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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 20th 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 Bhashanthara 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 19th 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. 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 analyzing 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 phenomenon. 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\(^{th}\) and early 20\(^{th}\) 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. 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 Dharwavd 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. 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 service 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 fascination 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 and II) Othello as Shoora Sena Charitre. 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. I 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. 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). He has also composed a tribute in verse using Kanda meter to His Highness Late Maharaja of Mysore Chamarajendra Odeyar (1863-1894) called Chamanrupachandra Prabhe 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. 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vaaNiye karNaTakadoL} \\
\text{raaNiyu sojigave peeLe kabba gowDam} \\
\text{jaaNaridoodiri niiv bi} \\
\text{nnaNava kaaNuvidaroLu mannisi tappam}
\end{align*}
\]

The translation of it in English goes like this:

When goddess Sarasw athi 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 I 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 style and Savithri Charitre in shatpadi 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. 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).
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 I 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 Dosaabhimani (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 “Traduttore Traditore” (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. 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. 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 I don't do it. I will not
be respected (as a translator) (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 **Bhashabhiman** - 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**. 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. I 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 within 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) 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. I 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.

II

Now let us take up what I 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 ćembha ghora kote 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. 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.

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 Marutha* (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 Bhashaanthara 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
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 Mahabharata 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. It is very clear that B.Venkatacharya is for translations, which would form part of
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 I 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 anything 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 I 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 vs. 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 vs. Kannada or English vs. 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 20th 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 cheeti144) ? Do you think the University of
Madras (Sarva Kala Shaale of Chenna Pattana\textsuperscript{145}) is a food pass giving Government Chatra (free boarding house)? Yes, True. You will get Rs. 25 Brahmanartha somewhere! \textsuperscript{146} Say enough! Chant 'English Stothra' (composition praising English)! Read ‘Gardhabha Stothra' (composition praising Donkey)! Follow the dictates of 'Arishadvarga Kumara Swamy!'\textsuperscript{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 \textit{salary} for occupying modern spaces is equivalent to ‘Brahmanartha’ which literally means money given for a Brahmin for his \textit{livelhood}, 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. Bhashabhimani'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 modern in the Kannada / princely Mysore context, then it is modernity that comes to the defense of Sreekantesh Gowda against a modern articulation of caste. I 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.