
Translations into Kannada in the 10th Century: Comments on Precolonial Translation

V.B.THARAKESHWAR

Abstract

Looking at early Kannada literary texts like Kaviraja Maarga and Vikramarjuna Vijaya (10th century), this paper tries to argue that employing binaries such as western/indian, colonial/indigenous, Kannada / Sanskrit would not do. Such early texts have to be placed in the context of the emerging writing culture (textual production) in the region, the uses to which it was put (economy, polity, religion), the question of patronage, the religious order of the day apart from subjecting it to a comparison with the source texts so as to figure out the function that they perform in the target culture. The paper identifies the existing pitfalls in theorizing pre-colonial translation practices and suggests that the complex matrix in which the practice is embedded has to be unearthed in further research in this area.

It has been thought over the last two decades that in pre-colonial times, India had a different notion of "bringing" texts into Indian languages from "classical languages" such as Sanskrit, Prakrit etc., from the one that exists today. People who posit such an

argument also inform us that it was a "dynamic notion of translation" compared to the one that is prevalent today, which is "western" and "colonial". It has been pointed out by several critics/scholars that the writers, who "rewrote" Sanskrit texts in Kannada, have transformed the "original text" to "suit the politics of Kannada" which was trying to negotiate the "hegemony of Sanskrit".¹

In this paper I argue that employing binaries such as Kannada/Sanskrit, orient/occident is not terribly useful in getting to know the interface between the phenomenon of translation and what drives it. We need instead to look at the social context in which these translations took place to unearth the complex processes that are set in motion when two "language-cultures"² meet on an uneven plane, and at an uneven place. Further, I look at some of the pre-colonial translations into Kannada, trying to place them in the "social space" of that period. I use the word "social space" to mean the socio-political context of the period. What helps us to understand translations is not the metanarrative but something that drives the translation, something that creates the translation in the first place, and at the same time gets transformed by the "translation". That is, not only are translations conditioned by socio-political spaces but translations themselves produce socio-political spaces or modify the existing ones. In the first section of the paper I look at a text that is the oldest available text in Kannada. It is called *Kaviraja Marga*. It is a text of poetics. The story of *Mahabharatha* has been retold in Kannada by many a writer. The first available retelling of the epic in Kannada is *Pampa Bharatham or Vikramarjuna Vijayam* of the 10th century³. This text is analyzed in the second section. In the last section I make some remarks that would facilitate further research in this area.

I

Many literary traditions have begun with translations.⁴ Translations mark the beginning of literature in Kannada language too. The first available written text in Kannada is *Kaviraja Marga*

(The Way of the King of Poets, 814 -877 A.D., henceforth *KRM*). This is treated as a work of rhetoric/poetics in Kannada, and is heavily indebted to Dandi's Sanskrit work *Kavyadarsha* (The Mirror of Literature). Some even call it a translation of *Kavyadarsha*. However it has been noted by scholars that this work differs from the Sanskrit one in many ways. This difference would account for the changes that a treatise on literature undergoes as it travels from one language to another and from one social space to another⁵.

The first poem in *KRM* is a salutation poem (*Seetharamaiah, 1994: (I:1) 73*). In Dandi's *Kavyadarsha* the salutation to Saraswathi, the god of learning, comes in the beginning. In *KRM* this becomes the third poem. The first two poems of *KRM* indirectly praise King Nrupatunga by praising Lord Vishnu (*Seetharamaiah 1994: (I: 2 & 3) 73*)⁶. Praising the king by equating him with a god or gods is something that we don't find in Sanskrit texts. This is one of the vital differences between Sanskrit texts and Kannada texts of this period. In Sanskrit human beings, whether kings or ordinary beings, are not equated with God. But the Jaina poets of this period in Kannada make it a custom to equate the king with God, whom they salute at the beginning of the text. Commenting on this aspect, Kurtakoti, a Kannada critic, says that this is not surprising because Jains don't believe in God and they consider the king himself as a god (*Kurtakoti 1995:v*)⁷. Kurtakoti's argument is hard to accept, as praising the king by equating him with God is not a simple issue of praising the king instead of God, but is more complex. Jainism is not an atheistic religion like Buddhism, so it is hard to accept that "instead" of God they praised the king. Interestingly, the texts that they are translating/rewriting belong to a "Vedic religion"⁸.

The pantheon of gods that we find in certain texts like *Mahabharatha* and such other Puranic texts has inspired the texts which are supposed to be part of "Sanskrit Literature" in general⁹. God Vishnu with whom King Nrupatunga is equated is part of such

a milieu. Nrupatunga was a Vaishnava, but Srivijaya the poet was supposed to be a Jaina.

The situatedness of a Vaishnava king and a Jaina poet on the same scene is a very curious one. Jaina poets were supposed to translate Vaishnava texts as commissioned by the king, or on their own took up that task to curry favors with the Vaishnava King. It is normally suggested that to obtain the king's favor or as expression of their regard to the kindness bestowed by the king, these writers praised the king by using such ambiguous words which equivocally denote both king and God. Elevating the king to the status of a god is not seen as dishonor to the god.

Similarly Dandi's first poem, which becomes the third poem in *KRM*, the author translates in such a way that it is not against the tenets of Jaina belief; for example, deleting reference to Brahma in the poem. Invocation of goddess Saraswati at the beginning of the epic is not an old custom in Sanskrit literature. It doesn't happen in *Mahabharatha* or in Kalidasa's plays. It must be a later development. While translating Dandi's poem into Kannada, the author of *KRM* adds a few adjectives to Goddess Saraswati: "madhura aaraavochite, chatura ruchira padarachane". Here we see a sense of tenderness associated with Saraswathi and Kaavya: in a sense, feminization of (epic) literature is happening here.

It has been remarked (*Pollock, 1998: 21*) that one could talk not just of the cosmopolis of languages like Sanskrit but even vernacularization took the form of a cosmopolis, and Pollock calls it 'making the global local' or calling the vernacular thus formed "the cosmopolitan vernacular". Here the imperial political space that Sanskrit had created for itself across South Asia was replicated at a different level of empire using the vernacular. Sanskrit was normally used before this period all over South Asia in Epigraphy to praise the king, while local languages were used, if at all, to document business transactions. This kind of division of linguistic labour that existed

during this period is termed "hyperglossia" by Pollock (*Pollock 1998:11*)¹⁰. With the vernacularization process, vernacular languages also sought to become the language of literature and the language that could be used for praising the gods. So with this process they replicated the Sanskrit model in the vernacular. It is not that the hyperglossia or diglossia of Sanskrit and Kannada discontinued with the vernacularization process. It indeed continued. The literary composition in Kannada presupposed literacy in Sanskrit. It in fact followed Sanskrit texts, but adapted it to local needs. What these "local needs" were need to be pinpointed by analyzing the differences that we find in the Kannada texts to understand the socio-political space that existed and which itself was shaped by these translations.

Apart from the first two stanzas that praise the king, *KRM* is different from *Kavyadarsha* in three ways:

1. Though it is the first extant text in Kannada, it refers to earlier poets in Kannada such as Kavishwara, Chandra, and Lokapala, whose texts have not been found yet. It is natural that *KRM*, which is trying to make Kannada a literary language, mentions earlier poets in Kannada to claim a tradition for Kannada literature. It also envisaged a space that maps the use of Kannada, as *Mahabharatha* does for Sanskrit¹¹. It thus talks about the geo-linguistic space of Kannada. Whether this space is real or far-fetched is not our concern, but the act of imagining a geo-linguistic space to elevate Kannada language is important for us here. It also talks of the people who use the Kannada language. It claims that they are well versed in spite of not reading anything (*Seetharamaiah 1994 (I: 36, 38): 79*). Kannada scholars feel that while saying this, the writer of *KRM* must be referring to folk literature that existed in Kannada. *KRM* also formulates certain rules and regulations to use Kannada.

2. *KRM* lists the "doshas"(= defects) in earlier Kannada poetry and suggests corrections (*Seetharamaiah 1994 (I: 41-50) 80-81*). The main purpose behind suggesting rules of writing is how to use Sanskrit while writing in Kannada. How to mix the two languages, what the best method is to combine these two languages while writing in Kannada are the concerns that emerge from this text. This part can only be part of the Kannada version, not the Sanskrit version, as this is an added burden that the writer of *KRM* has taken upon himself. It accepts the inevitability of the use of Sanskrit in Kannada (*Seetharamaiah 1994 (I: 51-67) 81-84*).
3. It also comments on Anandavardhana's 'dhwani theory' and upholds 'alankara theory'. This is also an added comment. Here the writer uses a poem by Anandhavardhana to oppose his argument that dhwani ('suggestion') is the mainstay of poetry (*Seetharamaiah 1994 (III: 208) 167*). Though it is heavily indebted to *Kavyadarsha*, it is a meta-text on it, as any translation would be - a *vyakhyana* (commentary)/ *teeke* (interpretation) of the original, in a literal sense.

II

Now let us take up another text - the first available written epic of Kannada - to illuminate further the issues that this paper addresses. *Pampa Bharatham* or *Vikramarjuna Vijayam* (henceforth *VV*) is a text written by Pampa in 959 A.D.¹². According to the poems that come in the last chapter (the 14th) in *VV*, where the poet talks about the history of his ancestors, he was born in a family which was converted to Jainism in his father's generation (*Venkatanaranappa, 1990: (14: 40-49) 401-403*). Before that the family was a Brahmin family. Though he is an ardent follower of Jainism as expressed in his text *Adipurānam* (*Venkatachala Shastri, 1995*), (Hereinafter *AP*)¹³, he was proud of his Brahmin background. In fact talking about the family's conversion to Jainism he claims that as it was a

religion that was fit for the Brahmins, his father got converted to that religion.

What comes out in this statement is that the 'varna' system was also a part of Jainism as those who converted to Jainism did not shed their sense of superiority even in the new religion, although while sketching the issue of Karna's "low-caste" origin in *VV*, Pampa seems to have been aware of the brahmin-shudra hierarchical opposition and arguments that were for and against the varna system (*Venkatachala Shastri, 1995 (II: 80-85) 60-61*). Even in *KRM* there are poems that clearly support the varna system¹⁴. In *VV*, there are many poems in which the characters glorify the old times as golden times, calling the present context as ruinous of the older one, with the rhetorical question that is usually asked - what will happen to the varna system with these changes? Preservation of the varna system thus seems to be the preoccupation of the period¹⁵. But it is also true that to some extent these conversions would have destabilized the system or rearranged the system in a slightly different way¹⁶. For example, Pampa, who was a Jaina Brahmin, was also a scholar, in the sense that he knew old texts and was conversant with the ways of training people for wars..

From the previous discussion we can deduce that religion or the author's beliefs might have played a major role in shaping the context of the texts. This would become clearer as we go on to explore some more examples of differences that we come across in the texts. In the first chapter of the epic, the poet himself says that *Vyasa Munindra Rudra Vachanaamruta Vaardhiyanisuvan Kavil Vyasanenemba Garvamenagilla* (*Venkatachala Shastri, 1995 (1:13) 3*)¹⁷ meaning, "though I am trying to swim across the ocean of the speech - nectar of sage Vyasa, I don't feel conceited about it". Here it is clear that he is acknowledging *Mahabharatha*, which is supposedly composed by sage Vyasa as the "original" text. But he seems to have taken a humble stand vis-à-vis the "original author".

How does he translate? He elucidates on why he translates mentions that in a poem:

*Kathe Piridaadodam Katheyameygaliiyade Mum
Samasta Bha | rathamanapoorvamaage Sale Peldha
(Kavishwarari)/
(da Vastuviivude) Ila Varnakam ||
Katheyoladambadam Padeye Pelvode Pampane
Pelgumendu Pam |
ditare Taguldu Bicchalise Pelalodarchidenii
Prabhandhamam ||*

(Venkatachala Shastri, 1995 (1:11), 0.2-3)

"As the story is vast, no poet-lord has been able to tell the complete story of Bharatha in an appealing manner. I started narrating this epic (prabhandam) by integrating the Varnaka style in the story to make the pandits proclaim that only Pampa could do it."

The poet is aware of the fact that the story of *Mahabharatha* is very vast. This is evident when he uses the metaphor of the ocean to refer to Vyasa's *Mahabharatha* to which I have alluded earlier (Venkatachala Shastri, 1995 (I: 13) but which appears after this poem in the text. According to the first version, he claims that no poet till now has been able to retell the complete Bharatha without affecting the framework of the story/theme. In the second version he seems to be claiming that till now nobody has been able to retell the complete tale of Bharatha in a "descriptive" way weaving that description with the story/theme¹⁸. He also claims that learned people say that only Pampa (that is, himself) can handle such a work.

What we see in the above analysis is that Pampa is aware of the Sanskrit *Mahabharatha* text and also knows that his audience

would be familiar with the "original text". Being able to retell the "original" without affecting the body of the story/theme either fusing "Vastuka" and "Varnaka" in the story or telling the story by fusing both Vastuka and Varnaka into the story is the challenge that he has taken up in these translations. Pampa's respect to both the "author" of the original and the story of the original is evident in these statements¹⁹. But this doesn't mean that VV has no differences when compared with Vyasa's *Mahabharatha*.

Many scholars have identified the differences between the Sanskrit *Mahabharatha* and Pampa's VV. Among these I here refer to Bellave Venkatanaranayappa (*Venkatanarayanappa 1990*), who has listed 27 such differences in the Introduction to his edition of VV, and Krishna Kumar (1999).

The first major difference that we come across in VV is that the hero of the epic is Arikesari II, the king in whose court the poet Pampa was. Arikesari II, as it comes out in the epic is equated with Arjuna, the hero of the epic. Some of the details regarding Arikesari II have been corroborated by other Kannada and Sanskrit texts, and also by epigraphs of the period. Arikesari was a Chalukya king and the Chalukyas and the Rastrakutas, the other and bigger kingdom of the period, had a love-hate relationship²⁰.

This act of equating king Arikesari II with Arjuna of the epic is the biggest challenge that Pampa has faced in VV. Venkatanaranayappa has felt that the changes that have been wrought because of this equation between Arikesari II and Arjuna seem to be "inappropriate" at certain places. The equation is achieved by equating the attributes that the king had with Arjuna in the beginning of each chapter. While describing the heroic qualities of Arjuna and his victories, he tries to equate victories with the wars that were waged by the king. Dharmaraja was worried that Arjuna would not be able to win against Karna. When Arjuna retorts to Dharmaraja,

Arjuna speaks as if he is born to Arikesari's actual parents. In the beginning of the epic Pampa praises the king using all his talents, and similarly at the end before embarking on a description of his own genealogy, he again praises the king.

Mahabharatha (Hereinafter *MB*) in Sanskrit is a Vaidic text as it appears today, whatever may be its origins. By the time of Pampa also this seems to have been the case. The poet has left out a major chunk of *MB* that alludes to religious issues and the explication of it. This may have been done as he was trying to compress the "original without affecting the main body of the theme/story, which is very vast. But it may also be due to the religious orientation of the poet. However, he has not been able to completely divest it of its religious connotations in his Kannada version. This point might again suggest that though he might have left out a large chunk of *MB*, it was not his intention to entirely leave out its religious connotations. In his epic he claims that, he has written a 'loukika' (secular) epic here and a "jinagamam" (Jaina Agama) over there²¹. The word 'there' refers to his other epic Adipurana, which is very much a Jaina Purana.

The sequence of situations in *MB* and *VV* are almost similar. He has not left out any parva of *MB*. Sometimes he has added new stories, stories that are not found in *MB*. While performing Rajasuya yaaga (sacrificial ritual) in *MB* the victories of each of the Pandavas have been described in great and rich detail. In *VV*, Pampa describes victories of all other Pandavas in just one line each and devotes the rest to praise Arjuna/Arikesari.

In Kirataarjuniya episode, Shiva defeats Arjuna in *MB*, but in *VV*, Arjuna defeats Shiva. Such is Pampa's loyalty to his king. Similarly during the fight between Bhima and Duryodhana, it is Arjuna who signals to Bhima to have a go at Duryodhana's thigh, but in *VV* it is Krishna who does the signalling. Hitting below the belt was against the rules of the fight. Violation of rules is something that

a king should not be doing. Krishna thus performs that role in *VV*. The story of a Brahmin child dying because of a penance undertaken by Sudraka, a non-dwija (non-brahmin i.e., a non twice-born) is found in both Ramayana and *MB*. It is Rama who upholds the varna system by killing the Shudra who performs penance in *MB*, whereas in *VV* it is Arjuna. This also reinforces my earlier point about the varna system.

Many such differences can be pointed out. I will, however, limit myself to the above examples. It is not that Pampa has taken only *MB* as his source for narration. He has also freely translated from other Sanskrit texts. He has taken poems from Kalidasa, Bhatta Narayana, and Bharavi and also from Bana's *Kadambari*. Pampa takes a poem out of its situation and uses it in other situations to suit his narration. For example, a poem describing Urvashi in Kalidasa's *Vikramorvasi* is translated verbatim to describe Subhadre in *VV*. Similarly the description of the usefulness of hunting in *Abhijyana Shakuntala* is used in *VV*. While translating poems from Bhatta Narayana's *Veni Samhara* he adheres to a word-to-word translation. In other places while translating, he has modified them to suit his situations. Thus he engages in all kinds of translation - what we call today re-creation, adaptation, word-to-word translation etc.

Later writers have assiduously followed Pampa, the path bearer of Old Kannada literature. Ranna, another Jaina poet of the same century but who comes after Pampa, has written *Gadhayuddham*, focusing on the final fight between Duryodhana and Bheema. In fact he has taken the storyline from Pampa's *VV* and elaborated on it. While doing so he has borrowed freely from Pampa, and it hints at the kind of borrowing that existed then not only from other languages like Sanskrit but also from old Kannada texts. It is appropriate here to keep in mind another important concept of poetics called "Kavisamaya", a stereotypical description of certain characters, moods, situations that poets easily borrow from older

poets for better communication, which indicates inter-textuality, and appeals to the readers' knowledge of those texts.

III

What appear as prominent markers that etch their stamp on the texts produced at the turn of the first millennium in the central Kannada-speaking part of today's South India are religion and polity. The analysis that has been carried out on texts such as *KRM* and *VV* of 10th century Kannada literature indicates several important issues pertaining to the movement of texts from one language to another across time and space. I would like to indicate those issues for further research here by no more than mentioning them.

Emergence of a literary tradition through textual production in a language other than Sanskrit and Prakrit is one of the main issues. Translation or inter-textuality did not appear as translation in the sense we know today - that of translation as "discovery" or translation as "opposition" to or an appropriation of a "dominant" tradition, but as that of a context of bilingualism that existed then. Then writers and the listeners/readers of that period knew both Sanskrit and Kannada. The writers of this period very well knew that the readers would know the source text, so it was not to introduce a new story to them, but a new theme to them in a different context/space²².

The issue of the king being the follower of a different faith than that of the poet is also an interesting issue that needs further research. Why the Jaina poets equated the king with the god of the Vaidic cult very easily is a question that needs to be probed further. Is it because they just wanted to praise the king and so equated him with god? Was it just the manifestation of their gratitude for the king in whose court they sought livelihood? Didn't they think that it was "wrong" to equate the king, a human being with god? Or as Pampa claims that his *VV* is not a religious text but a secular text. Did these

poets not think of it as profane at all, as their faith was different? How did they manage to toe the line both of "religion" and "polity"? Is it that the polity itself was hospitable to "other" religions? Or does it mean that there was perfect harmony between different faiths/cults during this period and only from the following century onwards we frequently get texts that depict other faiths in antagonistic terms and the violence that accompanies forced conversion?

I would say that instead of resorting to easy theorizing of the pre-colonial notion of translation as different from today's notion of translation and looking at it as just Kannada v/s Sanskrit, we need to place those texts in the socio-political space that gave rise to such texts and also look at the space that these texts were carving out during that period in the society. There is ample scope for research to be carried out in this field that would throw more light on issues such as language-community, language-culture, secular notion of running a polity, interaction between religious faith and polity etc.

NOTES

1. Such formulations can be found in Mukherjee (*Mukherjee 1981*), Devy (*Devy 2001*), Satchidanandan (*Satchidanandan 1998: 171-77*) and also by many Kannada critics such as Narayana (*Narayana 1998*), Nagabhusanaswamy (*Nagabushanaswamy 1998*) and Kurtakoti (*Kurtakoti 1994*). Elsewhere I have taken up these formulations for analyses to show the problems or holes in their arguments (*Tharakeshwar, 2002*).
2. Though I am using the word "language-cultures" to mean cultures defined on the basis of a language, I still have doubts whether the boundaries of a language and culture are coterminous. But as any notion of a culture is an abstraction based on certain identifiable traits, I use the word "language-culture" in this paper with all its problematics.

3. There are other texts in Kannada, which are also derived from *Mahabharatha* such as *Sahasa Bhima Vijayam* (Kulkarni, 1998), *Karnata Bharatha Kathamanjari* (Kuvempu & Iyengar, 1988) and *Jaimini Bharatha* (Sannaiah & Ramegowda, 1993).
4. Whether one should call these 'translations' or not is itself an issue in many writings as they "drastically" differ from the so-called 'originals'. For us any translation is a difference of the "original" text, and the "original" doesn't carry much weight apart from serving us as a reference point for comparison so as to analyze the difference of the translation.
5. This text has been analyzed by Pollock as the one that marks the birth both of "cosmopolitan vernacular" not as opposed to, but on the model of "Sanskrit Cosmopolis" in South Asia. (Pollock 1998).
6. The authorship of *KRM* was a contentious issue for quite some time. Some claimed that the author was King Nrupatunga, who was a devotee of Lord Vishnu but later might have veered towards Jainism. Some others claimed that Srivijaya, a Jaina follower, who was in the court of King Nrupatunga, wrote it. People like Fleet have suspected that a poet by the name Kavishwara might have written it. It is now accepted that the author was Srivijaya. But the authorship issue doesn't concern us much, except for his leanings towards religion.
7. As my knowledge of the Sanskrit texts in question is not adequate, I have taken up only those differences that have been identified by scholars such as Kurtakoti or as noted in their preface by the editors of the concerned text in Kannada.
8. 'Vedic' is a terminology that is found in some of these Kannada texts composed by Jaina poets. What it means is, non-Jaina and Non-Buddhist sects. Terming these various sects, as Jaina Poets/writers have done, as "Vedic" is problematic, but still at this stage I would like to persist with this category for purposes of expository clarity.
9. This is not to suggest that Jaina and Buddhist texts are not in Sanskrit. Though Buddhists preferred earlier Pali and Jains

- preferred Prakrit, they too, especially scholars of the Jaina religion, composed texts in other languages later on.
10. Hyperglossia refers to a situation of hierarchical bilingualism.
 11. For the existence of this spatial imagination in *Mahabharatha* see Pollock (*Pollock, 1988:15-16*).
 12. The editor of the revised version of this text (1931) Bellave Venkatanarayanappa says that the text was published in the year 863 of the Shalivahana calendar that corresponds to year 941 A.D. of the Christian era (*Venkatanarayanappa, 1990: xxii*)
 13. This is the first text composed by Pampa and is religious in nature.
 14. In *KRM* the order of the varnas is slightly different: first come the Vaishyas, then the Brahmins, followed by Kshatriyas and Shudras.
 15. Here it is not inappropriate to recall another text of this period, which is supposed to be the first prose text in Kannada, *Vaddaradhane* (*Narasimhachar, 1998*) of the same century. This is a collection of short stories, which aims at converting people to Jainism. Interestingly it targets only the first three varnas of the varna system viz. Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas.
 16. The destabilization (re-organization?) of the varna system is more evident in the context of the Shaiva (Veerashaiva) and Vaishnava drive to recruit Shudras or those who are outside the varna system or who have not yet become part of the varna system (as these communities might have been in their formative stages due to emergence of new occupations) in the 12th and 15th centuries respectively, than in conversions to Jainism. But occupation shifts don't seem to have taken place in spite of conversion to a new sect or adapting to a new sect.
 17. All references to page numbers chapter and poem numbers are based on the text edited by Bellave Venkatanarayanappa (1990).
 18. The words in parentheses are found in different manuscripts indicating two different versions of the text.

19. The words "Vastuka" and "Varnaka" are used as conceptual categories in Kannada literary tradition, but without exactly defining it. Various scholars have defined it in different ways, but Seetharamaiah argues that the concepts have changed their meaning over time (Seetharamaiah, 1974).
20. These kingdoms were situated in today's northern Karnataka, which the historians of the medieval period normally identify as the Deccan plateau.
21. Agamas are sacred texts that lay out the tenets of the religion.
22. This situation is something similar to the one that is pointed out by Bassnett (*Bassnett 1991*) with regard to Roman translations, in her classification of various stages of translation in Europe. There also, the translations were carried out for an audience who knew the source language well and would have read the translated text in original form. But there the Roman polity had taken firm root against that of the Greek polity. Here in South Asia we find no correspondence between language and polity. Even if there are correspondences between language and polity. Even if there are correspondences it is quite different from that of the European situation as sketched in the second part of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Bassnett, Susan. (1981) (Revised Ed. 1991) **Translation Studies: An Introduction** London & New York: Routledge.
- Devy G.N. 2000 (1999) *Translation and Literary History: An Indian Perspective* in Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, (eds.) **Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice**, London/ New York: Routledge.
- Krishna Kumar C.P. (1999a) *Prachina Sahityadalli Bashanthara: Kelavu Tippanigalu* in **Shasti Lekha**, Mysore: Chetana Book House, 121-126.

- Krishna Kumar C.P (1999b) *Ondu Padyada Eradu Anuvadagalu* in **Shasti Lekha** (Kannada), Mysore: Chetana Book House, 127-29.
- Krishna Kumar C.P (1999c) *Pampabharatha Mattu Vyasabharatha: Vastu Vinyasa* in **Shasti Lekha** (Kannada), Mysore: Chetana Book House, 130-143.
- Krishna Kumar C.P (1999d) *Pampabharatha: Vyasetara Akaragalu* in **Shasti Lekha** (Kannada), Chetana Book House, 144-148.
- Kulakarni R.V. (ed.) (1998) (First ed. 1995) **Kavichakravarthi Kaviranna Virachitam Sahasa Bhima Vijayam or Gadhayuddham**, Bangalore: Department of Kannada and Culture, Government of Karnataka.
- Kurtakoti K.D. (1992) **Bayalu-Alaya** Hampi: Prasaraṅga, Kannada University.
- Kurtakoti K.D. (1995) **Kannada Sahitya Sangati** Hampi: Prasaraṅga, Kannada University.
- Kuvempu and Masti Venkatesha Iyengar (eds.) (1988) (First ed. 1958). **Karnata Bharata Kathamanjari of Kumaravyasa**, Mysore: Prasaraṅga, University of Mysore.
- Mukherjee, Sujit. (1981) **Translation as Discovery and Other Essays**, New Delhi: Allied Publishers.
- Narasimhachar D.L. (ed.). (1998) **Shivakotyacharya Virachita Vaddaradhane**, Bangalore: Department of Kannada and Culture, Government of Karnataka.

- Narayana K.V. (1999) *Bashantharada Basheyagi Kannada* (Kannada) in **Bashantarada Samskritika Nelegalu**. Karigowda Beechanahalli (ed.), Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University.
- Pollock, Sheldon. (1998) *The Cosmopolitan Vernacular* in Journal of Asian Studies, Vol. 57, No. 1, 6-37.
- Sannaiah B.S. & Ramegowda, (eds.) 1993 **Jaimini Bharata by Lakshmisha**, Mysore: Prasaranga, University of Mysore.
- Satchidanandan K. (1995) *The State of Translation* in **Indian Literature: Positions and Propositions**, New Delhi: Pen Craft International.
- Seetharamaiah M.V. (1974) *Kavya Prabedhagalu- 1* in **Bharatiya Kavya Mimamsege Kannada Kavigala Koduge**, Mysore: Prasaranga, Mysore University.
- Seetharamaiah M.V (ed.) (1975) (rpt. 1994) **Sri Vijaya Krita Kavirajamgam**, Bangalore: B.M. Sri. Smaraka Pratishtana.
- Swamy, Nagabushana. O.L. (1999) *Prachina Mattu Madhyakalina Kannada Sahityadalli Bashanthara* in Karigowda Beechanahalli, (ed.). **Bashantarada Samskritika Nelegalu**, Hampi: Prasaranga, Kannada University.
- Tharakeshwar V.B. (2002) **Colonialism, Nationalism and the Question of English in Early Modern Kannada Literature**, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation submitted to University of Hyderabad.
- Venkatanarayanappa, Bellave. (ed.) (1990) (First ed. 1931) **Pampa Bharatam or Vikramarjuna Vijayam** Bangalore:

Department of Kannada and Culture, Government of
Karnataka.

Venkatachala Shastri, (ed.) (1900) **Pampakavi Virachitam
Adipuranam**, (rpt.) S.G. Narasimhachar (ed.), (1995)
Bangalore: Department of Kannada and Culture,
Government of Karnataka.

Venkatachala Shastri, (ed.) (1995) **Pampakavi Virachitam
Adipuranam**, S.G. Narasimhachar (ed.) Bangalore:
Department of Kannada and Culture, Government
of Karnataka.

