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 Geethagal*alu, which has been a landmark since its publication, bears witness to this fact. *English Geethagal*alu 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. 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 I 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 on it. I will further try to link his views on modernization/ standardization of Kannada with his use of different kinds of Kannada in his translation.
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 above 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. 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.

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. In traditional society, according to him, the elite carried on discussions in Sanskrit, which was jealously guarded 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. I 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 9th 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, 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. 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 15th 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 Shabdramani Darpana (around 13th century AD) and
Bhattakalanka's *Shahdanushasana* (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 I 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. I would rather call both Bengali identity formation and Indian identity formations as regional. What I 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 century. 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 Notes 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". 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, I 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 community. 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 over 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? 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).

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, 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 I 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 19th 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 I 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 missionaries 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 *Hosgatmada 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 16th 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. 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.

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 modern 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 involved 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 I have to alternate between the activities of missionaries and administrators.

With the fell of Tippe 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. The 1804 records of the College show that two Munsi 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). 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.\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{46} he wrote A Grammar for the Carnatic 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 Nachirajyam (around 14th century), Bomma’s Chaturasya Nighantu, Abhinava Mangaraja’s Nighantu, Devottama’s Nanaratharatnakara, 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. In preparing the format of the dictionary he has consulted Reeve's Carnatakam 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).\textsuperscript{48} The Fort St. George had its own printing press established in 1804. And in Calcutta, Srirampur press was well known already.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{A Grammar of the Carnataka Language} (1820) and William Reeve's \textit{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 \textit{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

\textit{...}
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 Williams 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. Casamajor (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 leaf manuscripts, 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 administrators, 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, 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 Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft Vol. 2 in 1848. 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. Dasa literature and Yakshagana. 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 I have already mentioned. Later on the natives began to take interest in these studies, but I 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. Thus the writings on Tippu was the main source of information on Princely Mysore for the British.

Apart from 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 Hyder Ali Khan Bahadoor, Hydur Jang, Nawab of the Karnatich Balaghan, which was translated into English by Col. W. Miles in 1864 as History of Tipu Sultan. 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 Ali Khan 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 write 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. 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). 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 Dynast\ 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 jhole. 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. 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 Maratha Country*, 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. 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 Gazetters 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 Munro, 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. 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 Venkataraao. 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 Venkataraao 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, Jaya 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. 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 Shaktiya 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. Bhagavadgita 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. 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. I 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 I characterize them as competing. For instance, Gubbi Murugaradhya’s attempt to list out Lingayat Kannada writers is at the same time part 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, I 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 by 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. 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). 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 saying 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). *Prabandha 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 pick up 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.  

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. 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.