Rajegowda, who has edited the complete works of M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda (Sreekantesh Gowda, 1974). But an article written by H.K. Rajegowda in 1995 gives a different kind of background (Rajegowda, 1995). According to this article by the same author the forefathers of M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda left Nagamangala during 4th Anglo-Mysore war fearing the atrocities that might take place when the combined army of Marathas. Nizam and British pass through Nagamangala. This article says that Linge Gowda, the grand father of M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda studied in a Christian missionary school, as suggested by the Ayya of Lingayat Math of Keregodu near Deshahalli. Thus Linge Gowda got English education and he was a favorite student of a Christian Father.

[123] See Rajegowda (1974: XXIV) and Manjunath G.G. (1995:185).

[124] See Manjunath G.G. (1995:185).

[125] See Rajendra D.K. (1995:131) and also see other articles in Shivaram and Rajegowda (1995).

I have not crosschecked the veracity of the author of this history book. Name of the author is mere transliterated from Kannada as provided by M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda in his preface.

This is in spite of a few enthusiastic Vokkaligas trying to reprint his writings and organize seminars on him in the 1970s and in the 1990s. A few faculty members of Institute of Kannada Studies in Mysore University formed a committee and with the active support of few Vokkaliga Community members were able to bring out the complete works of M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda. In 1995, again the same enthusiastic members organized a seminar on Sreekantesh Gowda's contribution to Folklore.

Poetry written by mixing both poetry and prose; A prosody specially found in Kannada literature from the beginning.

[129] Poetry written in stanzas of six lines.

[130] See an article on him by D.V. Gundappa "Basavappa Shastrigalu" (Kannada) in Gundappa (1996:336-338), See also the collected works of Basavappa Shastri (1977).

[31] Here when I say "caste-class configuration" I am not using it as an ahistorical, unchanging, reified category; it represents a certain kind of cultural capital and material position that comes with it in the then context of Mysore princely state.

[132] Actually this sentence is taken by the critic from Sreekantesh Gowda's preface to *Pratapa Rudra Deva* (1895 (1974: 10)).

[3] It is to be noted that this positive comment about the language of translation is only of *Pramilarjuniyam*, not of *Pratapa Rudra Deva*. In feet Ramachandra Deva points out that the use of New Kannada and Old Kannada respectively for prose and poetry is improper in *Pratapa Rudra Deva* (1993:47). But he quickly adds that this is the problem of finding a suitable form for Shakespeare's blank verse in Kannada and this was faced by almost all translators till *mukthachandassu* was discovered for that purpose. He says that pioneers like Sreekantesh Gowda were in search of such a form.

[4] 1 am not going to offer here my comments with regard to mixture of old Kannada and new Kannada, i.e.; old Kannada for poetry and new Kannada with rural/rustic language for prose/dialogues as the issue has been dealt with separately in Chapter 3.

[13] It is a reference to a verse in *KumaravyasBharatha*, where the poet explains why he has not written his epic on Ramayana. He says that the Phaniraya (The snake - a reference to the myth that the earth is standing on the head of the Snake) is already burdened with many Ramayanas and he doesn't want to burden him more by writing an epic on Ramayana. M.L. Sreekantesh Gowda's claim is that if we make proper changes to make it new, it won't be a burden to Phaniraya, in fact would be a positive addition.

[136] Ramachandra Deva also identifies it as the one of key texts on translation in Kannada (Ramachandra Deva, 1993:44-46)

[137] When I say pan-Karnataka, there was nothing like that then, it was still in the making. A certain kind of Kannada nationalism was getting evolved at this point of time. In feet these theatre companies played a major role in it.

For more details on the situation of Kannada theatre during this period see Ranganath H.K. (1982).

In K. Vasudevacharya's translation of *Merchant of Venice* as *Surata Nagarada Shrestiyu* (1929) the Jew - Shylock becomes a Maarvadi (the merchant community, that has settled down in South India but originally belonging to Gujarath and Rajastan).

[140] Saraswathi is the goddess of learning, so Sreekantesh Gowda uses it to name the girls who are getting modern education.

Dr. Sreenivasa Havanur, a well-known historian of Early modern Kannada literature gave this suggestion to me. And he also helped me with the type script copy of the preface of the book.

[142] I have not been able to look at the book. All page references here afterwards to this preface would be based on the typescript provided by Dr. Sreenivasa Havanur.

[143] I have not been able to trace the details of the book Shivaji. there are other books on Shivaji, which have been translated from Marathi, and other languages but they are after 1915.

[144] Hittu is the staple food of Mysore people, made out of Raagi. It acquires a generic name - food in this context.

[145] *Sana Kala Shaale* literally means The School of all Arts; he is using it to as an equivalent to University. And Chenna Pattana is an old name of Madras.

[146] Literally means money for Brahmins. Here it means some where you will get a job of around Rs. 25.

[147] Arishadvargas are bad emotions in a man and six in number like Kaama (sex/desire), Khrodha (Anger), Moha, Mada (Pride), and Maathsarya (Jealousy). Kumara Swamy is the lord of these emotions.

Chapter Six:

[148] *Utsavamoorthy* the idol that is taken-out in procession from the temple once a year or whenever there is a need, and represents the installed idol that is in the temple. Here Venkatarao, is using it to denote that the concrete manifestation of the world to us is visible only in the notion of India, and in-turn the manifestation of the essence of India and access to that is possible to us through Karnataka.

[149] For the relationship between Hindi language Nationalism and Hinduism, see Rai (2002).

[150] Also see Pandey (1990) for the construction of Other in the context of religious communities and communalism in colonial India.

[151] See for his complete collection of novels Galaganatha (1999).

[152] The early phase is a kind of cultural nationalism, where the West is seen as a single entity and the second phase is marked by the entry of Gandhi and the knowledge derived from Marxism, indicating a refusal to consider European modernity as a homogenous process.

Works Cited

Acharya P.B. 1978. *The Tragicomedies of Shakespeare, Kalidasa and Bhavabhuti,* New Delhi: Meharchand Lachmandas Publications.

Adiga, Gopalakrishna. 1987. "B.M. Sri Avarige" in *Chintamaniyalli Kanda Mukha*, Bangalore: Praja Printers Pvt. Ltd., 43-45.

———————1976. "Vijayanagarada Nenapu" in *Samagra Kavya* (Complete Works), Bangalore: Lipi Mudrana, 80.

Aiatna Keers. 1915. Preface to *Akindarane Emba Gora Kole Palakana Atma Charitre*, TypeScript given to me by Sreenivasa Havanur.

Alam, Javed. 1999. *India: Living With Modernity,* New Delhi: OUP.

Aloysius, G. 1998 (1997). *Nationalism without a Nation in India,* New Delhi: OUP.

Amur, G.S. 1984. "A New Look at Ashwathaman" in *BMS: The Man and His Mission,* ed. Ramachandra Sharma, Bangalore: BMS Memorial Foundation, 134-143.

————. 2001. *Essays on Modern Kannada Literature,* Bangalore: Karnataka Sahitya Academy.

Ananthanarayana, 1991 (1962). *Hosagannada Kaviteya Mele English Kavyada Prabhava* (Kannada), Mysore: Gangataranga.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991 (1983). *Imagined Communities,* London: Verso.

Aniketana. 1999. Vol. X-4, No. XI –1, A special issue on *Kaviraja Marga.*

Anthappa, I. 1994. *Srirangapattana Taluku Mathu Sthamuthalalli Christha Dharmada Ugama: 1648-1800* (Kannada- A Brief History of Origin of Christianity in and around Srirangapattana Taluk), Bangalore: Catholic Christara Kannada Sahitya Sangha.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. "Is Homo Hierarchicus?" in *American Ethnologist.* Vol. 13, No. 4.

Aristotle, 1989. *Poetics*, tr. M.E. Hubbard, in *Classical Literary Criticism*, eds. D.A. Russel and M. Winterbootom, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Asad, Talal. 1990. "The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology" in *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography,* ed. James Clifford and George E. Marcus, New Delhi: OUP, 141-164.

Balanna Shigihalli. 1993. *Deputy Chennabasappanavaru - Jeevana mattu Sadhane* (Kannada), Belgaum: Veerashiva Adhyayana Vedike.

Balasubrahmanya N. tr. 1991. *Aristotalana Kavya Mimamse* (Kannada - Aristotle's *Poetics),* Bangalore: Dept. of Kannada and Culture, Govt. of Karnataka.

Banakar, Mahadeva. 1986. *Anglara Kaladalli Kannada,* Bangalore: Dept. of Kannada and Culture. Govt. of Karnataka.

Basavappa Shastri, 1977. *Abhinava Kalidasa Basavappa Shastrigala Samagra Kritigalu* (Kannada: Collected Works of Basavappa Shastri), Mysore: Prabodha Pustaka Maale.

Bayly, C.A. 1988. *Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———————1999. *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780-1870,* New Delhi: Foundation Books (Cambridge University Press).

Bayly, Susan. 1999. *Caste, Society and Politics in India,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bendre D.R. 1974. "Shakuntalada Karuna Roudra" in *Sahityada Virat Swarupa* (Kannada- The Great Structure of Literature), ed. V. Bendre. Dharwad: Samaja Pustakalaya, 676-686.

Bhabha. Homi K. 1994. *Location of Culture,* New York: Routledge.

Bhoosareddy and Venkareddy, Madhu, eds. 1995. *Veerashaiva Niyatakalikegalu* (Kannada - Veerashaiva Magzines), Bangalore: Basava Samiti.

Boratti, Vijayakumar M. 1999. "Translating Modernity: Tradition, Brahminism and Kailasam", a paper presented in the Annual 1ACLALS conference held at University of Pune.

Brass. Paul R. 1991. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison,* New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Bucher. J. 1993 (1923). *Kannada-English Dictionary,* New Delhi: AES.

Chandra. Sudhir. 1994 (1992). *Literature and Social Consciousness in Colonial India,* New Delhi: OUP.

Chandrasekhar S. 1985. *Dimensions of Socio-Political Change in Mysore 1918-1940.* New Delhi: Ashis Pub. House.

———————. 1985A. "Kannada Navodaya Mattu B.M. Sri: Karnatakada Ekikarana" (Kannada) in *Srinidhi*. ed. G.S. Shivarudrappa. Banagalore: B.M. Sri Smaaraka Pratishtana.

.....1992. "Rastriya Chaluvali. Kannada Sahitya Mattu Komu Samasye" (Kannada) in *Komu Samasye Mattu Adhunika Kannada Sahitya,* Chief ed. Baraguru Ramachandrappa, Bangalore: Karnataka Sahitya Academy.

.....1995. *Colonialism, Conflict and Nationalism in South India: 1857-1947.* New Delhi: Wishwa Prakashana.

Chatterjee, Partha. 1986. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World,* London: Zed Books.

———————. 1989. "Caste and the Subaltern Consciousness" in *Subaltern Studies, Vol. VI,* ed. Ranjit Guha, New Delhi: OUP.

———————. 1993a. *The Nation and Its Fragments,* New Delhi: OUP

———————. 1993b (1989). "The Nationalist Resolution of the Women's Question" in *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History,* eds. Kumkum Sangari and Sudesh Vaid, New Delhi: Kali for Women.

Chowdappa, M.N. 1970. "Parishattina Sakshipta Itihasa" (Kannada) in *Chinnada Belasu* (Kannada - Souvenir of the Golden Jubilee of Kannada Sahitya Parishat), ed. Seetaramaiah, Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat, 1-26.

Cohn. Bernard S. 1985. "The Command of Language and the Language of Command" in *Subaltern Studies, Vol IV,* ed. Ranjit Guha, New Delhi: OUP.

———————. 1997 (1996). *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge,* New Delhi: OUP.

Copland, Ian. 1999. *The Princes of India in the Endgame of Empire: 1917-1947,* New Delhi: Foundation Books (Cambridge University Publications).

Dalmia, Vasudha and Stietencron, Heinrich von eds. 1995. *Representing Hinduism: Construction of Religious Traditions and National Identity,* New Delhi: Sage.

Desai, Shantinatha. 1984. "Reflections on B.M. Shri's English Githagalu" in *BMS: The Man and His Mission,* ed. Ramachandra Sharma, Bangalore: BMS Memorial Foundation, 57-65.

Devachandra. 1988. *Rajavali* (Kannada), ed. B.S. Sannaih, Mysore: Institute of Kannada Studies.

Deveerappa, H. 1985. *Mysore Basavaiyanavaru* (Kannada), Sirigere: Taralabalu Prakashana.

Dharawadakar, R.Y. 1975. *Hosagannadada Sahityada Udayakala* (Kannada: The Early phase of Hosagannada Literature), Dharwad: Karnataka University.

————1984. *Sri Namana* (Kannada - A felicitation volume to B.M. Srikantia), Dharwad.

Dhanna Theertha. Swami. 1992 (1941). *History of Hindu Imperialism.* Madras: Dalit Educational Literature Centre.

Dirks, Nicholas B. 1987. *The Hollow Crown: Ethnohistory of an Indian Kingdom,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dubois, Abbe J.A. 1995 (1823). *Letters on the State of Christianity in India: To Which is added A Vindication of the Hindus-Male and Female,* New-Delhi: AES.

Dumont, Louis. 1996. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fleet, J. F. 1885. "A Selection of Canarese Ballads No. 1 - The Insurrection of Rayanna of Sangolli" in *Indian Antiquiary,* Vol.14, 293-303.

————1 886. "A Selection of Canarese Ballads No.2 - The Income Tax" in *Indian Antiquiary,* Vol. 15, 353-362.

————. 1887. "A Selection of Canarese Ballads No.3 - The Bedas of Halagali" in *Indian Antiquiary,* Vol. 16, 356-361.

————. 1889. "A Selection of Canarese Ballads No.4 - The Crime and Death of Sangya" in *Indian Antiquiary,* Vol. 18, 353-362.

————. 1890. "A Selection of Canarese Ballads No.5 - The daughter-in-law of Channavva of Kittur" in *Indian Antiquiary,* Vol. 19, 413-423.

Foucault, Michel. 1984. *The Foucault Reader,* ed. Paul Rabinow, New York: Pantheon Books.

Galaganatha, Venkatesha Tirako Kulakarni. 1999. *Galaganatha Kadambari Samputa, 6 Vols.* (Complete Novels of Galaganatha), Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University-Hampi.

Geetha V. and Rajadurai V. 1998. *Towards a Non-Brahmin Millenium: From Iyothee Thass to Periyar,* Calcutta: Samya.

Geethacharya, N. 1985. "Gadayuddha Natakam - Ondu Parishilane" (Kannada - An interpretation of Gadayuddha Natakam), in *Srinidhi* (Kannada - B.M.Sri centenary volume) ed. G.S. Shivarudrappa, Bangalore: B.M.Sri Smaraka Pratishtana, 262-272.

Gellner, Ernest. 1998. *Language and Solitude: Wittgenstein, Malinowski and the Habsburg Dilemma,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goru, Albert. 1985. Supplementary Catalogue of Kannada Books in the British Library, Department of Oriental Manuscripts and Printed Books, India Office Library and Records, London: The British Library.

Govinda Pai, 1995 (1929). "Greek Prahasanadalli Kannada Maatugalu" (Kannada: Kannada Words in the Greek Farce) in *Govinda Pai Samsodhana Samputa* (Kannada - Complete Research Works of Govinda Pai), Udupi: Rastra Kavi Govinda Pai Research Centre, 67-76.

Gundappa D.V. tr. 1976. *Macbeth* (Kannada- A translation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth),* Mysore: Kavyalaya.

———————. 1995 *D.V.G. Samagra Kruti Shreni,* (Kannada - Complete Works of D.V. Gundappa), Bangalore: Dept. of Kannada and Culture. Government of Karnataka.

———————.]996. "Olleya Kelasa" (Kannada) in *Sreekantesh Gowdara Janapada Koduge,* eds. H.K. Rajegowda and V.N. Shivaram, Bangalore: Karnataka Janapada and Yakshagana Academy, 177-181.

Gundert, Hermann. 1997 (1882). *Hermann Moegling* (German), trs. Christoph Steinweg and Elisabeth Steinweg-Fleckner, Kerala: D.C. Books.

Gupta, Dipankar. 1991. *Social Stratification,* New Delhi: OUP.

———————. 2000. *Interrogating Caste: Understanding Hierarchy and Difference in Indian Society*, New Delhi: Penguin.

Habib, Irfan. 1998 (1995). *Essays in Indian History: Towards a Marxist Perception,* New Delhi: Tulika.

Hanumanthaiah V.R. 1996 (1926). *Kurubara Charitre* (Kannada - A History of Kurubas), ed. Sudhakara, Mysore: Pratiba Prakashana.

Harishankar, H.S. 1986. "Honganasugalu" in *Sree Utsava* (Kannada) ed. Vishalakshi, Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat, 480-490.

Havanur. Srinivasa. 1993. "Kannada Sahitya Patrikegalu" (Kannada: List of Kannada literary Magazines) in *Kannada Sahitya Patrikegalu: Itihasa-Vartamana*, ed. Baraguru Ramachandrappa, Bangalore: Karnataka Sahitya Academy, 71-82.

———————. 2000 (1974). *Hosagannadada Arunodaya* (Kannada: The beginnings of New Kannada), Bangalore: Pustaka Pradhikara.

Hegel, G.W.F. 1991. *The Philosophy of History,* tr. J. Sibree, New York: Prometheus Books.

Hobsbawm, Eric & Ranger, Terence eds. 1992. *The Invention of Tradition,* Cambridge: CUP.

Inamdar, V.M. 1983. *Govinda Pai* (Kannada), Mysore: Institute of Kannada Studies, Mysore University.

Inden, Ronald. 1986. "Orientalist Construction of India" in *Modern Asian Studies,* Vol. 20, No. 3,401-46.

Iyengar, Masti Venkatesh 1960. *Malara* (Kannada), Bangalore: Jeevana Karyalaya.

———————. 1965. *Prasanga 3* (Kannada: Occasional writings), Bangalore: Jeevana Karyalaya.

———————1995. "Hiriyara Aradhane" (Kannada: Worship of Elders) in *Sreekantesh Gowdara Janapada Koduge*, eds. H.K. Rajegowda and V.N. Shivaramu, Bangalore: Karnataka Janapada and Yakshagana Academy, 157-162.

Iyengar, Goruru Ramaswamy, 1995. "Sreekantesh Gowdara Janapada Prajne" (Kannada) in *Sreekantesh Gowdara Janapada Koduge,* eds. H.K. Rajegowda and V.N. Shivaramu, Bangalore: Karnataka Janapada and Yakshagana Academy, 22-46.

Javaregowda, D. 1970. "Mysore Vishwavidyalaya" (Kannada) in *Chinnada Belasu* (Kannada - Souvenir of the Golden Jubilee of Kannada Sahitya Parishat), ed. Seetaramaiah. Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat, 210-214.

Jayaprakash, Banjagere. 2000. *Kannada Rastriyate* (Kannada). Bangalore: Krantisiri Prakashana.

Jones, Kenneth W. 1999 (1994). *Socio-Religious Reform Movements in British India,* New Delhi: Foundation Books (Cambridge University Publications).

Joshi, Sanjay. 2001. *Fractured Modernity: Making of a Middle Class in Colonial North India,* New Delhi: OUP.

Joshi, Shamba. 1999. *Shamba Kriti Samputa 6 Vols.* (Kannada - Complete Works of Shamba Joshi). ed. Mallepuram G. Venkatesh. Bangalore: Kannada Pustaka Pradhikara.

Joshi, Svati. Ed. 1994. *Rethinking English: Essays in History, Literature and Language.* New Delhi: OUP.

Kailasam, T.P. 1987. *Kailasam Kritigalu* (Complete Works of T.P. Kailasam). Mysore: Institute of Kannada Studies.

Kalburgi M.M. 1988. "B.M.Sriyavara Sahitya Charitreya Vicharagalu" in *Marga* vol. 1. Bangalore: Naresh and Company, 628-633.

———————ed. 1994. *Kannada Kaifiyattugalu* (Kannada), Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University.

Kane P.V. 1987 (1951 iv ed) (1937). *History of Sanskrit Poetics.* Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.

Kannada Sahitya Parishat. 1979 (1941). *Sambhavane* (Kannada: A Felicitation volume in honor of B.M. Srikantia), Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat.

Kapase, Gurulinga. 1998. *Halasangi Geleyaru* (Kannada), Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University-Hampi.

Kaviraj, Sudipta. 1990. "Writing, Speaking and Being: Language and Historical Identity in South Asia", Keynote paper for the section on "Identity in History: South and Southeast Asia", *German Historical Congress* held at University of Heidelberg.

———————. 1992. "The Imaginary Institution of India" in *Subaltern Studies, Vol. VII,* eds. Partha Chatterjee and Gyanendra Pandey, New Delhi: OUP.

———————. 1997, (1995). "On the Structure of Nationalist Discourse" in *State and Nation in the Context of Social Change,* ed. by T.V. Sathyamurthy, New Delhi: OUP, 298-335.

———————1998 (1995). *The Unhappy Consciousness: Bankimchandra Chattopadhyay and the Formation of Nationalist Discourse in India,* New Delhi: OUP.

Keith A.B. 1992 (1923). *The Sanskrit Drama in Its Origin, Development, Theory and Practice.* Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.

Kinhanna Rai, Kayyara. 1983. *Govinda Pai: Smriti Mattu Kriti* (Kannada), Mangalore: Mangalore University.

Kittel F. 1982 (1903). *A Grammar of the Kannada Language,* New Delhi: AES.

———. (1894). *Kannada-English Dictionary.* New Delhi: AES.

———. (1895) *Nagavarma's Prosody,* New Delhi: AES.

———. 1986 (1875). *Canarese Prosody,* New Delhi: AES.

———. 1995 (1874). *Canarese Poetical Anthology.* New Delhi: AES.

Krishnaiah, M.H. 1985. "Honganasugalu" in *Srigandha,* ed. Srinivasaraju etal., Bangalore: B.M. Sri Smaraka Pratishtana.

Krishnamurthy M.G. 1994. *Kriti Samskriti* (Kannada: Collection of critical writings), Mysore: Rujuvaatu Prakashana.

Krishnamurthy K. 1971. "Prof. A.R. Kru Mattu 'Sanskrita Nataka'" (Kannada - A.R. Krishna Shastri and Sanskrit Drama", in *A.R.Kru: Jeevana Sadhane,* eds. H.M. Nayak and H. Tipperudraswamy. 76-80.

Krishna Shastri A.R. 1937. *Samskrita Nataka* (Kannada: Sanskirt Drama). Mysore: Mysore University Press.

Kurthakoti K.D. 1992. *Bayalu Mattu Alaya* (Kannada - A collection of articles on Kannada Literature), Hampi: Prasaranga (Kannada University Press).

Kuvempu (K.V. Puttappa). *Vibhooti Pooje* (Kannada), Mysore: Udayaravi Prakashana.

———————————. 1990. *Sri Ramayana Darshanam* (Kannada: An epic based on Ramayana), Bangalore: Dept. of Kannada and Culture, Govt of Karnataka.

Mangala, C.N. 1985. "English Geetagalu: Ondu Vivechane" (Kannada) in *Sreenidhi,* ed. G.S. Shivarudrappa, Bangalore: B.M. Sri Foundation, 176-186.

Madtha, William etal. Eds. 1998. *A Dictionary with a Mission: Papers of the International Conference on the Occasion of the Centenary Celebrations of Kittel's Kannada-English Dictionary,* eds. William Madtha, Heidrun Brueckner, A. Murigeppa and H.M. Maheshwaraiah, Mangalore: The Karnataka Theological Research Institute.

Maithreyi M.R. 1997. *'Retelling' Myth: A study of the 'Fringe people' in T.P. Kailasam's English Plays,* a M.Phil. dissertation submitted to the Dept. of English, University of Hyderabad.

Mallapura B.V. 1989. *S.S. Malimataru* (Kannada), Gadag: Veerashaiva Adhyayana Samsthe.

Manjunath G.G. 1995. "Karnatakada Shakespeare" in *Sreekantesh Gowdara Janapada Pragjne* (Kannada - Folk consciousness in Sreekantesh Gowda), ed. V.N. Shivaram and H.K. Rajegowda, Bangalore: Karnataka Jaanapada mattu Yakshagana Academy, 1995, 183-85.

Manor, James. 1977. *Political Change in an Indian Stale: Mysore 1917-1955,* New Delhi: Manohar.

Mathew K.M. 1994. *Rev. F. Kittel: Ondu Samagra Adhyayana* (Kannada: A Complete study of Rev. F. Kittel), Dharawada: Kittel Kala Mahavidyalaya.

Mugali, R.S. 1975. *History of Kannada Literature.* New Delhi: Sahitya Academi.

Mukherjee, Sujeeth. 1981. *Translation as Discovery and Other Essays,* New Delhi: Allied Publishers.

Murugaradhya, Gubbi. (1896). *Shringara Chaturyollasini*, Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat.

Muttanna I.M. 1987. *Bharata Sahitya Samskritige Paschatya Vidvamsara Koduge* (Kannada- The Service of Foreign Scholars to the Literature and Culture of India), Mysore: Sri Shakthi Press.

Mysore University, 1984. *Kannada Granthasuchi: 1972-1977* (Bibliography of Kannada books), eds. H.M. Nayak, K.S. Deshpande, Prabhushankara, K.T. Veerappa, P.K. Patil and R.L. Anantharamaiah, Mysore: Prasaranga, Mysore University.

Nagabushana Swamy O.L. 1999. "Prachina Mattu Madhyakalina Kannada Sahityadalli Bashantara" in *Bashantarada Samskritika Nelegalu* (Kannada - Culture and Translation), ed. Karigowda Beechanahalli. Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University, 30-38.

Nagaraj, D.R. 1996. *Saahitya Kathana* (Kannada), Heggodu: Akshara Prakashana.

Naidu, B.N. 1996. *Intellectual History of Colonial India: Mysore 1831-1920*, Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Nandy, Ashis. 1988 (1983). *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism,* New Delhi: OUP.

Narasimhacharya, R. 1934, *History of Kannada Language,* Mysore: Prasaranga, Mysore University.

———————. 1974 (1929) *Karnataka Kavi Charite, Vol. 3* (Kannada), Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat.

Narasimha Murthy M.S. 1985. *Bharatiya Nataka Parampare* (Kannada: Indian Tradition of Drama). Bangalore: Prasaranga, Bangalore University Press.

Narayana K.V. 1999. "Bashantarada Basheyaagi Kannada" in *Bashantarada Samskritika Nelegalu* (Kannada), ed. Karigowda Beechanahalli, Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University, 1-11.

Narayanarao, Hattiyangadi, 1985. *Angla Kavitavali* (Kannada), Mysore: Prabodha Pustaka Maale.

Naregal, Veena. 2000. "Language and Power in Pre-colonial Western India: Textual Hierarchies, Literate Audiences and Colonial Philology" in *The Indian Economic and Social History Review,* Vol. 37, No.3, 259-294.

———————. 2001a. "Figuring the Political as Pedagogy: Colonial Intellectuals, Mediation and Modernity in Western India" in *Studies in History,* Vol. 17, No. 1, 17-55.

———————. 2001b. *Language Politics, Elites, and the Public Sphere: Western Indian under Colonialism*, New Delhi: Permanent Black.

Nayak, G.H. 1988. "Hosagannada Kavite: Prastavane" (Kannada: A Preface to New-Kannada Poetry) in *Nijadani,* Heggodu: Akshara Prakashana.

Nayaka, H.M. etal. 1971-1984. *Kannada Grantha Suchi 7 Vols.* (Kannada - Descriptive Bibliography of Books Printed in Kannada from 1817 to 1968). eds. H.M. Nayaka, Deshpande K.S., Prabhushankara, Veerappa K.T., P.K. Patil and R.L. Anantharamaiah, Mysore: Prasaranaga, Mysore University.

Niranjana, Tejaswini. 1992. *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism and the Colonial Context,* Berkely: University of California Press.

Niranjana, Tejaswini; Sudhir P. and Dhareshwar, Vivek eds. 1993. *Interrogating Modernity: Culture and Colonialism in India,* Calcutta: Seagull Publications.

Niyoga, Maheshwara. 1983. "Assamese Literature" in *Anthology of Indian Literature,* Dharwad: Prasaranga, Karnatak University.

Noronha, Edward. 1996. *Kannada Sahityakke Kraista Mishanarigala Koduge* (Kannada- Contribution of Christian Missionaries to Kannada Religious Literature), Mysore: Bhagyavan Prakashana.

Padikkal, Shivaram. 1993. "The Emergence of the Novel in India" in *Interrogating Modernity: Culture and Colonialism in India,* eds. Tejaswini Niranjana. P. Sudhir and Vivek Dhareshwar, Calcutta: Seagull Publications, 220-241.

———————. 2001. *Naadu Nudiya Rupaka: Rastra Adhunikate Mattu Kannadada Modala Kaadambarigalu* (Kannada- A Metaphor of Land and the Language), Mangalore: Prasaranga, Mangalore University.

Pai. Govinda M. 1975. *Kannadada More* (Kannada- The Plea of Kannada). Mysore: Kavyalaya Publishers.

Pandey, Gyanendra. 1990. *Construction of Communalism in Colonial India,* New Delhi: OUP.

Pandiya, M.S.S. 1999. "Nation from Its Margins: Notes on E.V. Ramaswamy's 'Impossible" Nation" in *Multiculturalism, Liberalism and Democracy,* eds. Rajeev Bhargava, Amiya Kumar Bagchi and R. Sudarshan. New Delhi: OUP. 286-307.

Panditaradhya, M.N.V. ed. 1985. *Angla Kavitavali* (Kannada - Collection of Kannada versions of English poems by Hattiyangadi Narayanarao). Mysore: Prabodha Pustaka Maale.

Panikkar, K.N. 1998 (1995). *Culture, Ideology, Hegemony: Intellectuals and Social Consciousness in Colonial India,* New Delhi: Tulika.

Pavate, Chennakka. 2000. *Mugi Dodda Bhaveppa* (Kannada), Gadag: Veerashaiva Adhyayana Samsthe.

Prabhu Shankara. 1966. *Kannadadalli Bhavageete* (Kannada- Lyrics in Kannada). Mysore: DVK Murthy.

. . . . . 1986. *Kuvempu.* Mysore: Institute of Kannada Studies.

Prabhu, Dayananda. 1994. *Mysooru Samsthanada Chraisthara Itihasa* (Enlarged Kannada version of a French book by J. Jounet). Somavarapet: Shweta Prakashana.

Puttappa, Patil. 1982. *Sir Sahebaru* (Kannada), Gadag: Veerashaiva Adhyayana Samsthe.

—.....1984. *Hosamani Siddappa* (Kannada), Gadag: Veerashaiva Adhyayana Samsthe.

Raghavaachaar, 1973. *Oedipus Colonossinally* (Kannada - A Translation of Oedipus at Coloneus), Bangalore: Karnataka Sangha, Bangalore University.

Raghavendra Rao, 1995. *Haade Haadiya Toritu: Bendre, Kuvempu, Putina* (Kannada- A Comparative critical study of D.R. Bendre, Kuvempu and P.T. Narasimhachar). Bangalore: Kannada Sangha, Christ college.

Rai, Alok. 2002 (2001). *Hindi Nationalism*, Hyderabad: Orient Longman.

Rajegowda H.K. 1995. "Jeevana Chitra" in *Sreekantesh Gowdara Janapada Pragjne*, ed. V.N. Shivaram and H.K. Rajegowda, Bangalore: Karnataka Jaanapada mattu Yakshagana Academy, 1-21.

Rajendra D.K. 1995. "Sreekantesh Gowdara Janapada Koduge" in *Sreekantesh Gowdara Janapada Pragjne,* ed. V.N. Shivaram and H.K. Rajegowda, Bangalore: Karnataka Jaanapada mattu Yakshagana Academy, 128-135.

Ramachandra, M. 1985. "Sriyavara Gadayuddha Natakam" (Kannada: Gadayuddha Natakam of Srikantia) in *Srigandha* (Kannada - B.M. Sri Memorial Souvenir). ed. Srinivasaraju etal., Bangalore: B.M.S. Memorial Foundation, 45-49.

Ramachandra Deva, 1993. *Shakespeare Eradu Samskritigalalli* (Kannada: Shakespeare in Two Cultures), Bangalore: Granthavali.

Ramachandra Sharma, ed. 1984. *BMS: The Man and His Mission,* Bangalore: B.M.S. Memorial Foundation.

Ramachandrappa, Baraguru. ed. 1993. *Karnataka Sahitya Patrikegalu: Ithihasa - Varthamana* (Kannada- A Collection of articles by various writers on the history of Kannada literaty magazines), Bangalore: Karnataka Sahitya Academy.

Ramanan, Mohan etal., eds. 1993. *Provocations,* eds. Mohan Ramanan, Sudhakar Marathe and Robert Bellarmine, Hyderabad: Orient Longman.

Ramaswami S. and Sethuraman V.S. eds. 1986 (1977). *The English Critical Tradition: An Anthology of English Literary Criticism, **Vol.1,*** Madras: Macmillan India Ltd.

Ranganath H.K. 1982 (1960). *The Karnataka Theatre,* Dharwad: Karnatak University.

Ranganna, S.V. 1972. *B.M. Srikantia,* Mysore: Institute of Kannada Studies.

Rice, B.L. 1985. *Nagavarma's Shabdanushasana,* New Delhi: AES.

Rudolph, Lloyd I and Rudolph, Sussane Hoeber. 1987 (1968). *The Modernity of Tradition: Political Development in India,* Hyderabad: Orient Longman.

Rumale, Mrithyunjaya. 1999. *Allam Sumangalamma* (Kannada), Gadag: Veerashaiva Adhyayana Samsthe.

Said. Edward. 1978. *Orientalism,* London: Penguin.

Saki, 1998. *Making History: Karnataka's People and their Past, 2* Vols. Bangalore: Vimukti Prakashana

Samsa, 1988. *Samsa Natakagalu* (Kannada - Complete Plays of Samsa), Bangalore: Karnataka Nataka Academi.

San Juan, E. 1998. *Beyond Postcolonial Theory,* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Sangali, Venkatesha. 2000 (1959). *Sirigannada Granthakartara Kosha* (Kannada), Bangalore: Kannada Book Authority.

Sangari, Kumkum and Vaid, Suresh. Eds. 1993 (1989). *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History,* New Delhi: Kali for Women.

Satchidanandan K. 1995. "The State of Translation" in *Indian Literature: Positions and Propositions,* New Delhi: Pen Craft International, 171-177.

Seetaramaiah, M.V. 1970. *Chinnada Belasu* (Kannada - Souvenir of the Golden Jubilee of Kannada Sahitya Parishat). Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat.

———————. 1984. "Honganasugalu" in *BMS: The Man and His Mission.* ed. Ramachandra Sharma, Bangalore: BMS Memorial Foundation, 144-158.

……— ed. 1985. *English Geetagalu* (Bilingual Version), Bangalore: B.M. Sri Smaraka Pratishtana.

Seshagiri Rao, 1984. "In Search of Tragedy" in *BMS: The Man and His Mission.* ed. Ramachandra Sharma, Bangalore: BMS Memorial Foundation, 76-91.

Seth, Sanjay. 1995. *Marxist Theory and Nationalist Politics: The Case of Colonial India,* New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Sham. 1966. "—" (Kannada) in *Kannada Nudi*, Vol.29, No.2, 16.

Shankara Bhat D. N. 2000. *Kannadakke Beku Kannadadde Vyakarana* (Kannada: Kannada needs a grammar of its own). Mysore: Bhasha Prakashana.

Shantarasa. 1988. *Doddappa Appa* (Kannada), Gadag: Veerashaiva Adhyayana Samsthe.

Shivaram V.N. and Rajegowda H.K. eds. 1995. *Sreekantesh Gowdara Janapada Pragjne,* Bangalore: Karnataka Jaanapada mattu Yakshagana Academy.

Shivareddy K.C. 1999. "Bashantara: Ondu Apoorvavada Kalyana Ghatane" in *Bashantarada Samskritika Nelegalu* (Kannada), ed. Karigowda Beechanahalli, Hampi: Prasaranga. Kannada University. 39-48.

Shivarudrappa, G.S. ed. *Sreenidhi* (Kannada - B.M.Sri centenary volume), Bangalore: B.M. Sri Foundation.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1999. *A Critique of the Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present,* Calcutta: Seagull.

Sreekanteshgowda M.L. 1974. *Srikanteshgowdara Kritigalu* (Kannada - Complete Works of Srikanteshgowda). ed. H.K. Rajegowda, Mysore: M.L. Srikanteshgowda Memorial Committee.

Srikantia B.M. 1983. *Sri Sahitya* (Complete Collected works of B.M. Srikantia). Mysore: Prasaranga (Mysore University Press).

……. 1985. *English Geetagalu: Mula Angla Kavanagalondige* (Bilingual edition), Bangalore: B.M.Sri Smaraka Pratishtana.

————ed. 1995 (1938). *Kannadada Bavuta* (Kannada: The Flag of Kannada), Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat.

Srikantia S. 1984. "Ashwathaman" in in *BMS: The Man and His Mission,* ed. Ramachandra Sharma, Bangalore: BMS Memorial Foundation, 92-125.

Srikantia T.N. 1983 (1953). *Bharatiya Kavya Mimamse* (Kannada - Indian Poetics), Bangalore: Dept. of Kannada and Culture, Govt. of Karnataka.

Srinivasaraju et.al. Eds. 1985. *Srigandha* (Kannada - B.M. Sri Memorial Souvenir), eds. Srinivasaraju C, G.S. Venkataraju, K.M. Munikrishnappa and Prakash Kambattalli, Bangalore: B.M. Sri Foundation.

Subbanna, K.V. 2000. *Kaviraja Marga Mattu Kannada Jagatlu* (Kannada), Heggodu: Akshara Prakashana.

Sudhir P. 1993. "Colonialism and the Vocabularies of Dominance" in *Interrogating Modernity: Culture and Colonialism in India,* eds. Tejaswini Niranjana, Sudhir P. and Vivek Dhareshwar, Calcutta: Seagull.

Sunder Rajan, Rajeshwari, ed. 1992. *Lie of the Land: English Literary Studies in India,* **New Delhi: OUP.**

Taranatha, N.S. 1985. "Sriyavara Pragathagalu" (Kannada) in *Sreenidhi,* ed. G.S. Shivarudrappa, Bangalore: B.M. Sri Foundation, 195-209.

Tarikere, Rahamat ed. 2000. *Kaviraja Marga: Samskritika Mukhamukhi* (Kannada), Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University.

. . . . . 2001. *Kannada Sahitya Mimamse* (Kannada - Kannada Literary Poetics), Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University.

Timmappaia, Muliya. 1990. *Muliya Timmappaiah Samagra Sahitya, Vols. 2* (Kannada - Complete Works of Muliya Timmappaiah). ed. Muliya Mahabala Bhatt, Mangalore: Muliya Timmappaiah Shatamanotsava Samiti.

Trivedi, Harish. 1993. *Colonial Transactions: English Literature and India,* Calcutta: Papyrus.

Venkatachala Shastri T.V. 1989. "Kannadada Kelavu Rudra Natakagalu" (Kannada - A Few Kannada Tragedies) in *Rudra Nataka: Ondu Avalokana* (Tragedy: An Introudction) ed. G.S. Bhatta. Mysore: Chetana Book House, 111-26.

Venkatarao. Alur. 1974. *Nanna Jeevana Smritigalu* (Kannada - Memoirs of My life). Dharawada: Manohara Grantha Maala.

. . . . . 1983 (1919). *Karnataka Gata Vaibhava* (Kannada - The Golden Past of Karnataka), Bangalore: Directorate of Kannada and Culture.

. . . . . 1999 (1957). *Karnatakatvada Vikasa* (Kannada - The Development of Karnatakatva). Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat.

Venkateshamurthy H.S. 1985. "Swatantra Kavitegalu" (Kannada) in *Sreenidhi,* ed. G.S. Shivarudrappa. Bangalore: B.M. Sri Foundation, 186-194.

Viranna C. 2001. "Navodayada Netaara B.M. Sriyalla; Panje" (Kannada: The leader of Navodaya is not B.M.Sri but Panje) in *G.S.S. 75* (Kannada: G.S.Shivarudrappa felicitation volume), Bangalore: Ankana Prakashana.

Vishalakshi, ed. 1986. *Sree Utsava* (Kannada - A Felicitation Volume to Sriknatia), Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishat.

Vishwanathan, Gauri. 1990. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*, London: Faber and Faber.

Vivek Rai, 2001. "Ashaya Bhashana" (Kannada) in *Kannada Navodaya Kavya: Mangalore Kendra,* Ed. Giraddi Govindaraja, Bangalore: Karnataka Sahitya Academy, 1-9.

Weigle, Gottfried. 1997 (1846). "On the Canarese Language and Literature" (Gernam, tr. Karen Schere) in *Hermann Moegling*, Hermann Gundert, Kerala: D.C. Books, 268-291.

Williams, Raymond. 1966. *Modern Tragedy*. London: Chatto and Windus.

Wilson, Horace. 1984a (1827). *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus.* New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.

.....1984 b (1864) *Essays, Analytical, Critical and Philological on Subjects connected with Sanskrit Literature,* Collected and ed. by Reinhold Rost, New Delhi: AES.

.....1984c (1860). "Review of Professor Max Muller's 'History of Sanskrit Literature'" in *Sanskrit Literature*, ed. Reinhold Rost, New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 305-48.

Wordsworth, William. 1986 (1800). "Preface to the Second Edition of *Lyrical Ballads*" in *The English Critical Tradition: An anthology of English Literary Criticism, Vol.1,* eds. S. Ramaswami and V.S. Sethuraman, Madras: Macmillan India Ltd.