

# HOW DOES SHAKESPEARE BECOME ŚĒKH PĪR IN KANNADA<sup>1</sup>

T.S.SATYANATH

*Abstract:* The purpose of the paper is to identify and understand the cultural processes that went into the process of translating Shakespearian plays into Kannada during the Navōdaya (renaissance) and Navya (modern) periods of modern Kannada literature. Translation has been viewed here more as a cultural process involving domination, assimilation, and contestation rather than as a literary act of bringing a text from one language into another. Translation as an act of transfer of knowledge, information and ideas from one language to another is a colonial enterprise and which implies certain relationships of power among the languages and cultures involved. Thus, in order to understand the postcolonial translations of a linguistically constructed region, we need to interrogate the colonial links, nature of interrelationship among languages involved in the contact and their linguistic history. Tracing the process of translating Shakespeare in a chronological order from the colonial to the postcolonial period, the paper points out that the selections and avoidance of texts for translation, the popularity of certain texts revealed

*by multiple translations of a text, transformations in the title of translations, deviations in translation etc. actually reveal the processes of constructing dominations and counter constructions. The paper also attempts to incorporate the role of the theatre both professional and amateur, and its audience in bringing about such changes and transformations.*

Some Kannada theatre critics have observed that during the early phase of Kannada theatre (1880-1920), Shakespeare was known popularly as *Śēkh Pīr*. Some have claimed that he was also popular by the name, *Śēṣappayyar* (Sheshappa Iyer). Considering the fact that such instances have been noticed in the history of English theatre (Balurao 1966: viii), it would not be surprising if such a speculation is actually true. Such tendencies clearly represent the complexity of cultural processes operating in the nativization of non-native entities and suggest the presence of ambivalences in a culture undergoing transformation. Students of modern Kannada literature are familiar with the term used to address the white master, *biḷi-dore*, 'white king' akin to the term *gaurāṅga mahāprabhu* in Hindi and other modern Indo-Aryan languages. Interestingly, the folk ballad of *Sangoḷli Rāyaṇṇa*, collected during the later part of the nineteenth century and published with an English translation by Fleet (1885) in the *Indian Antiquary* uses a derogatory term, *kempu-mūtiya-kōti/manga*, 'red-faced monkey' to refer to British soldiers. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the word in use to refer to the white-woman was *dore-sāni*, 'king's courtesan' Considering the fact that feminine forms in designator words such as *brāhmaṇa* (*brāhmaṇi*), *rāja* (*rāṇi*) etc. usually translate as 'the housewife'; and 'the queen', the derivative component of *sani* to refer to the white

woman is not only startling but also intriguing. If cultural constructions such as the 'manly Englishman and effeminate Indian', '*bīli-dore*' and "*gaurāṅga mahāprabhu*" could become constructions with the purpose of dominating the other, then terms such as *kempu-mutiya-kōti/manga* and *dore-sāni* could as well be read as counter-constructions.<sup>2</sup> In this sense, inscribing and re-inscribing processes such as Shakespeare and Śēkh Pīr or Śēṣappayyar have an inherent potential to be read as constructions and counter-constructions.

The terms that I have chosen in the title of the paper suggest certain inherent ideological positions. As a matter of fact, the names *Shakespeare* and *Śēkh Pīr* suggest colonial and colonized entities on the one hand and impact and reception on the other. Even a cursory survey of the writings on Shakespearian translations in Indian languages clearly demonstrates the existence of a power relationship of that sort. Kannada scholars have pointed out that a newly developing modern Kannada intellectual community incorporated Shakespeare to such an extent that he was popularly referred to as Śēkh Pīr.<sup>3</sup> Locating such a contact of literary and theatrical interaction within the context of colonial rule coupled with an influence theory centred approach for comparison has far reaching consequences not only in the positioning of Shakespeare but also in locating his 'postcolonial' position. Scholars argue that both literally and metaphorically colonial practices such as census, maps and surveys are practices of dominating the colony and its peoples (cf. Anderson 1983). The processes of 'discovering' the 'undiscovered' lands and peoples, through projects like voyages, enumeration, cartography and surveys, thereby textualizing and inscribing 'others' in terms of numerical and

spatial imaging, have all been a part of the dominating process of colonization. All projects of translation, be it translating the *Bible* into a native language as part of the missionary activity, or compilation and codification of law texts like the *nyāyaśāstra*, or defining linguistically ordered power relationships through terminological categorizations such as donor - recipient, original - translated etc., are activities in which the land, people and their representations were constructed through a process of inscribing, literally 'writing over', existing concepts, categories and terms, often existing in the oral tradition, by the concepts, categories and terminologies of the colonizers. Even when such a systematic replacement is not possible through imperialistic domination, the distortion of the concepts, categories and terminologies of the colonized land and people could be seen as an inscribing process. (Re) naming or the process of identifying, when not done according to native conventions and practices, signifies domination and control, both in symbolic and literal terms. We need to notice here that in all cases of colonized lands, people and their representation, European explorers, enumerators, cartographers and ethnographers, and others were also translating either a region or a culture or a language, literally re-inscribing them, as the concepts, categories and terminologies of the people were either replaced by new ones, or were distorted to suit Europeanized forms. The process of replacement also involved marginalization and denigration of native concepts, categories and terminologies, and eventually relegation of the colonized people to the background. Renaming, redefining or translating, processes used to suit colonial conventions could become counter constructions.



A noteworthy characteristic of theatre in Indian languages is the conspicuous absence of dramatic texts. Despite a long-standing Sanskrit theatre tradition, well attested through *śāstra* texts, plays and performing traditions, such a claim cannot be made for modern Indian languages beyond the 15-16<sup>th</sup> century A.D. The first Kannada play, Singararayya's *mitravindā gōvinda*, written in 1860, is a rough translation of Sriharsa's Sanskrit play *ratnāvali*. Although the evidence of *yaksagana* plays, the folk plays from coastal Karnataka region, is available from palm leaf manuscripts right from the 16<sup>th</sup> century A.D., the contact with the west and the English education system gave a new direction to theatre and drama in Kannada. The first translation from Sanskrit was of Kalidasa, of his play titled as *śākuntala nāṭakavu* by Shesha Ramachandra Churamuri in 1870. Similarly, the first translation from English was that of Shakespeare, *The Comedy of Errors* by Chennabasappa, with the title *nagadavarannu nagisuva nāṭaka*, which was published in 1871.<sup>5</sup>

Scholars of Kannada and Indian drama, from Murthy Rao (1964, 1966) to Chaudhri (2002), have consistently felt that Kannada's response to Shakespeare represents two ambivalent and parallel streams of sensibilities, one corresponding to the literary tradition and the other to the stage tradition. However, it is worth noting that Murthy Rao actually notes that stage versions preceded literary versions.

*The earliest translations (they were really a cross between translation and adaptation) of Shakespeare came from theatre lovers rather than academic men. (Murthy Rao 1964:63)*

However, Chaudhri's (2002) generalization reduces the significance of the precedence of stage versions and brings the literary version in par with the stage ones.

*Renderings of Shakespeare in the south Indian language Kannada might be taken as an allegory of the reception of Shakespeare in India. They often run concurrently on two planes; one is a reader's translation following literary, largely Sanskritic norms of form and diction; the other, a racy stage version with sensational touches, colloquialisms and popular songs. Between them, these two tendencies epitomize much of what happens to Shakespeare in India.*

As one of the aims of the present paper is to demonstrate the significant role played by the sensibilities of theatre community as revealed in the stage versions of Shakespeare in Kannada, it is important that we notice that views such as that of Chaudhri can systematically contribute and stabilize the attempts of constructing a literary taste-centred poetics rather than a stage-centred one. In addition, such attempts might also result in homogenizing the vibrant and pluralistic literary and stage traditions existing side by side. A majority of Kannada scholars who have written about drama come from a literature background. I have pointed out elsewhere (Satyanath 2002) how a new sensibility for tragedy developed in the Kannada literary context during the early part of the twentieth century and the controversies and debates that surrounded its emergence. Shamaraya (1962) observes that it was quite natural for Kannada playwrights to look for a great dramatist like Shakespeare from English in the same way they looked up to Kalidasa in the case of

Sanskrit. On the other hand, it was equally important to attempt to demonstrate the agenda of the Orientalist project of a harmonious Ancient East - Modern West encounter through translating the two great playwrights, Kalidasa from the East and Shakespeare from the West.

A brief outline of the characteristic Shakespearian translation in Kannada has been attempted here. It would be out of place here to attempt a systematic analysis of all Shakespearian translations. A rough estimate of Shakespeare's translations in Kannada would be about one hundred and eleven, spanning a period of 120 years (1871-1992). These include free translations, adaptations and prose renderings. In all, only about twenty out of Shakespeare's thirty-six plays have been translated (55.5%). All the historical plays except for the first, second and third parts of *King Henry the VI* have remained untranslated. About twelve plays comprising both comedies and tragedies have been translated into Kannada. Appendix-I provide tabulated information of Shakespearian translations in Kannada and provide information about the translated title, year of translation, name of the translator, language on which the translation is based and certain interesting remarks. The frequency of translations of different plays is given in Table- 1.

Original Title	No. Of Translations
<i>Hamlet</i>	18
<i>The Merchant of Venice</i>	10
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	10
<i>Macbeth</i>	10
<i>Taming of the Shrew</i>	8
<i>Julies Caesar</i>	8
<i>Othello</i>	8
<i>The Tempest</i>	8
<i>As You Like It</i>	5
<i>King Lear</i>	4
<i>A Mid Summer Night's Dream</i>	4
<i>The Winter's Tale</i>	4
<i>The Comedy of Errors</i>	3
<i>Cymbeline</i>	2
<i>Twelfth Night</i>	2
<i>All's Well that Ends Well</i>	1
<i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>	1
<i>King Henry VI</i>	1
<i>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</i>	1
<i>Coriolanus</i>	1
<i>Pericles</i>	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>

Table 1: Table showing the frequency of Shakespearian Translations in Kannada

In general, translations prior to 1920 could be called adaptations and that of the post-1920 period may be said to be literal translations suggesting their closeness to the originals. It should be noted that the pre-1920 period is the period of the precursors for modern Kannada literature, be it



fiction, drama or poetry. Modern literature in Kannada is conspicuously marked by events such as the establishment of the University of Mysore, the publication of the translations of English Romantic poems in Kannada, *ingliš-gītegaḷu* by B M Srikanthaiiah (1921), the first social play *ṭollu-gaṭṭi* 'the hollow and the strong' by T P Kailasam (1921) and the first novel *māddidunṇō -maharāya* 'eat whatever you have cooked', a proverb with the meaning 'suffer the consequences of your deeds' by M S Puttanna (1916).

Around the same time, Hattiyangadi Narayana Rao and his associates in the Bombay Karnataka region and Manjeshwara Govinda Pai and others in the coastal Karnataka region were engaged in similar activities. It should be noted that a majority of the translations for which the date of publication are not available in Appendix-I, happen to be translations from the pre-1920 period. A conspicuous aspect of these early translations is that the titles, names of the characters, locales, settings, sequences, and in certain cases even the endings (tragedy to comedy) have undergone modifications. However, Deva (1993) observes that the earliest literal translation of Shakespeare is that of *Macbeth* by D V Gundappa (1936) and all translations prior to that can be considered as adaptations. If we accept this view, almost half of Shakespearean translations in Kannada must be categorized as adaptations. As this cut off point also marks the beginning of the decay of professional Kannada theatre, it also suggests a periodization divide between translations (adaptations) centred on professional theatre and texts that are literary translations.

A curious aspect of some of the early translations is that the original English text has not been used for

translation. Table- 2 provides information about the translations that have been done based on texts available in other Indian languages.

Original Title	Translated Title	Year	Translator	Language
<i>All's Well that Ends Well</i>	<i>satīmaṇi-vijaya</i>	1897	Somanathayya	Telugu
<i>The Comedy of Errors</i>	<i>bhrāntivilāsa</i>	1876	Venkatacharya	Bengali
<i>The Taming of the Shrew</i>	<i>gayyāliyanu-sādhumāḍuvike</i>	1987	Somanathayya	Telugu
<i>Othello</i>	<i>padmini</i>	1911	Srikantha Shastry	Telugu
<i>The Taming of the Shrew</i>	<i>trāṭikānāṭaka</i>	1920	Honnapuramath	Marathi
<i>The Merchant of Venice</i>	<i>venīsu-nagarada-vartaka</i>	1906	Venkatacharya	Bengali
<i>The Winter's Tale</i>	<i>māṇjuvāṇi</i>	1914	Srikanthashastry	Telugu <sup>6</sup>

Table 2: Kannada translations of Shakespeare based on the texts available in other Indian languages.

It is interesting to point out that almost all translations belong to the early phase of Shakespearian translations in Kannada. Translations based on Telugu are by Vireshalingam Pantulu, those from Bengali are from Iswara Chandra Vidyasagar and those of Marathi are by Kelkar. A majority

of these are based on Charles Lamb's prose renderings of Shakespeare's plays.

Another interesting aspect of Shakespearian translations in Kannada is the way the genre of drama has been conceived in terms of indigenous genres. Accordingly, we can see that the titles have been translated as *nāṭaka* (drama), *carite/caritre* (life-story), and *kathe* (story). The comedies are usually given a title that ends with *vijaya* (victory), *vilāsa* (romance) and *pariṇaya* (marriage). Such titles were frequently used both in folk and professional theatres during the early modern phase of Kannada theatre. Similarly, dramatic, prosaic, blank verse and classical styles have been used frequently in these translations. Table-3 provides information about titles that have been used by translators.

Original Title	Translated Title	Year	Translator
<i>Othello</i>	<i>rāghāvendrarāv-nāṭaka</i>	1885	Churamuri
<i>Othello</i>	<i>śūrasēna-carite</i>	1895	Basavappashastry
<i>As You Like It</i>	<i>kamalāvatī-pariṇaya</i>	n.d	Shamaray
<i>All's Well that Ends Well</i>	<i>satīmaṇi-vijaya</i>	1897	Somanathayya
<i>King Lear</i>	<i>hēmacandrarāja-vilāsa</i>	1899	Puttanna
<i>The Taming of the Shrewd</i>	<i>candīmardana-nāṭakam</i>	1910	Lakshmanarao
<i>The Taming of the Shrewd</i>	<i>trāṭikā-nāṭaka</i>	1920	Honnapuramatha

<i>The Merchant of Venice</i>	<i>pāncālī-pariṇayam</i>	1890	Anandarao
<i>A Midsummer-night's Dream</i>	<i>pramīlārjunīya</i>	c.1890	Srikantheshagowda
<i>A Midsummer-night's Dream</i>	<i>vasaṇṭayāmīni-swapanacamatkāra-nāṭaka</i>	c.1890	Vasudevacharya
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	<i>kamalākṣa-padmagandhiyara-kathe</i>	1881	Bhadvada
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	<i>rāmavarma-lilavati - caritre</i>	1889	Anandarao
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	<i>ramavarma- līlāvati - caritre</i>	n.d	Jayarajacharya
<i>Cymbeline</i>	<i>jayasimharāja-caritre</i>	1881	Puttanna
<i>Cymbeline</i>	<i>jayasimharāja-caritre</i>	1907	Nanjappa

*Table 3: Table giving the genre specific information in the translated titles of Shakespearean translations in Kannada.*

In order to understand the dynamics of the deviations detailed above, a systematic mapping of information about the translations is necessary. In the absence of such information, our attempt must be of limited scope. However, to point out the significance of such an approach, I have attempted here to briefly discuss the eight Kannada translations of *Romeo and Juliet* and some of the criticisms that have been levelled against these translations (See Table 4). Out of the eight, three translations, Shanmukhayya (1952), Shankaranarayana Rao (c.1950) and Huyilagola (1963) are prose translations. The other translations are all



from the pre-1920 period and are stage adaptations of the original play. Apart from the fact that a tragedy has become *kathe* (story) and *carite* (life story), they have been given a happy ending, thereby transforming a tragedy into a comedy. This is intriguing considering the fact that not all tragedies have been transformed into comedies in Kannada. First of all, it is important to note that it is only with regard to the translations from English that such freedom has been taken. During the early phase of modern Kannada literature, plays from English on the one hand and Sanskrit and other Indian languages on the other were brought into Kannada. However, it is only in the case of adaptations from English that liberties have been taken by translators and not with the translations from Sanskrit or other Indian languages. Many early translators [(Puttanna 1881), (Srikantheshagowda 1895)] have sharply defended their changes in theme, locale, characterization etc by citing cultural differences between the two cultures involved in the process of translation. It is noteworthy that in several early translations of *Macbeth* (Chennabasappa 1881), *Othello* (Churamuri 1885) and *Hamlet* (Anandarao 1905), the tragic endings of the original have been retained. Only in the case of *Romeo and Juliet* we notice that the tragic ending has been changed to a happy one. Deva (Deva 1993) observes that there appears to be an influence of the episode of *sāvitri-satyavān* in these adaptations. However, in the subsequent Kannada criticism of Shakespearian translations, translators have been harshly criticized for such deviations.

Translated Title	Year	Translator
<i>kamalākṣa-padmagandhiyara-kate</i>	1881	Bhandivada
<i>rāmavarma-līlāvati</i>	c.1889	Varadachar
<i>rāmavarma-līlāvati -caritre</i>	1889	Anandaraao
<i>rāmavarma-līlāvati -caritre</i>	1889	Jayarajacharya
<i>rōmiyō-and-jūliyet</i>	n.d.	Basavappashastry
<i>rōmiyō- and -jūliyet</i>	n.d.	Srikantheshagowda
<i>asūyā-pariṇāma</i>	1931	Amruthachari
<i>rōmiyō -mattu- jūliyet</i>	C.1950	Shankaranarayanarao
<i>rōmiyō -jūliyet</i>	1952	Shanmukhayya
<i>rōmiyō -mattu-jūliyet</i>	1963	Huyilagola

Table 4: Kannada Translations of *Romeo and Juliet*.

With the exception of Bhandivada's translation (Bhandivada 1881), which was done in North Karnataka, all the pre-1920 translations done in Mysore were meant for different professional theatre groups. Basavappashastry was commissioned by the royal court of Mysore to translate *śākuntalam* and *Othello* for the staging requirements of the Palace Company. During pre-1920 days *Romeo and Juliet* as *rāmavarma-līlāvati* was a very popular play and used to be performed by three different professional theatre companies in Mysore alone and all of them appear to have been published during the same year. Ratnavali Nataka Sabha used the script of Varadachar, Chamarajendra Nataka Sabha used the script of Jayarajacharya and Rajadhani Nataka Mandali

used Ananadarao's script. The performance of the same play by three professional theatre companies and its translations by five different writers in a single city at a particular point of time reveals that a new sensibility was emerging with regard to modern Kannada drama. It was a complex relationship between modernizers, performers, translators and audiences, well beyond the reach of academic criticism of the intellectuals for some time to come. Deva (Deva 1993) points out that only a few translators like Kerur Vasudavacharya, Bhandivada and Srikatheshagowda were able to capture at least a few aspects of Shakespeare's originality, and that others failed to capture the cultural significance of the originals. However, it needs to be pointed out that such criticism actually marginalizes the instrumental role played by these translations in the cultural transformations of the early phase of Kannada drama.

It is important for us to explore the reasons behind these adaptations. Antecedent criticisms to Deva's critique of Shakespearian translations reveal a bias of literary criteria on the one hand and fidelity to the original on the other, completely ignoring the condition that the early adaptations were done for the theatre. Shamaraya's (1962:146) harsh criticism of the happy ending in Anandarao's (1889) translation of *Romeo and Juliet* - one of the earliest systematic attempts to survey and review modern Kannada drama - makes this point clear:

*The absurdity par excellence is the self-conceived last act of the play, in which Pujiyapada Yogishwara (Fraiar Lawrence) prays to Lord Vishnu, who appears on the stage, appreciates Ramavarma's (Romeo) love*

*for Lilavati (Juliet) and Lilavati's chaste virtues and brings them back to life. The translator, in an attempt to bring Ramavarma and Lilavati back into life, has murdered the great dramatist (śēkspiyar mahākavi). The saying that 'translators are traitors/murderers' has actually become true here. When it is often told that this was a very popular play, we not only need to shake our heads (taledūgu; in total approval; also rejecting something totally) about the dramatic skills of its actors but also have to put a big question mark on the taste (rasa-śuddhi) of the audience who use to enjoy such performances.*

This is only one of several instances typical of the critical approach adopted by the critics of modern Kannada drama in their attempts to clarify the early theatrical translations of Shakespeare. It clearly demonstrates the creative literary criteria of an elitist approach and the prefixed power relationship between the original and translation. The effect of such an approach had far reaching consequences on the Kannada drama to the extent that it not only advocated a literary and elitist approach, but also encouraged an attitude of looking down on the professional theatre, an attitude that eventually led to self-denigration and to the drama's subsequent downfall. Subsequent criticism of Kannada drama shows scant interest in the performance aspect of early Shakespearian translations. In order to understand the inherent biases of this approach, we need to probe the issue further. Shamaraya was an academic, literary historian and critic. He considers D.V.Gundappa's (Gundappa 1936) translations of *Macbeth* to be more literary



than (and hence superior to) those of Srikantheshagowda's (Srikantheshagowda 1895) adaptation. A comparison of the two Kannada translations of the famous lines spoken by Lady Macbeth during her sleepwalk shows this clearly:

*Out, damned spot! Out I say.*

*chi chi, asahya kaleye, tolagu tolagu,  
tolagendarū tolagadiruve. (Srikantheshagowda  
1895)*

*hōgu, haḷu cikkiye hōgu, nānu hēḷuttēne.  
(Gundappa 1936)*

It is unfortunate that non-Kannadigas cannot appreciate the appropriateness and the colloquial style apparent in Srikantheshagowda's translation. In spite of the alleged 'deviation', Srikantheshagowda's lines are lively, dynamic and poetic whereas Gundappa's translation, despite claims that they are 'highly literary' (Shamaraya 1962 and Deva 1993), is dull and static. However, without even considering that the former was a performing text and that the latter one was for study as a text, Shamaraya (Shamaraya 1962:147) not only uses literary criteria for evaluation but also concludes as follows:

*Srikantheshagowda has the heart of a poet; but he does not have the appropriate Kannada scholarship to translate the original feelings that he is experiencing into Kannada.*

Subsequent criticism thus obscures and marginalizes the achievements of early translations and brings text-centred translations to the focus of analysis. This is a significant

departure not only with reference to the theatre sensibilities of the early adaptations phase, but also from the subsequent progressive literature phase (1930s and 1940s). Punekar (Punekar 1974) points out that there was a period of a lively and healthy relationship between theatre movements (professional and amateur) and progressive writers like A.N. Krishnarao (A.Na.Kru), and D.K.Bharadvaj. These writers wrote serious criticism in theatre journals about the performances of professional companies and about leading performances like Varadacharya, Mahammad Peer, Bellary Raghavacharya and their contemporaries.<sup>7</sup> Punekar further points out that the stiff-necked attitude of the newly emerging white collar middle class dealt the deathblow to professional theatre companies. They thought it was not only below their dignity to watch plays being performed by professional companies but they also developed either a total arrogance towards theatre or began patronizing amateur groups. Such changes not only eroded the public patronage that professional companies had hitherto enjoyed, but also had far reaching consequences for the theatre sensibilities of the community itself. To appreciate how the community gradually lost its sensibilities, and eventually developed an entirely new set of sensibilities - a development that resulted in the death of the professional theatre movement - we need to visualize the experience of Girish Karnad, as told in his own words.

Karnad has attempted to map his links with the folk-professional-amateur theatres though the words used originally were 'a search for a new theatre'. The rural theatre's input for him consisted of a variety of visiting Parsi theatre groups and the local folk theatre tradition.

*In my childhood, in a small town in Karnataka, I was exposed to two theatre forms that seem to represent irreconcilably different worlds. Father took the entire family to see plays staged by the troupes of professional actors called nātak companies, which toured the countryside through out the year. The plays were staged with semi-permanent structures on proscenium stages, with wings and drop curtains, and were illuminated by petromax lamps.*

*Once the harvest was over, I went with the servants to sit up nights watching the more traditional yakṣagāna performances. The stage, a platform with a black curtain, was erected in the open air and was lit by torches. (Karnad 1989:21)*

However, Karnad's attitude to native performing traditions underwent a change during the course of his education. The onslaught of modernism not only dealt a deathblow to some of the native performing traditions, but also brought forth a significant change in the artistic sensibilities of the newly educated, to the extent that the need for native performing traditions was not felt by the new generation.

*By the time I was in my early teens, the natak companies had ceased to function and yakṣagāna had begun to seem quaint, even silly, to me. Soon we moved to a big city. This city had a college, and electricity, but no professional theatre. (Karnad 1989:21)*

An abrupt discontinuity with the native performing traditions on the one hand, and a changing conceptual world due to education is clearly evident from Karnad's account:

*I saw theatre only when I went to Bombay for my post-graduate studies. One of the first thing that I did in Bombay was to go see a play, which happened to be Strindberg's Miss Julie, directed by the brilliant young Ebrahim Alkazi. I have been told since then that it was one of Alkazi's less successful productions. The papers tore it into shreds the next day. But when I walked out of the theatre that evening, I felt as though I had been put through an emotionally or even a physically painful rite of passage. I had read some written playwrights in college, but nothing had prepared me for the power and violence I experienced that day. (Karnad 1999:21-22)*

Though a bias towards modernity is clearly visible in his words, Karnad's links among folk, professional and amateur theatres are not clearly visible, but we can also note that he has constantly appropriated traditional material from the folk and professional theatre alike, both in its form and content. Karnad's experience, seen in the light of his words here, rightly theorizes the transformation that took place in the sensibilities among the theatre-going community of Karnataka. Historians of theatre (c.f. Amur 1995) have pointed out that by the 1940s the golden days of the professional theatre companies came to an end, with companies gradually closing one theatre after another. Around the same time the literary translation of



Shakespearian plays began appearing, thereby serving the purposes of the amateur groups and the students who studied them as texts. In other words, Kannada theatre gradually lost his mass patronage and took the form of leisure courses in schools and colleges. At the same time however a pertinent question arises about the popularity that early translations could achieve.

Considering the fact apart from the folk theatre tradition, there is a conspicuous absence of plays in medieval Indian literatures, the factors that initiated the emergence of interest in theatre and its sustenance, and in particular its attempts at modernization and denigration inflicted on them by the label 'adaptations' needs further probing. The answers for this have to be sought in the emergence of Parsi theatre and the movement of folk theatre performing groups from one region to another, thereby leading to their enrichment through mutual absorption of ideas, themes and styles from whatever quarter they could. At the same time, these adaptations could also be viewed as culturally unique ways of dealing with cultural imperialism and domination, thereby distorting and regionalizing universalistic tendencies. After all, our cultural uniqueness and identities are crucial tools for constructing counter-constructions against any sort of domination.

My intention is not to draw a comparison between the early theatre-centred adaptations and the subsequent textual and literary translations of Shakespearian plays by using qualitative criteria. But the very presence of a massive body of adaptations and the lively dialogue between the audience and the performers needs to be explained. In addition, we also need to understand how such a sensibility - understood

as a cultural phenomenon - was able to develop. This however is a difficult task, considering that there are no documents available on this subject. Long ago, Kurtukoti (1969) made an appeal for a historiography of Kannada theatre, an appeal that has remained unfulfilled to this day.

In order to understand the text-and-performance relationship of early Shakespearian translations, we first need to understand the nature of text and performance during the periods of medieval Kannada literature. As mentioned earlier, there was no tradition of written plays in Kannada, despite a longstanding folk theatre existed in oral tradition. The texts of *kumāravyāsa bhārata* (16<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) or *torave rāmāyaṇa* (17<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) were in use only in recitation performances called gamaka-vācana. Although several palm-leaf manuscripts of the two texts were available, their oral transmission has continued even to the present day thorough gamaka- vācana and folk plays. That the Kannada folk-plays based on the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* episodes contain verses from the Yakṣagāṇa performances of coastal Karnataka region is well known to students of Kannada literature. The erasure of the distinction between the written and oral text in literary conventions - or to put it the other way, the lack of a distinction between the written and the oral text on the one hand and the crucial role of performing traditions in shaping and determining the texts on the other - has played an important role, both at the conceptual and performing levels, eventually shaping the construction, composition, maintenance and transmission of textual/performing traditions. These salient features of medieval Kannada literature continued in folk plays and the newly emerging Parsi theatre during the nineteenth century. The early precursors of modern Kannada drama, which

include several Shakespearean translations, should be seen as an interface that continued the sensibilities of an earlier performing tradition into the newly emerging literary (text-centred) sensibilities. The deviation or lack of 'fidelity' that have been pointed out in the early Shakespearean translations in Kannada need to be understood and appreciated as cultural maneuvers of an interface in transforming culture in which the nature of the text and its performance was in a state of flux and change. In the prefaces to their translations, M.S. Puttanna and Srikantheshagowda attempted to justify this by suggesting cultural appropriateness as a justification for the liberties they take.<sup>8</sup>

The paucity of plays during the medieval period in the regional languages of India has already been pointed out. However, nineteenth and early twentieth century theatre in Kannada and neighbouring languages is marked by the movement of theatre groups from one region to another and thus constituting a mutual influence on each other's sensibilities. The annual seasonal migration of the *yakshagāna* performing groups during the dry season in the coastal Karnataka region touching places of religious, commercial, aristocratic and public patronage serves as a pointer to understand the nature of movements of performing groups, both traditional and Parsi theatre companies, during the nineteenth century. Marathi theatre historians believe that the *yakshagāna* group from Karki (North Kannada district in Karnataka) visited Sangli (Maharashtra) in 1842 and performed a *yakshagāna* play under the patronage of Srimanta Appa Saheb Patavardhan. The performance encouraged Patwardhan to take the initiative to stage the first Marathi play, *sītāsvayamvar* written by Vishnudas Bhave in 1843. In addition, the *yakshagāna* group from Gokarna



(North Kannada district in Karnataka) visited Icalakarnjekar during 1948-49. Tradition records that the *yakṣhagāna* groups went as far as Baroda and performed in the royal court there. The Oriya *prahlāda-nāṭaka*, performed in the Gunjam district has been claimed by its performers to come from Karnataka about 150-200 year ago. This suggests the nature of interaction that existed across linguistic regions during the pre-Parsi theatre days. The impact of Kannada folk plays was so profound on Marathi theatre that the tunes of the famous Marathi play *sangīta saubhadra* of Kirloskar Nataka Mandali were based on the tunes of *śrīkrṣṇa-pārijāta*, a folk performing tradition of north Karnataka.<sup>9</sup> At the same time, the Marathi plays staged by this company, in particular, *śākuntalā*, *sangīta saubhadra*, *vikramōrvaśīya* and *rāmarājya* were extremely popular among theatre lovers of North Karnataka.

On the other hand, Baliwala Company, a Parsi theatre company from Maharashtra visited the royal court of Mysore in 1881, a visit that was responsible for the emergence of the Palace Company with the Maharaja of Mysore as its patron. Basavappashastry's translations of *śākuntalā* and *sūrasēna-carite* (Macbeth) were rewritten for performance by the palace Company. The Marathi theatre group became so popular in the North Karnataka region that Altekar's Hindu Nataka Mandali, which was founded in 1869, had a five-month 'camp' in Dharwar during its 1873 tour. The famous Marathi Company, Kirloskar Nataka Mandali toured the North Karnataka region during 1886 and 1889. Similarly, the drama companies of Sangalikar and Icalakaranjekar used to tour the North Karnataka region. The presence of Marathi theatre groups in the North Karnataka region was so



prominent that Shanta Kavi wrote a poem strongly reacting to the dominance of Marathi theatre:

*Wherever you see, there is the fame of Marathi  
dramas*

*Wherever you see, there are viewers of Marathi  
dramas*

*Wherever you see, there move the Marathi stage  
actors*

*Wherever you see, there is a performance of  
Marathi drama*

*Karnataka itself has become full of Marathi  
language.<sup>10</sup>*

The multilingual situation in the North Karnataka region was so vibrant that it is said that the Tantupurastha Nataka Mandali of Dharwar had multilingual actors in its repertoire who could fluently speak Kannada, Marathi and Hindi (Dakkhini), an advantage that enabled the company to perform plays in the Marathi- Kannada- and Telugu-speaking regions. It is also said that *ṭrāṭikā-nāṭaka*, the Marathi translation of *The Taming of the Shrew* by Kelkar was performed in Dharwar in 1908. This interaction among theatre groups was not confined to the Kannada and Marathi speaking regions. Tamil and Telugu language theatre groups used to visit specific regions and cities in the Kannada-speaking regions to cater to the needs of their respective speech communities, and the Kannada theatre groups did the same in the Telugu and Tamil regions. The visit of Gubbi Viranna's company to Madras and its popularity are well known. Bellary Raghavacharya's performance as a great

actor in Telugu, Kannada and English plays has found abundant mention in the literature on Kannada theatre.<sup>11</sup> Artists, actors, musicians and painters alike were invited from their linguistic regions by the companies of the other regions. Kulkarni (2002) notes that the famous Marathi stage actor Balagandharva, after witnessing Vamanarao Master's performance (who was a renowned actor and the owner of the Vishwagunadarsha Sangita Nataka Mandali), invited him to join his Company. Vamanarao, it is said, politely declined the offer. Similarly, Alagiriswamy, the painter, who used to prepare the scenes for Govindaswamy Nayakar's Tamil Company, was invited by Vamanarao to help him in a Kannada version of *lankādahana*, a play that subsequently made the Tamil theatre company famous.

Apart from the fact that new plays emerged during the period under discussion, we can also witness the emergence of new folk plays, in which the authors have documented their names in the play. Two popular folk-plays of north Karnataka region, *sangya-bāḷya* and *kaḍḷēmaṭṭi-sṭēṣan-māṣṭar*, for which the author's name is available have been claimed to be written during the 1860s. In addition, if we consider the fact that the first Kannada play, Singarārya's *mitravindā gōvindā*, was also written in 1860, then the changes that were taking place in the mid-nineteenth century Kannada theatre become conspicuous and evident. It is worth pointing out here that *sankalpa siddhiyu* (*As you Like It*), the earliest adaptation of Shakespeare, was done in the style of *yakṣagāna*, the folk theatre of coastal Karnataka.

All these events suggest that there was a theatre-centred sensibility during the nineteenth century, which, on the one hand, had its temporal continuities with medieval

Kannada performing traditions, and on the other, had its spatial extensions with the theatre traditions of Kannada, Marathi, Telugu, Tamil and Oriya folk performing traditions. Not only were the new plays adopted with innovations in stagecraft and script, but also a large and greatly committed audience backed them. The new theatre that emerged during the later part of the Nineteenth century enriched itself not only from the theatre traditions of Sanskrit, medieval Kannada and other regional languages, but also from western traditions, primarily through Parsi theatre and subsequently from exposure to English plays. It is appropriate to identify this phase as an interface, rather than as a binary opposition like traditional-modern, east-west etc. as is currently done. In fact, we can identify similar clearly identifiable interfaces for other genres in Indian languages, especially fiction and poetry. Early Shakespearian translations need to be understood as cultural productions of this interface and as an outcome of theatre-centred activity rather than as academic literature-centred translations.

It is pertinent to ask here what the impact of these early Shakespearian translations, with their so-called objectionable deviations, was on the community that flocked to theatres to see them performed. It is quite possible that they served as conduits of the new ideas and modernism, not to mention the imperialistic ideology of the British masters. There is no doubt about the need for research in the reception these translations enjoyed, however scanty the evidence may yet be. But it could also be the other way round. We know that in the Bakhtinian paradigm, any act of parodying, inverting, tilting and mutilating representations provides fertile grounds for acts of contestation, interrogation and subversion. If performances of Khandekar's Marathi play

*kīchak-vadhā* could become an anti-colonial act during the days of Swadeshi movement, then the contestation and subversive potential of performing traditions cannot be belittled. In fact, during the period 1908-18, Shanta Kavi, an activist of the Swadeshi and Kannada unification movement, used to ride a buffalo from village to village to perform the play *vidyāranya-vijaya* in the *kīrtana* form. Though the plot and dialogue of the play were written against the backdrop of the history of the Vijayanagara empire, in its performance it is said to have become a play reflecting the sentiments of the nationalist and Karnataka unification movement. How a culture re-inscribes and reads a text is an important factor that needs to be considered in understanding translations. In an article in the volume *śēkspiarige-namaskāra*, Sriranga (Sriranga 1966) brings to our notice that his Sanskrit professor used to refer to Kalidasa as 'the Shakespeare of Hindustan'. The colonial context and the power relationship forged between the two authors are obvious. Balurao, the volume editor, provides a sketch done by R S Naidu, a renowned artist from the Jaganmohana School of Arts, Mysore. A close reading of the following sketch helps us to appreciate its significance.(see p.30)

Kalidasa and Shakespeare are represented as being friendly, standing hand in hand and dressed appropriately, their attires suiting the worlds they represent. While Kalidasa has a palm-leaf manuscript in his hand, Shakespeare has a scroll. Everything looks like a perfect demonstration of a harmonious East-West encounter.



*But wait a minute!*

*Did someone feel uncomfortable that Shakespeare is slightly taller than Kalidasa?*

*Or that Shakespeare looks like a 'manly Englishman'!*

*And that Kalidasa looks a BIT 'effeminate'!*

*Also there is no doresāni anywhere around (for our comfort)!*

*It doesn't matter; Kalidasa is represented on the right side and Shakespeare to his left.*

We all know that in the Indian iconographic tradition, *vāma* (left) conventionally suggests inferiority and insignificance with reference to its right counterpart. Like Naidu's sketch, many of these early Shakespearian translations were probably doing something of this sort, wittingly or unwittingly. Only viewers and audience can decide what to read from a representation.



*Kalidasa and Shakespeare*  
(Sketch by R.S. Naidu, reproduced from Balurao 1966).

## Notes

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the National Seminar on *Postcolonial Translation* held at the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur during March 28-30, 2003. However, the initiative to work on this topic began with my remarks as the Chairperson of a session on Shakespeare in Kannada at the National Seminar on Shakespeare in India held at the Department of English, University of Delhi during March 1988. I acknowledge Professor Harish Trivedi and Dr. Anjali Gera Roy for providing me an opportunity to undertake a study on the theme. I would also like to acknowledge the suggestions and comments made by an anonymous reviewer of this journal, most of which have been incorporated. Special thanks for Ms. Nazir Lasker for her help in preparing the final draft of the paper.
2. For a detailed discussion of counter-construction dynamics of 'the manly Englishman, effeminate Indian and the infidel mem sahib', see Satyanath 1997.
3. The fact that the name of one of the most popular actors of early twentieth century was Mahamaad Peer also needs to be kept in mind.
4. It is generally believed that B. Venkaracharya's *bhrāntivilāsa*, a translation of *The Comedy of Errors* done in 1876 (based on a Bengali translation by Ishwara Chandra Vidyasagar), was the earliest translation of Shakespeare in Kannada. However, Deva (Deva 1994) has recently pointed out that Chennabasappa's translation

is actually the earliest. A translation of *As You Like It* with the title *sankalpa siddhiyu* in the yakṣagāna style also appeared in 1871.

5. This translation is based on the Telugu title *sumitrā - caritram*. It is interesting to point out that the Telugu concept of *caritram* has not been incorporated in the Kannada translation.
6. Criticism of professional theatre came also from another quarters, viz. the amateur groups, and some criticisms were in the form of plays. T.P. Kailasam and Adyarangacharya (Sriranga), having their exposure to theatre through the west, wrote plays like *namkampni*, 'our company' and *nāṭakavemba-nāṭaka*, 'a drama called drama', in which they ridiculed what they thought was absurd in the professional theatre of those at times.
7. Such justifications could be seen in the case of other genres as well, like the novel. Padikkal (Padikkal 2002:56-57) provides an instance of such a justification from the preface of *śṛṅgāra cātur्यōllāsini*, a romance written by Gubbi Murigaradhya in 1896. Murigaradhya uses the locution *Hindu maryāde* 'Hindu mannerisms' to express the concept of cultural appropriateness.
8. The very fact that Anna Saheb Kirloskar hailed from Gurlahosur in Dharwar district of north Karnataka and that he was exposed to the folk performing traditions of the region makes the point clear for us. Kurtukoti (1993) notes that even the instructions in the Marathi text of *sangīta saubhadra* (1882) clearly mentions the popular tunes of the Kannada folk play *śrīkr̥ṣṇa-pārijāta*.



Accordingly, the text mentions that the famous tune of the song 'pāṇḍu nrpati janaka jaya' is based on the Kannada folk play tune 'kṣīra sāgara namma mane'. Kurtukoti further points out that after thirty years the dominance of Marathi plays was so profound that the link between the two was completely forgotten.

9. It is important to note that Shanta Kavi was associated with the Sri Virnarayana Prasadita Krutapura Nataka Mandali of Gadag, which was in existence during 1877-1895. He also wrote the first play *uṣāharaṇa* that the company performed in 1877. It is also worth mentioning that Betageri Krishnasharma wrote a poem in Kannada to make the Kannadigas aware of the strong dominance of Marathi over Kannada, but actually composed that song basing it on a famous Marathi tune of those days viz. 'rājahamsa mājha nijalā'. This is only to suggest the complexity of the situation during the early phase of translation.
10. Bellary Raghavacharya was one of the most popular actors and was associated with the Amateur Dramatists Association, Bangalore. He was a multilingual actor and acted in English, Kannada and Telugu plays. His characterization of Shakespearian characters was so famous that Srinivasamurthy (Srinivasamurthy 1966) notes that Raghavacharya even went abroad in 1927 to Singapore and London and performed before English audiences.
11. Kīrtane is a popular form of religious discourse in which a story is narrated through songs and dialogues to the accompaniment of musical instruments. The mass appeal

that the religious discourse had in those days, the existence of the text only in its oral form, the fluid nature of the text and its potential for spontaneous interpolations, improvisations and changes, and above all, the insularity that such texts enjoyed from the British law (against seditious writings), all suggest the innovative ways in which apparently conservative performing traditions could transform the performances into subversions and contestations.

# APPENDIX-I: TABLE SHOWING THE DETAILS OF SHAKESPEARIAN TRANSLATIONS IN KANNADA

ORIGINAL TITLE	TRANSLATED TITLE	YEAR	TRANSLATOR	LANG.	GENRE	REMARKS
Othello	rāghavēndrarāv nāṭaka	1885	Churamuri	English		
Othello	śūrasēna caritre	1895	Basavappa shastry	English		Oral rendering's tr.
Othello	padmini	1911	Srikantha shastry	Telugu	Prose tr.	V.Pantulu's tr.
Othello	athellō	n.d.	Krishnashastry	English		
Othello	athellō	c.1954	Shanmukhayya	English		
Othello	othelō	1963	Huyilagoḷa	English	Prose tr.	
Othello	othelō	1967	n.a.	English	Prose tr.	Tr. for Children
Othello	athelō	1974	Nisar Ahmad	English		
As You Like It	sankalpa siddhiyu	1871	KKR	English	yakṣagāṇa	
As You Like It	āys yu laik iṭ	n.d.	Shastry	English		
As You Like It	kamalāvatī parinaya	n.d.	Shamaraya	English		
As You Like It	doremagaḷu	1959	Bharatisuta	English	Prose tr.	
As You Like It	nīvu bayasidante	1963	Huyilagoḷa	English	Prose tr.	
All's Well that Ends Well	satīmaṇi vijaya	1897	Somanathayya	Telugu	Prose tr.	V.Pantulu's tr.
Antony and Cleopatra	āntoni mattu kliyōpātra	n.d.	Mallaraḷe Arasu	English		unpublished
The Comedy of Errors	nagadavarannu nagisuva kathe	1871	Chenniabasappa	English		earlist tr.
The Comedy of Errors	bhrāntivilāsa	1876	Venkatacharya	Bengali	Prose tr.	I.Vidyasagar's tr.
The Comedy of Errors	viparyāsa	1947	Parvatavani	English		
King Henry VI	jāk kēḍ dombi dāndhaleya prahasana	1959	Gundappa	English	II Part only	
King Lear	hēmacandrārāja vilāsa	1899	Puttanna	English	Verse + prose	1989?
King Lear	liyar mahārāja	1959	Srinavasa	English		
King Lear	king liyara	1963	Huyilagoḷa	English	Prose tr.	

King Lear	king-liyar	1988	Shivaprakasha	English		
Julies Ceaser	jūliyas sīzar	1931	Sharma, T.T.	English	Prose tr.	
Julies Ceaser	śavasamskāra	1939	Channabasava	English	III Act, II Scene	
Julies Ceaser	jūliyas sīzar	n.d.	Inamdar	English		
Julies Ceaser	jūliyas sīzar	n.d.	Shanmukhayya	English		
Julies Ceaser	jūliyas sījhar	1963	Huyilagola	English	Prose tr.	
Julies Ceaser	jūliyas sīzar	1973	Shankar	English		
Julies Ceaser	jūliyas sīzar	1975	Bhagavan	English		
Julies Ceaser	jūliyas sīzar	1977	Niranjana	English		
The Two Gentlemen of Verona	kusumākara	1897	Annajirao	English	Prose tr.	1905?
The Tempest	chandamāruta	1893	Subbarao	English	Prose tr.	C.Lamb's tr.
The Tempest	birugāli	1930	Kuvempu	English		Free tr.
The Tempest	chandamāruta	1959	Srinivasa	English		
The Tempest	māntrikana-magalu	1963	Mahalinga Bhatta	English		
The Tempest	birugāli	1963	Huyilagola	English	Prose tr.	
The Tempest	birugāli	1967	Vi Vi	English	Prose tr.	Tr. For Children
The Tempest	chandamāruta	1981	Murthy Rao	English		
The Tempest	dhūm dhūm sunṭaragāli	1992	Vaidehi	English		
The Taming of the Shrew	n.t.	1881	Varadachar	English		
The Taming of the Shrew	gayyāliyanu sādhumāḍuvike	n.d.	Narasimhachar	English		
The Taming of the Shrew	chandīmardana	n.d.	Ramashastry	English		
The Taming of the Shrew	gayyāliyanu sādhumāḍuvike	1897	Somanathayya	Telugu	Prose tr.	V.Pantulu's tr.
The Taming of the Shrew	chandīmadamardana nāṭakam	1910	Lakshmana Rao	English		



The Taming of the Shrew	trāṭikā nāṭaka	1929	Honnapura matha	Marathi	Prose tr.	V.B.Kelkar's tr.
The Taming of the Shrew	bahaddūr gaṇḍa	1947	Parvatavani	English		
The Taming of the Shrew	gayyāli gaṇḍa	1964	Murthy	English		
Twelfth Night	dvādaśa rātri	1960	Srinivasa	English		
Twelfth Night	hannerāṇeya rātri	1975	Narayana	English		
The Merchant of Venice	pāncālī pariṇayam	1890	Anandaraao	English	A Mysorian	For Palace Co.
The Merchant of Venice	venisu nagarada vaṇika	1906	Venkatacharya	Bengali?		
The Merchant of Venice	vēṇupuriya vartaka	1928	Hanumanta Gowda	English		
The Merchant of Venice	suratanagarada śrēṣṭhiyu	1929	Vasudevacharya	English		
The Merchant of Venice	venis vyāpāri	1958	Sukuma	English		
The Merchant of Venice	venissina vyāpāri	1959	Gundanna	English	Blank verse	
The Merchant of Venice	venisina vartaka	1962	Huyilagoḷa	English	Prose tr.	
The Merchant of Venice	marcanṭ af venis	n.d.	Jayarajacharya	English		
The Merchant of Venice	di marcanṭ af venis	n.d.	Sitaramayya	English		
The Merchant of Venice	di marcanṭ af venis	n.d.	Shanmukhayya	English		
A Midsummer-night's Dream	pramīlārjunīya	c. 1890	Srikanthesha Gowda	English		

A Midsummer- night's Dream	vasantayāminī swapanacamatkāra nāṭakavu	c. 1890	Vasudevacharya	English		
A Midsummer- night's Dream	naḍubēśageya irujuganasu	1963	Huyilagoḷa	English	Prose tr.	
A Midsummer- night's Dream	e miḍ sammar naiṭs drīm	1974	Nisar Ahmad	English		
Macbeth	myākḇet	c. 1881	Channabasappa	English		
Macbeth	praṭāparudra dēva	1895	Srikanthesha Gowda	English		
Macbeth	dvēśa bhāṇḍāra nāṭakavu	1926	Anantaraya	English	Dukha- janya	
Macbeth	raktākṣi	1932	Kuvempu	English		Free tr.
Macbeth	myākḇet	1936	Gundappa	English		1974?
Macbeth	myākḇeth	1963	Huyilagoḷa	English	Prose tr.	krūra-hambala (1964)
Macbeth	myākḇet	1976	Ramachandra deva	English		
Macbeth	myākḇet	1985	Parvatavani	English		
Macbeth	māranāyakana drṣṭānta	1990	Shivaprakash	English		
Macbeth	gombe myākḇet	1992	Vaidehi	English		
Romeo and Juliet	kamalākṣa padmagandhiyara kathe	1881	Bhandivada	English		
Romeo and Juliet	rāmavarma līlāvati	c.1889	Varadachar	English		
Romeo and Juliet	rāmavarma līlāvati caritre	1889	Anandarao	English		
Romeo and Juliet	rāmavarma līlāvati caritre	1889	Jayarajacharya	English		
Romeo and Juliet	rōmiyō anḍ jūliyeṭ	n.d.	Basavappa shastry	English		Oral rendering's tr.
Romeo and Juliet	rōmiyō anḍ, jūliyeṭ	n.d.	Srikanthesha Gowda	English		
Romeo and Juliet	asūyā pariṇāma	1931	Amrutachari	English		
Romeo and Juliet	rōmiyō mattu jūliyeṭ	1949	Shankara narayanaRao	English	Prose tr.	
Romeo and Juliet	rōmiyō jūliyeṭ	1952	Shanmukhayya	English		

Romeo and Juliet	rōmiyō mattu jūliyet	1963	Huyilagola	English	Prose tr.	
The Winter's Tale	manjughōṣa	n.d.	Rangacharya	English		
The Winter's Tale	mahīmaṇḍana	1900	Annajirao	English	Prose tr.	
The Winter's Tale	manjuvāṇi	1914	Srikantha shastry	Telugu	Prose tr.?	V.Pantulu's tr.
The Winter's Tale	hēmanta	1982	Shivarama Karantha	English		
Cymbeline	jayasimharāja charitram	1907	Nanjappa	English		
Cymbeline	jayasimharāja caritre	1881	Puttanna	English	Prose tr.	
Hamlet	hyāmlet	1905	Anandaraao	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet, ā nāṭakada karnāṭaka bhāṣāntaram	1905	Rao	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	c. 1930	Shivarama Karantha	English		Unpublis-hed
Hamlet	santāpaka	1937	Amrutachari	English	Prose tr.	
Hamlet	hyāmlet	n.d.	Kulakarni	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	n.d.	Jayarajacharya	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	n.d.	Jivannaraya	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	n.d.	Shivalinga swamy	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	n.d.	Hemantakumara	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	n.d.	Jivaji	English		Unpublis-hed
Hamlet	hyāmlet	n.d.	Savaligimatha	English		Unpublis-hed
Hamlet	hyāmlet	1958	Srinivasa	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	1960	Parvati	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	1961	Kulakarni	English	Prose tr.	
Hamlet	hyāmlet	1970	Anandaraao	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	1973	Bhagawan	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	1978	Ramachandra deva	English		
Hamlet	hyāmlet	1985	Parvatavani	English		
Coriolanus	koriyalēnas	1981	Rajagopal	English		
Pericles	parikālābhyu daya	1897	Annajirao	English	Prose tr.	

## APPENDIX – II

### A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SHAKESPEARIAN TRANSLATIONS IN KANNADA

#### *Othello*

Krishnashastry, A.R. n.d. *athellō*.<sup>i</sup> n.p.

Churamuri, G.K. 1885. *rāghavēndrarāv nāṭaka*. Dharwar: G.K. Churamuri.

Basavappashastry M. and C. Subbarao. 1895. *śūrasēna caritre*.<sup>ii</sup> Mysore: G.T.A. Press.

Srikanthashastry, Nam. 1911. *padmini*.<sup>iii</sup> Mysore: G.T.A. Press.

Shanmukhayya, Y.M. 1954. *athellō*.<sup>iv</sup> n.p.

Huyilagola, Varadaraja. 1963. *othelō*.<sup>v</sup> Dharwar: Ramashraya Book Depot.

n.a. 1967. *othelō*.<sup>vi</sup> Mysore: Sharada Mandira.

Ahmad, Nisar. 1974. *athelō*. Mysore: Thalukina Venkannayya Smaraka Granthamale.



### *As You Like It*

K. K. R. 1871. sankalpa siddhiu.<sup>vii</sup> *subōdhinī*, Nov. 1<sup>st</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> issues.

Shastry, A.V. n.d. *āys yu laik it*.<sup>viii</sup> n.p.

Shamaraya, Venkatadri. n.d. *kamalāvatī parīṇaya*.<sup>ix</sup> n.p.

Bharatisuta. 1959. *doremagaḷu*.<sup>x</sup> Mangalore: Kannada Prapancha Prakashana.

Huyilagola, Varadaraja. 1963. *nīvu bayasidante*.<sup>xi</sup> Dharwar: Ramashraya Book Depot.

### *All's Well that Ends Well*

Somanathayya, Bellave Somappa. 1897. *satīmaṇi vijaya*.<sup>xii</sup> n.p

### *Antony and Cleopatra*

Arasu, K. Mallaraje. n.d. *āṇṭoni mattu kliyōpātra*. Unpublished.

### *The Comedy of Errors*

Chennabasappa, Basavalingappa. 1871. *nagadavarannu nagisuva kathe*.<sup>xiii</sup> Dharwar: n.p.

Venkatacharya, B. 1876. *bhrāntivilāsa*.<sup>xiv</sup> Mysore: G.T.A. Press.

Parvatavani. 1947. *viparyāsa*. Bangalore: Chaya Prakatanaalaya.

### ***King Henry VI***

Gundappa, D.V. (Di.Vi.G.) 1959. *jāk kēḍ dombi dāndhaleya prahasana*.<sup>xv</sup> Mysore: Kavyalaya.

### ***King Lear***

Puttanna, M.S. 1899. *hēmacandrarāja vilāsa*.<sup>xvi</sup> Bangalore: Coxton Press.

Srinivasa. 1959. *liyar mahārāja*. Bangalore: Jivana Karyalaya.

Huyilagola, Varadaraja. 1963. *king liyara*.<sup>xvii</sup> Dharwar: Ramashraya Book Depot.

Shivaprakasha, H.S. 1988. *king liyar*. Bangalore: Priyadarshini Pustakalaya.

### ***Julius Caesar***

Inamdar, V.M. n.d. *jūliyas sīzar*.<sup>xviii</sup> n.p.

Shanmukhayya, Y.M. n.d. *jūliyas sīzar*.<sup>xix</sup> n.p.

Sharma, Tirumale Tatacharya. 1921. *jūliyas sīzar*.<sup>xx</sup> Mangalore: Dashaprabhu and Sons.

Chennabasava. 1939. *śavasamskāra*.<sup>xxi</sup> Bellary: Kannada Geleyara Gumpu.

Huyilagola, Varadaraja. 1963. *jūliyas sījhar*.<sup>xxii</sup> Dharwar: Ramashraya Book Depot.

Shankar, S.N. 1973. *jūliyas sīzar*. Mysore: Sharada Mandira.

Bhagavan, K.S. 1975. *jūliyas sīzar*. Mysore: Mahima Prakashana.

Niranjana, Tejasvini. 1977. *jūliyas sīzar*. Bangalore: Katha Sahitya.

### *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*

Annajirao, M.R. 1897. *kusumākara*.<sup>xxiii</sup> Bangalore: Town Press.

### *The Tempest*

Subbarao, B. 1892. *caṇḍamāruta- śēkspiya mahākaviyinda racitavāda ṭempeṣṭ emba nāṭakada katheya sārāṃśavu*.<sup>xxiv</sup> Mysore: G.T.A. Press.

Kuvempu. 1930. *birugāḷi*.<sup>xxv</sup> Mysore: Udayaravi.

Srinivasa. 1959. *caṇḍamāruta*. Bangalore: Jivana Karyalaya.

Huyilagola, Varadaraja. 1963. *birugāḷi*.<sup>xxvi</sup> Dharwar: Ramashraya Book Depot.

Mahalingabhatta, Y. 1963. *māntrikana-magaḷu*. Mangalore: U.R. Shenoy and Sons.

Vi.Vi. 1967. *birugāḷi*.<sup>xxvii</sup> Mysore: Sharada Mandira.

Murthyrao, A.N. 1981. *caṇḍamāruta*. Mysore: Arpana Prakashana.

Vaidehi. 1992. *dhūm dhūm sunṭaragāḷi*. Heggodu: Akshara Prakashana.

### ***The Taming of the Shrew***

Varadachar, A. n.d. n.t. n.p.

Ramashastry, Godapalli. n.d. *caṇḍīmardana*.<sup>xxviii</sup> n.p.

Narasimhachar, S.G. n.d. *gayyāḷiyanu sādhumāḍuvike*.<sup>xxix</sup> n.p.

Somanathayya, Bellave Somappa. 1897. *gayyāḷiyanu sādhumāḍuvike*.<sup>xxx</sup> n.p.

Lakshmanarao, K. 1910. *caṇḍīmadamardana nāṭakam*. Mysore: G.T.A. Press.

Honnapuramatha, Ga. Hu. 1929. *trāṭikā nāṭaka athavā monḍa gaṇḍa tunṭa henḍati nāṭaka*.<sup>xxxi</sup> Dharwar: R.A. Hirematha.

Parvatavani. 1947. *bahaddūr gaṇḍa*. Mysore: Bharati Prakashana.



Murthy, A.S. 1964. *gayyāḷi gaṇḍa*. Tiptur: Sudarshana Prakashana.

### ***Twelfth Night***

Srinivasa. 1960. *dvādaśa-rātri*. Bangalore: Jivana Karyalaya.

Narayana, P.V. 1975. *hanneradaneya rātri*. Bangalore: Ullasa Prakanalaya.

### ***The Merchant of Venice***

Sitaramayya, V. n.d. *di marcent af venis*.<sup>xxxii</sup> n.p.

Shanmukhayya, Y.M. n.d. *di marcent af venis*.<sup>xxxiii</sup> n.p.

Jayarajacharya, Narahari. n.d. *marcent af venis*.<sup>xxxiv</sup> n.p.

Krishnashastry, A.R. n.d. *venisu nagarada vaṇika*.<sup>xxxv</sup> n.p.

Ananadarao, A. 1890. *pancālī pariṇayam*.<sup>xxxvi</sup> Bangalore: Albion Press.

Venkātacharya, B. 1906. *venisu nagarada vaṇika*.<sup>xxxvii</sup> n.p.

Hanumantagowda, C. 1928. *vēṇupuriya vartaka*, ed. by Bhi. Ji. Hulikavi. Dharwar: Sharada mandira.

Vasudevacharya, Kerura. 1929. *suratanagarada śrēṣṭhiyu*. Bagilukote: Vasudeva Pustakalaya.

Sukuma. 1958. *venis vyāpāri*. Bangalore: Panchajanya.

Gundanna, G. 1959. *venissina vyāpāri*. Citradurga: G. Gundanna.

Huyilagola, Varadaraja. 1962. *venisina vartaka*.<sup>xxxviii</sup> Dharwar: Ramashraya Book Depot.

### *A Midsummer Night's Dream*

Vasudevacharya, Kerura. n.d. *vasantayāminī swapanacamatkāra nāṭakavu*.<sup>xxxix</sup>

Bagilukote: Kerura Swamirayacharya.

Srikantheshagowda, M.L. 1890 (?). *pramīlārjunīya*. Mysore: G.T.A. Press.

Huyilagola, Varadaraja. 1963. *naḍubēsageya iruḷuganasu*.<sup>xi</sup> Dharwar: Ramashraya Book Depot.

Ahmad, Nisar. 1974. *e miḍ sammar naiṭṣ drīm*. Mysore: Pruthvi Prakashana.

### *Macbeth*

Chennabasappa, Basavalingappa. 1881 (?). *myākbet*.<sup>xli</sup> Dharwar: n.p.

Srikantheshagowda, M.L. 1895. *pratāparudradēva*.<sup>xlii</sup> Mysore: G.T.A. Press.

Anantharaya, Haranahalli. 1926. *dvēśa bhāṇḍāra nāṭakavu*.<sup>xliii</sup>  
Karwar: Haranahalli Anantharaya.

Kuvempu. 1932. *raktākṣi*.<sup>xliv</sup> Mysore: Udayaravi.

Gundappa, D.V. (Di.Vi.G). 1936. *myākbet*.<sup>xlv</sup> Bangalore:  
Karnataka Prakanalaya.

Huyilagola, Varadaraja. 1963. *myākbet*.<sup>xlvi</sup> Dharwar:  
Ramashraya Book Depot.

Deva, Ramachandra. 1976. *myākbet*. Chokkadi: Sumanasa  
Vichara Vedike.

Parvatavani. 1985. *myākbet*. Bangalore: IBH Publishers.

Shivaprakasha, H.S. 1990. *māranāyakana dr̥ṣṭānta*. Shimoga:  
Parisara Prakashana.

Vaidehi. 1992. *gombe myākbet*. Heggodu: Akshara  
Prakashana.

### ***Romeo and Juliet***

Basavappashastry, M. n.d. *rōmiyō and jūliyet*.<sup>xlvii</sup> n.p.

Srikantheshagowda. K.L. n.d. *rōmiyō and jūliyet*.<sup>xlviii</sup> n.p.

Bhandivada, Venkatesha Bhimarao. 1881. *kamalākṣa  
padmagandhiyara kathe*. n.p.

Anandarao, A. 1889. *rāmavarma līlāvati caritre*. Mysore: Government Branch Press.

Jayarajacharya, Narahari. 1889. *rāmavarma līlāvati caritre*. Mysore: n.p.

Varadachar, A.V. 1889. *rāmavarma līlāvati*. Mysore: General Agency.

Amrutachari, Ti. 1931. *asūyā pariṇāma*. Mysore: Wesleyan Mission Publishing House.

Shankaranarayanarao, H.M. 1949. *rōmiyō mattu jūliyeṭ*.<sup>xlix</sup> Mysore: Sharada Mandira.

Shanmukhayya, Y.M. 1952. *rōmiyō jūliyeṭ*.<sup>i</sup> Bangalore: Eastern Press.

Huyilagola, Varadaraja. 1963. *rōmiyō mattu jūliyeṭ*.<sup>li</sup> Dharwar: Ramashraya Book Depot.

### *The Winter's Tale*

Rangacharya, Mudgal. n.d. *manjughōṣa*.<sup>lii</sup> n.p.

Annajirao, M.R. 1900. *mahīmandāna*.<sup>liii</sup> Mysore: G.T.A. Press.

Srikanthashastry, Nam. 1914. *manjuvāṇi*.<sup>liv</sup> Mysore: G.T.A. Press.



Karanta, Shivarama. 1982. *hēmanta*. Hubballi: Sahitya bandhara.

### *Cymbeline*

Puttana, M.S. and M.B. Srinivasa Iyengar. 1881. *jayasimharāja caritre*.<sup>lv</sup> Bangalore: City Press.

Nanjappa, Mallappa. 1907. *jayasimharāja caritram*.<sup>lvi</sup> Bangalore: Town Press.

### *Hamlet*

Karantha, Shivarama. n.d. *hyāmleṭ*.<sup>lvii</sup> Unpublished.

Jayarajacharya, Narahari. n.d. *hyāmleṭ*.<sup>lviii</sup> n.p.

Jevannaraya, Gode. n.d. *hyāmleṭ*.<sup>lix</sup> n.p.

Savaligimatha, Shivalingaswamy. n.d. *hyāmleṭ*.<sup>lx</sup> n.p.

Hemantakumara. n.d. *hyāmleṭ*.<sup>lxi</sup> n.p.

Ananadarao, A. (Mysuru Deshiyya). 1905. *hyāmleṭ ā nāṭakada karnāṭaka bhāṣāntaram*.<sup>lxii</sup> Bangalore: Mysore Book Depot Press.

Amrutachari, T. 1937. *santāpaka*.<sup>lxiii</sup> Bangalore: M. Nanjundayya and Brothers.

Shanmukhayya, Y.M. 1954. *hyāmleṭ*.<sup>lxiv</sup> n.p.

Srinivasa. 1958. *hyāmleṭ*. Bangalore: Jivana Karyalaya.

Narasimhamurthy, Parvathi Krishnappa. 1960. *hyāmleṭ*. Mysore: Purnima Sahitya Mandira.

Kulakarni, K.S. 1961. *hyāmleṭ*.<sup>lxv</sup> Belagam: Sarasvati Pustaka Bhandara.

Bhagavan, K.S. 1973. *hyāmleṭ*. Mysore: Thalukina Venkannayya Smaraka Granthamale.

Deva, Ramachandra. 1978. *hyāmleṭ*. Sagara: Akshara Prakashana.

Parvatavani. 1985. *hyāmleṭ*. Bangalore: IBH Publishers.

### ***Coriolanus***

Rajagopal. K.V. 1981. *koriyolēnas*. Bangalore: Jagat Sahitya Male.

### ***Pericles***

Annajirao, M.R. 1897. *parikalābhyudaya*.<sup>lxvi</sup> Mysore: G.T.A. Press.

### ***Anthologies***

Narasimhashastry, V.L. 1909. *śēkspiyaṛ mahākaviya nāṭaka kathānūvāda*.<sup>lxvii</sup> Mysore: Christian Literature Society.

Shastry, V. Lakshminrusimha. 1934. *śēkspiyaṛ nāṭaka kathegaḷu*.<sup>lxviii</sup> Bangalore: Karnataka Prakatanaḷaya.

Srikanthashastry, Nam. 1953. *kavinandana kathegaḷu*.<sup>lxix</sup>  
Bangalore: M.S. and Sons.

Shastry, Bellave Narahari. 1955. *āngla nāṭaka kathāvaḷi*.<sup>lxx</sup>  
Bangalore: Bellave Pustakalaya.

Girvani. 1957. *othellō mattu itara nāṭaka kathegaḷu*.<sup>lxxi</sup>  
Bangalore: Ashoka Sahitya.

Iyengar, Masti venkatesha. 1958. *śēkspiyaṛ bhāṣāntara - sampuṭa I: liyaṛ mahārāja mattu hyāmleṭ*. Bangalore: Jivana Karyalaya.

Iyengar, Masti venkatesha. 1959. *śēkspiyaṛ bhāṣāntara - sampuṭa II: dvādaśa rātri mattu caṇḍamāruta*. Bangalore: Jivana Karyalaya.

Venkataramappa, K. 1959. *ingliś nāṭakada kathegaḷu - bhāga I*.<sup>lxxii</sup> Mysore: K. Venkataramappa.

Kulakarni, A.S. 1961. *venis nagarada vartaka mattu itara kathegaḷu*.<sup>lxxiii</sup> Bangalore: S.S.N. Depot.

Srinivasa. 1962. *śēkspiyaṛ-dr̥syagaḷu*.<sup>lxxiv</sup> Bangalore: Jivana Karyalaya.

Ramananda. 1963. *śēkspiyaṛina kathegaḷu*.<sup>lxxv</sup> Dharwar: Samaja Pustakalaya.

## FOOT-NOTES FOR APPENDIX-II

- i. The year of publication and the place and publisher's name are not available.
- ii. Basvappashastry did not know English. The translation has been done based on the Kannada rendering of the play by Subbarao. The translation was commissioned for the Palace Company.
- iii. Prose translation based on the Telugu version by Kandukuri Vireshalingam Pantulu.
- iv. The year of publication is only tentative and the place and publisher's name is not available.
- v. Prose translation.
- vi. The translator's name is not available; however, this translation was meant for the children are evident from the fact that this is the twenty-fifth publication in the children books series (makkaḷa pustakamāle).
- vii. This appears to be the earliest translation though, Deva (1994) claims that Chennabasappa's translation of *The Comedy of Errors* is the earliest one. The exact date of publication for *sankalpa siddhiyu* is available to us: the November 1<sup>st</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> issues of *subōdhinī*, a journal that use to get published from Mangalore. What is interesting with this translation of *As You Like It* is that it has been adapted into yakṣagāna style, the regional folk theatre of coastal Karnataka (for more details see Padikkal 2001).
- viii. The year of publication and the place and publisher's name are not available.
- ix. The year of publication and the place and publisher's name are not available.
- x. Prose rendering; like a long story (nīlgate).
- xi. Prose translation.
- xii. The place and publisher's name is not available. The translation is based on the Telugu translation by Vireshalingam Pantulu and probably, a prose translation.
- xiii. This is the earliest translation of Shakespeare in Kannada according to deva (1993).



- xiv. A prose translation based on Ishvara Chandra Vidyasagar's Bengali translation. The second edition appeared by 1899. The first edition appeared in 1876 simultaneously from G.T.A. Press in Mysore and Karnataka Press in Bangalore.
- xv. Contains translation of the second part of *Henry VI*.
- xvi. Havanura (1974) observes that compared to the then prevailing trend in translation of using prose and verse (based on the model of Sanskrit plays), Puttanna's prose translation of the play is a new step in the emergence of Kannada drama.
- xvii. Prose translation.
- xviii. The year of publication and the place and publisher's name are not available.
- xix. The year of publication and the place and publisher's name are not available.
- xx. Prose translation. Balurao's bibliography gives the year of publication as 1931 and publisher as Karnataka Sahitya Prakatana Mandira, Bangalore.
- xxi. Translation of the second scene, third act of the play.
- xxii. Prose translation.
- xxiii. Balurao (1966) notes that it is a prose translation.
- xxiv. Prose translation; the third edition of the translation had appeared by 1898. However, Balurao (1966) gives the year of publication as 1893 and the publisher's name as Karnataka Granthamala, Mysore.
- xxv. This is a free translation. A subsequent edition (second?) appeared in 1959. Balurao (1966) gives the publisher's name as Kavyalaya.
- xxvi. Prose translation.
- xxvii. This translation that was meant for the children is evident from the fact that this is the ninth publication in the children books series (makkaḷa pustakamāle).
- xxviii. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
- xxix. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.

- xxx. The place and publisher's name is not available. The translation is based on the Telugu translation by Vireshalingam Pantulu and probably, a prose translation.
- xxxī. This translation had seen the third edition by 1952. The publisher for the third edition was Chandrodaya Mudranalaya of Dharwar.
- xxxii. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
- xxxiii. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
- xxxiv. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
- xxxv. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
- xxxvi. The bibliographies mention that the name of the translation is 'a resident of Mysore'. However, it has been pointed out that the translator is actually A. Anandarao.
- xxxvii. The place and publisher's name are not available. Probably, a prose translation based on Ishvara Chandra Vidyasagar's Bengali translation.
- xxxviii. Prose translation.
- xxxix. The date of publication is not available. However, secondary sources mention that it was published around 1890.
  - xl. Prose translation.
  - xli. The date of publication has been confirmed only from the secondary sources.
  - xlīi. The title of the play, *pratāparudradēva* is not the name given for Macbeth in the Kannada adaptation. It is the name given to Malcom, the first son of Macbeth, who ascends the throne. If fact, the name given for Macbeth in the adaptation is *vīrasēna*. Similarly the witches have become *yakṣiṇis* in the adaptation.
  - xlīiī. Includes an introductory essay on tragedy; it is interesting to note that the term used for tragedy is 'dukhajanya nāṭaka'.
  - xliv. This is a free translation. A subsequent edition (second?) appeared in 1959.

- xliv. Subsequent edition appeared in 1974 from Mysore and was published by Kavyalaya.
- xlvi. Prose translation. Another prose translation with the title *krūra hambala* has been published from the same translator in 1964 from Nilakantha Prakashana from Dharwar.
- xlvii. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
- xlviii. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
- xliv. Prose translation.
  - 1. The second edition appears to have been published in 1970 from Bangalore by Triveni Mudranalaya.
  - li. Prose translation.
  - lii. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
  - liii. Prose translation.
  - liv. Prose translation based on Kandukuri Vireshalingam Pantulu's prose translation, *sumitrā caritam* in Telugu.
  - lv. There is a suggestion in Sujata (1981) that this was subsequently rewritten as a play by Puttanna. However, the text is no evidence of its publication.
  - lvi. Some references mention that the publisher's name is T.N. Mudrakshara Shale.
  - lvii. Probably was translated some time around 1930.
  - lviii. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
  - lix. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
  - lx. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
  - lxi. The date of publication, place and publisher's name are not available.
  - lxii. Scholars have pointed out that the translator is probably A. Anandarao.
  - lxiii. Prose translation.
  - lxiv. The place and publisher's name is not available.

- lxv. Prose translation.
- lxvi. Prose translation.
- lxvii. Includes prose translation of eight plays: *King Lear*, *As You Like It*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Cymbeline*, *Twelfth Night*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest* and *All's Well That Ends well*.
- lxviii. Translated from English and contains prose renderings of four plays: *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Othello* and *Julius Cesar*.
- lxix. The year of publication given here is for the second edition. This is the prose translation of Kandukuri Vireshalingam Pantulu's prose translation of Shakespeare's plays in Telugu and contains the following: *The Merchant of Venice*, *Othello*, *The Winter's Tale*, *King Lear*, and *The Taming of the Shrew*. Srikanthashastry's prose translations of *Othello* and *The Winter's Tale* have already been published separately in 1911 and 1914.
- lxx. Includes prose translations of comedies.
- lxxi. Includes prose translations of seven plays: *Othello*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Cymbeline*, *Pericles*, *As You Like It*, *The Winter's Tale* and *Macbeth*.
- lxxii. Includes prose translation of six plays: *The Tempest*, *Pericles*, *Cymbeline* and others.
- lxxiii. Includes prose translations of four plays: *The merchant of Venice*, *Othello*, *As You Like It* and *Macbeth*.
- lxxiv. This includes translations of scenes from fifteen different plays.
- lxxv. Includes prose translations of seven plays: *The Merchant of Venice*, *As You Like It* and others.



## References

- Amura, G.S. (1995). *uttara karnāṭakadalli ādhunika rangabhūmiya udaya* (vṛutti nāṭaka mattu vilāsi nāṭakagalu) sātvikapatha. Bangalore: Prithvi Prakashana.
- Anderson, Benedict. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Balurao, S. (1966). *śēkspiyarige namaskāra*. Delhi: Kannada Bharati.
- Chaudhuri, Sukanta (2002). *Shakespeare in India*.  
<http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Library/Criticism/Shakespearein/India.html>
- Deva, Ramachandra (1993). *śēkspiyar: eraḍu samskr̥tigalaḷli*. Bangalore: Granthavali.
- Enke (2002). *naṭa nāṭakakāra vāmanarāv māstar*. Dharwar: Sankalana Prakashana.
- Fleet, J.F. (1885). *The Insurrection of Rāyaṇṇa of Sangolli*. *Indian Antiquary*. Vol. XIV:
- Havanura, Srinivasa (1974). *hosagannaḍada aruṇōdaya*. Mysore: University of Mysore.

**kannaḍa granthasūci: mudrita kannaḍa kṛitigaḷa vivaraṇātmaka granthasūci- anuvāda sāhitya.** Vol. 7. Mysore: University of Mysore. 1984.

Karnad, Girish. (1989). *In Search of a New Theatre*, in Sorden, Clara M. (ed) **Contemporary India**. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kurtukoti, K.D. (1969). *nāṭaka naḍedubanda dāri*. Dharwar: Manohara Grantha Mala.

Kurtukoti, K.D. (1993). *tēli banda kaṭṭigeya tunḍu. uriya-nālige*. Dharwar: Manohara Grantha Mala.

Murthy Rao, A.N. (1962). *śēkspiyaṛ: pūrvābhaga*. Mysore: University of Mysore.

Murthy Rao, A.N. (1966). *sekspiyaṛ mattu karnataka* in Balurao S. (ed.) *śēkspiyaṛige namaskāra*. New Delhi: Kannada Bharati.

Padikkal, Shivarama (2001). *nāḍu-nuḍiya rūpaka: rāṣṭra, ādhunikate mattu kannaḍada modala kādambarigaḷu*. Mangalagangoṭri: Mangalore University.

Punekar, Shankara Mokashi (1974). *prēkṣaka mattu kalābhīruci. kannaḍa rangabhūmi: anḍu-inḍu, āru upanyāsaḷu*. Dharwar: Karnatak University.

Ramachandramurthy, H.K. (1977). *kannaḍa rangabhūmi. kannada nataka prapaṃca*. Bangalore: Kannada Sahitya Parishattu.

Satyanath, T.S. (2002). **Translation and Reception as a Cultural Process: Translating Tragedies in Kannada**. *Translation Today: Online Journal*, 1.1, Inaugural issue, now available in its print version. [www.cill/anukrti/Tt/1.1](http://www.cill/anukrti/Tt/1.1)

Satyanath, T.S. (1997). **Manly Sahabs and their Infidel Memsahabs**. *Paper presented at the National Seminar on the Image of the Colonizer in Indian Representations*. Delhi: Karnataka Sangha, March 1-3.

Shamaraya, Ta. Su. (1962). *kannaḍa nāṭaka*. Mysore: Gita Book House.

Shamaraya, Ta. Su. (1966). *kannaḍa mattu śēkspiyaṛ* in S. Balurao (ed.) *śēkspiyaṛige namaskāra*. New Delhi: Kannada Bharati.

Sriranga. (1966). *sāmanyara śēkspiyaṛ* in S. Balurao (ed.) *śēkspiyaṛige namaskāra*. New Delhi: Kannada Bharati.

Sujata, H.S. (1981). **M.S. Puṭṭaṇṇa: ondu adhyayana**. Bangalore: IBH Prakashana.

Venkataramanayya, T.V. (1973). *kannaḍa bhāṣā-sāhitya lēkhana sūci*. Bangalore: Bangalore University.