Translating Medieval Orissa[1]

Debendra K. Dash
Dipti R. Pattanaik

Abstract

This article is predicated on the assumption that the cultural history of a society can be constructed by examining the translated texts of the culture in question. On the face of it, this seems to be assuming too much, but in the context of medieval Orissa, this is probably both necessary and possible. This is necessary because of the paucity, and sometimes, of the contradictory nature, of historical material available on the subject to provide any coherent vision of cultural/linguistic evolution in Orissa. Since there is a definite and identifiable trajectory of translational practice in medieval Orissa, a genealogy of that practice can serve as a supplement to the available cultural historiography. Moreover, this is possible because translational practice in medieval Orissa can be translated as the index of socio-political forces in operation in the society.

While translating translational practice into indices of culture and political economy, we are aware of the very late emergence of what Daniel Simeoni (2002) calls the 'sociological eye' in Translation Studies, an epistemic displacement of attention that contextualizes translation activity rather than making a normative analysis of the same. We also hold with Simeoni that translations primarily are a fact of social praxis and a major component of social communication mirroring the ideological, argumentative or rhetorical principles with which the translators function and the tradition of construction and understanding of their nations in which they are implicated. In at least two essays on the

Translation Today Vol. 3 Nos. 1 & 2, 2006 © CIIL 2006

translation scene in Orissa (Pattanaik 2000, Dash & Pattanaik 2002), such ideological nature of the translation enterprise has been analyzed and the role of competing ideologies that are implicated in national/linguistic identity formation laid bare. The former presents a model of the ways in which translation had been used in Orissa as a tool of cultural affirmation in the past and articulates the apprehensions about surrendering those cultural gains by uncritical submission to the structures of colonial hegemony governing translational practices in the contemporary times. The second essay, which is more important in the context of the present essay, goes deeper into the analysis of the so-called cultural affirmation generated by the translational practice in medieval Orissa. It identifies four successive moments in the history of medieval Orissa: the denial of translation, subversion through translation, collusion through translation, and finally competition through translation. Various forms of hegemony trying to control the discursive site and the distribution of knowledge and power among caste and religious groups within the Orissan society were seen as the cause of those distinctive moments in the history of translational practice in medieval Orissa. The complexity of the translation scene, it was argued, was because of the complexity of the social matrix, which gave rise to those translations. The present essay seeks to test these insights by placing them against the texts actually translated (both manuscripts and published texts), and the various ideologies that were in operation in the society during that time.

If we agree with Dasgupta (Dasgupta 2000) that cognitive accountability is a condition of modernity and that translation is a necessary means through which knowledge is tested, recontextualised and submitted to critical scrutiny, then the earliest modern moment in the written discourse involving Orissa could be Sarala Das's translation/appropriation of Sanskrit texts *Mahabharata*, *Ramayana* and *Chandi Purana* in the 15th century.

With these texts, Oriya emerged as one of the dominant languages and it became a key constituent in the Oriya national identity-formation. During the following fifty years, various literary genres including prose literature were articulated in this language. The major prose texts of the period were *Rudra Sudhanidhi* by Narayana Abadhuta Swami, *Brahma Gita, Ganesha Bibhuti* and *Gyana Chudamani* by Balaram Das and *Tula Bhina* by Jagannath Das. That prose texts with such sophisticated conceptual thinking could be articulated in the Oriya language of that time is proof of the democratization of the episteme. This kind of democratization of discourse was possible because of the pressures of the Muslim presence. In order to protect their spheres of influence the Hindu ruling elite consisting of the Kshyatriya and the Brahmin castes tried to democratize some religious tenets and accommodate the subalterns in their fold. This resulted in the Bhakti cult, which in turn generated some religious diffusion and the translational process. The restrictions to the domain of knowledge and power (Dash and Pattanaik 2002) were automatically diluted and people belonging to various castes and religions participated in the production, consumption, transmission and diffusion of knowledge. The sphere of influence, and the extent of acceptance of the Oriya language was such that, even when the political formation that enabled this kind of emergence of language-based national identity collapsed after about hundred years, the language continued to unite people culturally. The resilience and accomodative capacities of Oriya enabled it to become one of the ideological formations that controlled the apparatuses of the states where the language was used.

Dash and Pattanaik (2002) discusses how the Oriya language had a rather dormant existence for around four hundred years after its emergence from Purva Magadhi. Though it was used widely in colloquial transactions and stray rock-edicts, there were not many written texts. Only after Sarala Das's translations/transcriptions (the word 'translation' has been used here

in its wider significance), voluminous written texts were produced in this language. We must remember here that Sarala's writings were in fact the cultural manifestation of a socio-political process, which sought to undermine the Brahminical/Sanskrit stranglehold over power-knowledge. The discourse generated by such a process, in its turn, brought about a reversal of social hierarchies. The knowledge, and so the power accruing from it which was hitherto under the control of the elites and the elite language Sanskrit was now under the appropriating grasp of the emerging castes and social groups. Translational praxis played a pivotal role in the process of appropriation and mutilation of earlier hegemonies and leveling down of the social playing field. In this context, the study of translational praxis as the index of socio-cultural dynamics is relevant and rewarding.

Translated Texts

Although the first translations are credited to Sarala Das, those are not translations in the sense in which we understand 'translation' today. Those are more a mutilation and reworking of the original texts (the ideological implications of such an exercise will be dealt with later). Translation, as it is understood today, began in the early sixteenth century with Balaram Das. From that time until the colonial translations (those by European missionaries, the natives and the bureaucratic variety) around hundred translated texts have been identified, out of which most are in the form of palm-leaf manuscripts. (A detailed list of the translated texts published/discovered so far is given at the end of this paper).

We must clarify here that the list given at the end is not exhaustive, since the search and discovery of fresh evidence of manuscripts is still in process. It has been prepared taking into account the evidence and information available so far in state

museums and manuscript collections in university libraries. Moreover, the dating of the manuscripts not accompanied by *puspika* (colophon) might not be accurate for several reasons. First, except for the writer-translators who were also kings, rulers, and some major writers like Balaram Das, Jagannath Das and Dhananjaya Bhanja, it has not been possible to trace the genealogy of most of the writers. Secondly, several writer-translators share the same names, which are often the names of the major writers/translators, which adds to the confusion. However, it can be claimed with certainty that all the translated texts mentioned here belong to a period before European colonization and were produced within fifty years before or after the dates mentioned against them.

Development of Translational Practice from 16th to early 19th Century

The long list of translated texts both in print and in manuscript form mentioned above proves that translational practice in medieval Orissa was an important cultural activity. Compared with the translations during this period, translational activity between 11th century (when written Oriya discourse consolidated itself) and early 15th century is almost negligible. That a literary tradition, which remained almost dormant during a four-hundred year time-span, should proliferate in such a manner during the next three hundred and fifty years indicates that a cultural upheaval of sorts had taken place in the interregnum. This cultural upheaval is related to the rise of a nascent language-based patriotism around Kapilendra Dev's consolidation of political power. While analyzing this cultural phenomenon K.C. Panigrahi (1986:289) states:

> A love for the Oriya language, literature and culture was therefore an inevitable consequence of the new ferment created by the strong and vigorous rule of Kapilesvara. Since the topmost of castes, particularly the Brahmins

> were still the devotees of Sanskrit literature and had perhaps an aversion to the spoken language and its literature, a man from the lower rung of the social ladder came forward to accept the challenge of the time. After Sarala Das all castes shook off their prejudice against Oriya Literature and conjointly contributed to its growth .

Language-based patriotism was not only consolidated by the direct intervention of a great literary genius like Sarala Das, but also by the indirect influence of the language policy adopted by the emperor Kapilendra Dev. The Ganga rulers of Orissa had so far adopted a mixed-language policy in their royal proclamations. However, Kapilendra issued proclamations only in Oriya (Sahu 1968:7). Such championing of the language by the ruling power created a base for the subsequent growth of the Oriya language, literature and nationalism. Thus, it is clear that literary/translational discourse during the medieval times is grounded on an identifiable social and political context. What follows is an analysis of this context that gave rise to the variety and volume of translated texts in medieval Orissa.

The social and political context of medieval Orissa was informed by a kind of religious eclecticism. This religious eclecticism was organized around the institution of Lord Jagannath[2] at Puri, who had almost assumed the status of the principal state deity. Various ruling dynasties irrespective of their original sectarian affinities were assimilated into the denominational polyphony represented by Lord Jagannath. For example, though the Somavanshis were Shaiva-Saktas, they tempered their sectarian edge to be accommodated into the cult of Jagannath who was principally a Vaishnav deity. Similarly, the Gangas, originally Shaiva by faith, consolidated the accommodative and tolerant practice of faith around Jagannath. By the time Kapilendra Dev came to the throne, this assimilative spirit had become so pronounced that he could

proclaim himself as Shaiva, Shakta and Vaishnava at the same time while he worshipped Lord Jagannath.

This spirit of religious assimilation could have been the basis of the Gangas' hold over power for so long and the ability of Kapilendra to build an empire. It was evident that the Gangas used their religious tolerance and language policy of issuing proclamations in three languages viz. Telugu, Sanskrit and Oriya as a tactical ploy to appease their Oriya subjects, for, outside the Oriya-speaking domains, they were neither devotees of Lord Jagannath nor staunch followers of Vaishnavism (Satyanarayana:1982). Kapilendra Dev also buttressed his empire-building enterprise with religious eclecticism and language loyalty. However, this strong language loyalty, which was an asset for Kapilendra when he organized the Oriyas for empire building, ultimately became a liability once the empire became expansive. The non-Oriya speaking areas of the empire could not be welded together culturally with the center of power. Thus, the vast empire had already been riven with internal contradictions during Kapilendra's lifetime. By the time Purushottama Dev ascended the throne, these contradictions had brought about a crisis for the state. This crisis was accentuated by a protracted economic mismanagement. Kapilendra spent the better part of his life raising an army and supporting it through the state revenue. During Purushottama's time, the state became unable to generate enough resources to maintain a huge army and administer the far-flung provinces of the empire. When Prataparudra ascended the throne, Orissa was a crumbling state. However, the central part of the empire was held together merely by religious, linguistic and cultural sentiments.

Thus, when Chaitanya came, Orissa was a failed state but a culturally vibrant linguistic unit. For the next three hundred years this phenomenon continued defying conventional logic that ascribes the cause of cultural vibrancy to the prosperity and growth of the

state. The vibrancy of the culture during that time can be discerned from the proliferation of written discourse and translational activity. However, the distribution of translated texts and creative works among the various Oriya speaking regions was uneven. This unevenness can be explained by the socio-political context that followed the fall of Gajapati kings. Most of the historians of medieval Orissa like B.C. Ray (1989) and M.A. Haque (1980) have failed to develop a coherent narrative of the context because of their inability to understand the regional dynamics within the Oriya-speaking people. The three main regions of Orissa had separate trajectories of socio-cultural growth because of the varying political–economic contexts.

At the beginning of the 16th century, the western region of Orissa was already under the control of Chauhan ruler. Their rule continued for more than four hundred years, unhindered even during the Muslim rule over the rest of Orissa. Only small parts of the region came under direct British administration after 1849. The socio-political character of western Orissa thus had a trajectory of growth different from that of the rest of Orissa. Of course the cultural affinities between the western and eastern segments established during the Somavanshi kings in the 10th century continued in some form, but the effect of the cultural upheaval after Sarala Das was not felt in these areas.[3] The difference between the spoken languages of these regions could be one of the reasons for the lack of growth of a uniform literary tradition across the various regions. The spoken language of western Orissa was derived from a different strain of Prakrit than the spoken language used in the eastern part.

Secondly, the Chauhan rulers claimed that they were of Rajput origin and had migrated from north India. They patronized Sanskrit and Hindi, which were popular in north India at the expense of Oriya. Therefore, before the 19th century we come across stray

texts like *Sashi Sena* by Pratap Ray, *Sudhasara Gita* by Chandramani Das, *Bharata Savitri* and *Kapata Pasa* by Bhima Dhibara and *Saraswata Gita* by Ratanakara Meher. *Adhyatma Ramayana* is the only translated text of the region during this pre-colonial era. Its translator Gopala Telenga was the court poet of Ajit Singh, the king of Samabalpur in the 18th century. That only one translated text was produced under the patronage of the court during all these years is proof of the apathy of the ruling establishments towards Oriya literature in general and translational practice in particular. So while discussing the development of translational activity in medieval Orissa, the western region can be conveniently put aside.

The importance of eastern/coastal Orissa in terms of the development of translation is not merely because of Sarala Das, but also because of the tradition of translation activity that followed him. The Pancha Sakhas belonged to this area and their sphere of operation was within the districts of Puri and Cuttack, which were close to the religious and administrative centers of power. Several translations of *Gitagobinda* were also undertaken in this region. With the possible exception of Jagannath Das's *Srimad Bhagabata* all these translation followed the model set up by Balaram Das with minor variations here and there. Translational activity was initiated by three texts of Balaram Das viz. *Jagamohan Ramayana*, *Bhagabad Gita*, and *Uddhab Gita*. *Bamana Purana*, another text ascribed to Balaram demonstrates translational strategies and other internal evidence, which are more common to an 18th century text. For example, an identity centered on Lord Jagannath, which was common to Balaram's text, is absent here. Moreover, the vocabulary seems to be a part of the 17th century practice influenced by Arabic and Persian languages. Thus, we encounter two models of translation in the 16th century coastal Orissa with their variants, one set up by Balaram and the other by Jagannath Das. Towards the 17th century, after this area came under direct Mughal rule, translation

activity seems to have dwindled. Mughal rulers' involvement with Orissa was confined to collecting revenue through their subedars. They neither participated in, nor contributed to, the cultural life of the people. Whatever translations we encounter in this region after the 17th century were therefore undertaken at the religious centres or the minor Gadajats or principalities under petty Oriya kings and zamindars.

The focus of translation shifted to the south after 17th century. The southern part of Orissa (from Chilika Lake onwards) had been occupied by Qutbsahi since the late 16th century. Two citations in Satyanarayana (1983) about the strategy behind the administration of Qutbsahi rulers in general and their greatest ruler Sultan Quli in particular, are worth quoting here:

> (The Qutbsahi kings) believed that it was expedient to allow a large measure of freedom to the Hindus who formed the bulk of the people subject to their rule, so that they might establish their power on firm and lasting foundations. This fact perhaps explains why they condemned the acts of intolerance perpetuated occasionally by some of their overzealous subordinates.

Further,

> Of all the Muslim dynasties that ruled India, the Qutbsahi of Golconda was the most enlightened. True, they plundered and destroyed Hindu Temples in the enemy's territory during the course of invasions, but within their own dominions the Hindus enjoyed a measure of religious freedom, not known in other Muslim kingdoms (516).

Because of the measure of freedom granted, and the influence of enlightenment, the chieftains of southern Orissa under Qutbsahi during 17th century, pursued a policy of patronizing the written discourse both in Sanskrit and in Oriya. This cultural practice continued in south Orissa even when it came under the Nizams of Hyderabad in the third decade of the 18th century and under the British colonial administration in the seventh decade of the same century. The cultural autonomy prevalent in this area was so resilient that it remained unaffected until the last decade of the 19th century despite various changes in the political domain and administrative set-up. This relative autonomy and a stable steady cultural atmosphere proved extremely fertile for translation activity. Translation of almost three-fourth of the texts mentioned earlier had been undertaken in this area during the three hundred years.

> In order to have an idea of the strategies and methods of translation obtaining in medieval times a detailed analysis of the major translated texts is called for.

Methods of Translation

Translational practice in Oriya did not have any authoritative methodological guidelines to fall back upon. The aestheticians of Sanskrit, the dominant language, were for the most part silent about the nature and mode of this genre. In an earlier essay (Dash & Pattanik 2002), we have hinted how Anandabardhana came close to the concept of translation/influence as we understand it today, in his explication of the idea of "sambada" or dialogue. The idea of dialogue implies a democratic exchange, within a particular language or between two languages, in a spirit of epistemic cooperation. However, the earliest works of translation in Oriya done by Sarala Das were born out of a contest between two antagonistic social forces trying to control the epistemological field.

Translation in Sarala's hands, therefore, was a tool of subversion not only of the text in question but also of the ideological structure represented by the texts and the social forces that were controlling them. Sarala ostensibly was not in favour of the Brahminic ideology that informed texts like *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana*. A lot of violence and mutilation has therefore accompanied his rendering of these texts into Oriya. Translation is more of a reshaping and reworking within a broad narrative framework, which is also an uncanny reflection of the redistribution of power among various social groups in the society of those times.

This dynamics of social processes and translational methodology seems to have continued in subsequent phases of translation giving rise to a methodological tradition, which is in essence an instinctive apprehension of the shifting social perspective. What follows is an analysis of that phenomenon by looking at a few representative translations across the ages. We must clarify here that the texts or passages from them have not been chosen at random because they also represent a pattern, a pattern of emergence from the various aesthetic practices in the dominant language Sanskrit and their assimilative appropriation into the practices of translation in the target language Oriya.

The Sanskrit aesthetic/scriptural practice of elucidation/interpretation had been dominated for a long time by the pronouncements of Jaimini, Kumarila, and Mallinath. According to Jaimini the three major axioms of interpretation are the autonomy of verbal meaning, its impersonality and the unity of meaning (Chari 1993:163). This formulation virtually closed the scope of translational practice, because any translation is bound to violate the autonomy and unity of a verbal structure. However, the scope of exegetical discussion was not fully closed down. Moreover, Mallinath claims explicitly at the outset of his commentaries on

Kalidasa's poetic works that "all this is being commented upon by me only by way of explicating the meaning of the text, I say nothing that is not in the text and not warranted by it" (trans. Chari 1993:193). He proceeds to find new significance in Kalidasa's text. This practice automatically opens up possibilities of reconstructing an alternative discourse and proliferation of exegeses. What happened on the Oriya translation scene is the exploitation of the scope of such exegetical proliferation albeit in a different language. Translators from Balaram onwards have internalized the traditional Sanskritic scriptural/philosophic practice in order to turn them against their own grain and have violated the so-called verbal autonomy of the original texts in Sanskrit. The borderline between tika ('commentary') and bhasya ('interpretation' with renderings of fresh significance) were often blurred when these were amalgamated into translational practice.

There was another parallel practice in Sanskrit, viz. that of retelling the same narrative from the point of view of a specific cult, which might have been appropriated as a method of translation in Oriya. For example, the story of Rama has been reshaped repeatedly from the perspectives of Jaina theology and epistemology, the practices of Vaishnava and Shakta cults. Jaina *Ramayanas, Adhythma Ramayana* and *Adbhuta Ramayana* stand testimony to this practice. When Sarala, Balaram, Achyuta and others have translated the text of *Ramayana*, they have done it from the perspectives of their own cult affiliations and ideological beliefs. While dealing with the development of translational practice in Oriya, we have to negotiate with this complex cultural inheritance.

The problematic nature of such complex inheritance can be discerned in Balaram Das's translation, *Jagamohan Ramayana*, the first text we have chosen for a detailed analysis. Balaram's cult-affinity is transparent from the very beginning of the text, whose first eighty couplets are eulogies not of Rama, the chief protagonist

of Valmiki's epic, but of Lord Jagannath, the presiding deity of Orissan kingdom and the then Vaishnav cult. For him Rama is important because he is the seventh incarnation of Lord Jaganath. His proposal to write about Valmiki's Rama is a surrogate activity to the real act of paying obeisance to his original inspiration, Lord Jagannath. Translation here is a religious activity, which leads to salvation.

There are also other ideological reasons behind the drastic difference between the beginning in Valmiki's text and that of Balaram Das's text. Balaram has dropped the first four chapters of Valmiki's epic, because Rama, according to him, is not merely the 'ideal man' (Purushottama) as conceived by Valmiki, but is the very embodiment of the Divine on earth. Moreover, while the story of *Ramayana* is, for Valmiki, a lived history, for Balaram, it is part of sacred mythology.

However, after reformulating the symbolic significance of Rama, Balaram proceeds to follow Valmiki's narrative closely with minor variations in detail. Of the three readings available on the original text his reading of Valmiki is based on the 'northern Indian reading'(Sahoo 2000:93-94). Valmiki's story of Rama and his ancestors begins from the fifth canto of the first book *Adi Kanda* and Balaram starts the same story from couplet no. 190. Balaram thereafter describes Ayodhya with minor changes in Valmiki's depiction of the locale (for a detailed comparison between Valmiki's text and Jagamohan Ramayana, See Sahoo 2000).

Overall, while retaining the main storyline, the broad division of books etc we see that Balaram has adopted various methods in his translation of *Ramayana* at different points including literal translation, the expansion of theme, excision of a few details, amalgamation of ideas and stories from other canonical texts like

Gita Gobinda and *Adhyatma Ramayana*. At least one difference between Valmiki's text and Balaram's which needs an elaborate analysis for purposes of this essay is the fact that Balaram's text is extremely indulgent while describing the sensuous details. For example in the tale of Rusyasringa, Balaram inserts eighty-five couplets to describe the history of his birth, which are not found in Valmiki. These eighty-five couplets are replete with erotic descriptions following the ornate Sanskrit poetry tradition. The echo of Sarala's grotesque imagination can also be heard when Rusyasringa is half-man and half-deer with horns on his head. Balaram's translation is ultimately a delicate balance between the erotic and the devotional, between the elite tradition of Sanskrit and subaltern Oriya ethos and between translation as subversion and translation as dissemination.

Srimad Bhagabad Gita, which belongs to the later phase of Balaram's literary career, is a continuation of that delicate balance and also an advance upon it. It is an advance in the sense that this is for the first time that a sacred philosophical text of very great importance incorporating the essence of Brahminic ideology is being rendered in the Oriya language. Because of the philosophically intricate nature of its discourse, which is not easily accessible to non-Brahminic castes, Sarala had refrained from incorporating this text, although it is commonly perceived as a part of the "Bhisma Parva" of the Sanskrit *Mahabharata.* For, Balaram too, the knowledge of *Gita* is "Brahma Gyana" meant exclusively for the Brahmins.However, with the advent of another order of knowledge dominated by Bhakti, or love in which the caste-hierarchies are leveled down by the extent of one's devotion, the knowledge of *Gita* becomes accessible to the real devotees irrespective of their castes. This ideology of devotion is a justification for a Sudra like Balaram, not only to access this privileged knowledge, but to disseminate it among the devotees of Lord Jagannath, one of whose incarnations Krishna the original preacher of *Gita* was. In order to provide this

justification of translation of the *Gita*, Balaram adds a postscript titled *"Gitabakasha"* to his translation of the original Sanskrit text. In the postscript, he also claims, with the blessings of Lord Jagannath, the originator of all knowledge, to have surpassed the genius of Vyasa, the first codifier of the divine speech. Along with the postscript, he has also added an introductory portion in the first chapter before coming to the actual translation of the text. However, the translation can be said to be literal in nature.The key concepts have been simplified for the Oriya audience and ethical and moral inflection has been added here and there. Thus, one can discern a simplification and a moral and ethical dilution of the philosophical rigor of the text during the translation process. Moreover, the *sambada* (dialogue) form of the original Sanskrit has been changed into Bhakti ritual in which the devotee has invoked the godhead by his question (*pidhabandha*) and the answer of the divine teacher has been given in the *Gitabandha.* The rhyme of the original was uniform but in the translation, several rhyme schemes have been used for various chapters. Despite its limitations as a translated text, including its dilution of the philosophical rigor of the original, this is a radical step forward in introducing abstract thought to the Oriya language through translational practice.

The articulation of abstract thought in the Oriya language was further tested in the translation of *Srimad Bhagabata* (especially in the eleventh book), which is both a philosophical and a devotional text. Subsequently because of its wide acceptance among the Oriya people, the translation of *Bhagabata* succeeded in institutionalizing abstract thinking in the hitherto Prakrit-oriented Oriya language. The parallels and variations between the original and the translated version of *Srimad Bhagabata*, have been elaborately dealt with by a number of scholars like Gopinath Nada Sharma, Ketaki Nayak, Krushan Chandra Sahoo, Bansihar Mohanty and Bansidhar Sarangi as Oriya *Bhagabata* by Jagannath Das is a central text of the Oriya

literary and theological canon. These scholars, however, have not identified the translational strategies adopted by Jagannath Das, the first Brahmin among the early translators in the Oriya language. Probably because of his caste affiliation, Jagannath Das demonstrates fidelity to the essence of the original, hitherto not seen in the earlier translations. In a manner of speaking, he was trying to replicate the Brahminic ideology within the broader spectrum of the Bhakti cult, as is evident from his repeated assertion of Brahmin identity. Moreover, the translation is directed by the commentary on *Bhagabata* by Sridhara Swami, a great Sanskrit scholar. The text of Jagannath has become at the same time, a translation, an explication and a commentary. While Balalram's translation tended to omit abstract philosophical concepts due to the unavailability of parallel terms in Oriya, Jagannath Das naturalized those Sanskrit terms in Oriya language. This translation transformed Oriya language into a meta-language parallel to Sanskrit, which was also a meta-language with a pan-Indian acceptance. Subsequently, the written literature in Oriya language tended to minimize the use of colloquial expressions resulting in a stagnation of the standard Oriya language and can be seen in the Oriya ornate poetry tradition. Another translational practice followed by Jagannath Das is the juxtaposition of the original Sanskrit verses with the Oriya rendering as has been done in the eleventh book of *Bhagabata*. It is well known that the eleventh book contains the most abstract philosophical ideas in the whole *Purana*. It seems as if Jagannath Das is apprehensive that the target language is not competent enough to internalize those dense philosophical formulations. Therefore, Jagannath Das on the one hand accepts the superior status of Sanskrit and is apologetic about the people's language, and on the other uses the people's language as a parallel to and alternative to the original language Sanskrit. This complex practice became one of the norms for subsequent translations into Oriya.[4]

The extent of abstraction to which Jagannath Das had moulded the Oriya language can be gauged from a subsequent text titled *Siba Swarodaya* by Jasobanta Das, one among the so-called Panchasakhas.[5] *Siba-swarodaya* is a translation of the Sanskrit text *Swarodaya Lesa.* The original text is divided into twenty-one small chapters. Jasobanta Das transformed the entire text into one single continuous discourse having four hundred and seventy three couplets. He justifies the undertaking of the task of retelling the text in Oriya on the ground that the wisdom codified in the text is actually meant for the people. Had it not been meant for the people, it would not have been articulated at all. Once it has been articulated, it should be transmitted into the language, which the common people can easily access. He does not therefore call it translation, but a manifestation, *Prakash*, coming out of some thing, which is latent. However, if the original Sanskrit text and the derivative Oriya text are compared, one can easily sense the closeness of the translated text to the original, a rendering of simple and lucid Sanskrit into standardised Oriya, which had started taking after Sanskrit, after Jagannath Das's *Bhagabata.*

Jayadeva's *Gita Gobinda*, which has been translated more than twenty times during this period alone, is the central text for an analytical understanding of the evolution and standardization of translational practice in Orissa. The popularity of this text can be gauged from the number of imitations it had spawned in Sanskrit within Orissa's geographical space. The lilting rhythm, the erotic theme and the epic structure, all contributed to its enormous popularity among various sections of the audience ranging from the common people to the royal courts. After Chaitanya adopted and eulogized this, it became the canonical text of the Vaishnav sect, which followed Chaitainya's teachings.

Among the translations available, Trilochan Das's *Gobindagita* is the earliest. By caste, Trilochan was a barber, a backward caste in the caste hierarchy, which normally had no access to the Sanskrit language. According to K.C. Sahoo, Trilochan was a translator belonging to the late 16th century (1981: 53), but there are a number of references in *Manibandha Gita* and *Kabikalpa Tika* by Achyutananda Das to this text and its author. Das's translational intervention was revolutionary in many ways. First, he conceives the text as being multi-layered in significance. For him, while the outer erotic surface is meant for the plebeian reader, the inner subtext of the core is metaphysical. Radha and Krishna, the amorous protagonists of the source text, become the 'Jiva' ('the essential created being'') and 'Parama' ('the supreme absolute') in the translated one. Therefore, we see a simultaneous literal rendering along with a kind of inverted Bhasya, which instead of simplifying the complex, transforms the ordinary into an abstract metaphysical discourse. This construction of a metaphysical discourse around *Geeta Gobinda* through translational practice unalterably afforded a secular text a spiritual significance and set the trend for all subsequent translations of the text. Though many subsequent translations confined themselves to the rendering of only the erotic outer surface, in the popular perception, this continued to be a sacred text. Moreover, this is the earliest instance of an 'iconic' translation (as characterised by Ramanujan). Ironically the translational strategy adopted by Das saves it from degenerating into pornography, the inevitable risk a translation runs when such a text is mediated in a people's language.

The next important translation of *Geeta Govinda* is Brindabana Das's *Rasabaridhi*. The title he chooses for his text is drawn from the Vaishnav aesthetics where Krishna is the embodiment of all the aesthetic pleasures. Any aesthetic enterprise having Krishna at its center is therefore full of 'rasa', the essence of aesthetic enjoyment. He calls his translation 'Rasabaridhi', which

literally means a 'sea of rasa' while the original title would mean 'a song for Krishna'. Here we see the predominance of Vaishnavite ideology in the Orissan society of the times. However, while Artaballav Mohanty (1973) claims that this is an early 15th century text, the later historians place it in the mid-16th century (Sahoo: 1981, Mishra: 1976). Its importance lies in the fact that this is probably the first translated text in Oriya, which mutes the revelatory nature of all creative enterprise. Although they were conscious of the authors of the source texts, earlier translators claimed a divine inspiration, or a revelation as the main motivating factor behind their attempt at mediating knowledge/wisdom in a Prakrit language. Brindavan Das is however courageous enough to ascribe the text to its human author, Jayadeva, and not to any metaphysical source, which is the repository of all knowledge. He explicitly owns up the "iconic" nature of his translational practice, despite adopting the age-old practice of the reconstruction of the text according to his own ideological predilections. He has even changed the title of the text and reworked its introductory portion. Moreover, he has succeeded in fashioning the rather expansive Oriya language, into some sort of pithy brevity, which matches Jayadeva's Sanskrit. Jagannath Das's linguistic model of a standard Oriya being populated heavily by Sanskrit diction seems to be followed by Brundavana Das with minor throwbacks to a few archaic native words and expressions.

Jagannath Mishra's *Geeta Govinda* is the first prose rendering in Oriya, in the form of 'tika' or commentary. Earlier most of the translations were only in verse form. Jagannath Mishra's prose rendering not only flattens the lilting musical quality of the original text, but it also uncovers the veil of sacredness imposed on it by the Vaisnav cult. It is instructive to remember here that Jagannath was a Brahmin by caste and had profound command over Sanskrit as is evident from the Sanskrit slokas he has composed as

an introduction to his translation. In deference to the rituals of Smarta Brahmins, he pays his obeisance to five sacred deities before embarking upon translational activity and the slokas begin with a prayer not to Krishna, but to Ganesha the auspicious hurdle-removing deity invoked at the beginnings of events. Like Jagannath Das who used both Vyasa's text and Sridhar Swami's commentary in his translation of *Bhagabata*, Mishra writes his Sanskrit commentary to Jayadeva's text and translates the text along with its commentary into Oriya. It is simultaneously a critical elucidatory and translated text, demonstrating Jagannath Mishra's scholarship and ability to use the genre of Oriya prose at a time when it was in a nascent form. This was completed on 6 August 1598 but could be cited as a precursor to standard modern translational practice anywhere in the world.

It is obvious that Mishra's work was not meant for a common audience. However, Dharnidhara Das's translation, produced around the same time, became extremely popular because of its musical quality, and because of the absence of intellectual pretensions. That it was the earliest printed text in Oriya is a proof of its continuing popularity. Though it is a classic example of the iconic translation, the translator claims that it is actually a commentary upon the Sanskrit original. It is significant that this text exemplifies the stabilization of the process of commentary as translational practice in Oriya language. The traditional desire of an Oriya translator to elevate, excise or expand the text, however, can be discerned at places in Dharanidhara's attempt, despite the iconic nature of his translation. For example, the first canto has been divided into three, while the seventh and eleventh have been divided into two each. This has been done often to maintain continuity or to mark a thematic wholeness.

After such texts like Dharanidhara's, it would be natural to expect that the entire translational practice in Orissa would settle

down to iconic translational practice that evolved during such a long period or would try to bridge the gaps, wherever they are, in such a method. Nevertheless, in practice, translational activity in Oriya continues to be a heterogeneous practice even hundred years after Dharanidhara's *Geeta Govinda Tika*. Bajari Das's *Artha Govinda* is an example of such heterogeneity, in which the translator seems to revert to the methods of the earliest translations. *Artha Govinda* was completed on 28 February, in the year 1673. His avowed claim in the text is to locate the meaning of the original more than its structure or rhythm. Therefore, the twelve cantos of Jayadeva's *Geeta Govinda* have been expanded into twenty-seven chapters in Bajari's translation, which adopts a single meter throughout the text. The secular and literary identity that this text had assumed in the hands of Jagannath Mishra and Daranidhara Das has been recast in a sacred mould, probably owing to Bajari's Vaishnav allegiance. Probably the religious and cult allegiance is more responsible for this translation than any other commitment. For, the translator reveals Bajari's inadequate command over the source language, which has resulted in misinterpretation in several places. Moreover, Bajari has taken recourse to archaic expression in Oriya while his previous translators had already put the language to sophisticated use. His translation is an example of how commitments other than literary can spawn translations, which misrepresent the intentions of the source text.

Haribansha by Achyutananda is a composite translation of several source texts in Sanskrit woven around the life of Krishna. The original *Haribansh.*consisting of three parvas viz. "Haribansha", "Bishnu", "Bhabisyata" is an appendix to Vyasa's Mahabharata and belongs to the genre of 'upapuranas' in Sanskrit. However, Achyutananda expands the text in a manner in which it assumes the shape of a Purana by amalgamating material culled from *Bhagabata*, Book X and Sarala's *Mahabharata* etc. Achyutananda's text is

divided into seven parts and is quite different from its Sanskrit original, even if we completely excise the Mahatmya portion. According to Natabara Satapathy (1990), the Oriya work excels more in its aesthetic quality, psychological insight, and coherence of structure than in its religious significance. Although the subversive edge of Sarala Das's Mahabharata is missing, like Sarala Das's *Mahabharata,* it is a restructuring of the original, catering to contemporary literary tastes in the name of translation.

Lanka Ramayana[6] by Siddheswar Das inaugurates another translational practice by choosing a part of the source text, *Adbhuta Ramayana,* which practice corresponds to his own belief system. Since the source text is a shakta one, it totally undermines the original *Ramayana* by Valmiki and valorizes the female protagonist Sita as the real slayer of the evil forces in the place of Rama. The novelty of such a formulation is quite attractive for the translator, which according to Grierson (1904), "is a comparative modern work","distinctly Shakta in character". But the subversive dimension is too combustible for the Oriya audience of those times. So Siddheswar begins the text from the seventeenth chapter of the source text and changes the ending in such a manner that it becomes a delicate balance between tradition and novelty, the Vaishnav and Shakta strains and the original *Ramayana* and *Adbhuta Ramayana*. The elements of other translational practices like excising, expansion are also present in this text. More than theological and literary intentions, the novelty of the story seems to be the main source of inspiration for this translation.

Ichhabati by Dhananjaya Bhanja is a purely imaginative literary text of the later part of the eleventh century, which incorporates the translation of two independent Sanskrit texts i.e. *Chaura Panchasika* by Bilhana and *Purva Panchasika* by an anonymous writer. Bhanja, a king of Ghumusara reworked the original literary creation of Banamali Das and then fused the iconic

translation of the said text with a reworked *Chata Ichhabati* by Banamali Das while the sixth and seventh cantos are the translation of *Purva Panchasika*. The eighth, ninth and tenth cantos are the translations of Bilhana's text. Minor adjustments have been made in the translation to adapt them to the original storyline. This is not only novel as a translational practice, but also attracts attention for being the first translation in Oriya of a purely secular text, unlike *Geeta Gobinda* which was more open to religious interpretation. Though Jagannath Das's *Bhagabata* was extremely popular among the public and set the trend for future translations in Oriya, the scholarly segment of the society frowned upon some of its translational strategies. In the 18th century, he produced his own translation, generally referred to as *Khadanga Bhagabata*, which was more faithful to the Sanskrit original. In order to counter the enormous prestige of Das's *Bhagabata*, and gain legitimacy for his own, he demonstrated his ability as a Sanskrit scholar early in his enterprise. In the subsequent chapters too, he incorporated Sanskrit epigrams summarizing the theme, which underlined his scholarship. Nevertheless, sometimes this scholarship became a hindrance to the easy flow and naturalness of expression despite his adoption of Das's innovative metrical form and the standardized Oriya language. His ideological compulsions and social location might have been responsible for such a scholarly attitude that came in the way of popular appeal. For example, he belonged to the Gaudia Vaishnav sect, which disapproved of Das's *Bhagabata.* Moreover, his status as a poet attached to the royal court made it contingent upon him to wear the scholarly garb. Valmiki's popular tale of Rama spawned various kinds of literary expressions in India, including translations into various regional languages, subversive texts in Sanskrit and their translations and so on. One major Oriya text on Rama in the ornate poetry tradition was *Baidehisha Bilasha* by Upendra Bhanja. In order to match the skills employed in the said text, Banamali Patnaik translated Bhaojaraja Suri and Laxmana Suri's text

Ramayana Champu that also belonged to the ornate Sanskrit poetic tradition. However, Patnaik's text *Suchitra Ramayana* written in 1754 abandons the style of the original, which combines both the prose and verse forms and the entire text, and is written in verse. He admits that though the theme he has undertaken is sacred, he is more attracted by the poetic skills employed in the original. In order to sharpen the poetic skill, that is part of the ornate tradition and to heighten the emotional content or rasa, he has deviated from the original at a few places. His text can be characterized as an iconic translation in which his faithfulness to the original sometimes causes artificiality of expression.

The last text taken up for consideration is the *Gita* by Krishna Singh, the king of Dharakot belonging to the latter half of the 18th century and the translator of the more popular *Mahabharata* and *Haribandha*. Like Dinabandhu Mishra he has tried to follow the original faithfully. In the introductory verses, he establishes his identity as a devotee of Jagannath, as done in his other translations like *Mahabharata*. However, unlike in the *Mahabharata*, he has faltered at places while interpreting the subtle nuances of the abstract philosophical formulations of the original *Srimad Bhagabata Gita*. Krishna Singh's translations are an example of the limitations of iconic translations of philosophical texts into the Oriya language.

This brief analysis of some representative texts belonging to a period spanning three hundred years, from the early 16th century to early 19th century, reveals a heterogeneous field in which various translational and interpretative practices coalesced. Barring a few texts towards the end of the period, most of the texts demonstrate the simultaneous presence of multiple strategies current at the time. However, most of the works do not designate themselves as 'translations' but as 'revelations'. By expressing their obeisance to some super human creative agency, they not only legitimize their creation/translation but also problematize the whole question of the

claims of authorship and ownership of texts. A deeper ideological analysis is called for to map the contours of the problematic field in question.

Section V: Texts and Ideologies

"The king of spirits said, 'there have been as many Ramas as there are rings on this platter. When you return to earth, you will not find Rama. This incarnation of Rama is now over. Whenever an incarnation of Rama is about to be over, his ring falls down. I collect them and keep them. Now you can go.' So Hanuman left."

This is how the story cited in Ramanujan's essay "Three Hundred *Ramayanas*: Five Examples and Three Thoughts on Translation" ends. The story narrates how one day Rama's ring fell off, made a hole on the ground and vanished into the nether world. Asked to go in search of the ring, Hanuman arrived there and met the king of spirits. As the king of spirits was asking him to choose Rama's ring from amongst a bunch of identical rings, the time of that particular *Ramayana* was over. Then the king explained to Hanuman that since that particular *Ramayana* was over, by the time he returned, Rama would be gone. In addition, there are numerous Ramas as there are several *Ramayanas*. This story signifies the existence of multiple discourses around a single theme in the Indian mythological and epistemological tradition. This multiplicity of discourses not only challenges the contemporary notions of authorship and ownership of texts but also counters the traditional perception of classical Indian episteme as being conservative, stifling any kind of growth. There are at least four distinct literary traditions around the myth of Rama. The central tradition around Valmiki's text is apparently conservative with liberal strains here and there. Rama the protagonist is represented in this tradition, not as the ultimate Godhead but as the best among humans. The example

of the Brahminical discourse around Rama can be gleaned from such texts as *Yogabasistha Ramayana* or *Adhyathma Ramayana*. Rama is represented here either as "all knowledge" or as "divine incarnation" depending on the philosophical or spiritual thrust of the composition. The subversive treatises like *Adbhuta Ramayana* and Bimal Suri's *Pauma Chariya* belong to the third type of discourse. While the former represents sectarian or cult allegiance, the latter is heterodox in nature. In subversive texts, the character of Rama is subordinate to other higher forces like Shakti in the character of Sita or Ravana, the evil character in other traditional texts. Apart from these three, there are various kinds of recycling of the Ramayana tale in folk traditions. This multiplicity of representations performs several functions like spiritual and intellectual heightening, subversion or popularization of the 'original' text within a given episteme. Thus, it can be clearly seen that the domain of the original text was never authoritarian in the Indian translation tradition. This denial of the authority of the original or authorship is not only true of the Rama myth but of the entire tradition of Indian philosophy and its ideological underpinnings. Although narratives like those of Dr.S.Radhakrishnan have tried to create an impression that Indian philosophy is idealistic by concentrating on its orthodox traditions, later historians like S.N.Dasgupta and D.P.Chattopadhyaya give equal importance to all the four major philosophical strands i.e. the Vedas, post-Vedic systems, heterodox systems like Jainism and Buddhism and the Lokayata schools, including popular traditions. They counter the notion that the Vedic and post-Vedic knowledge under Brahmin hegemony constitute the only Indian method of philosophical discourse. The knowledge under the Brahmin hegemony is primarily metaphysical and exclusionary. It excludes the common people and their material location. They turn to the heterodox systems and popular experience across generations for a coherent worldview. Both the orthodox systems under Brahmin hegemony and the heterodox and Lokayata systems of popular participation have together given rise to complex textual practices in

ancient and medieval India. The 'grand' narratives were in perpetual tussle with the 'little' narratives.

The textual practices developed in India can be divided into three parts, i.e. the orthodox Brahminic (Sanskrit), the heterodox (subversive) and the folk (subaltern). The orthodox practice encouraged imitative and interpretative texts while the heterodox tradition gave rise to texts that subverted the hegemonic Sanskrit texts. It would be fruitful to invoke the Jaina Anekantabada in this context. According to Ramakrishna Rao:

> It (Jaina Anekantabada) is what might be called a view of reality as being pluralistic, many-sided or expressing itself in multiple forms. The result is that no absolute predication of reality is valid. Whatever we assert about reality must be probable or relative (Ramakrishna Rao 1975:94).

This relativistic and pluralistic notion about reality gave rise to a tentative attitude to texts. The Brahiminical concept of an absolute text was challenged by this notion and paved the way for subsequent subversion of textual practices. The folk discourse balanced the orthodox and heterodox elements in an unsystematic manner. All these textual categories were not very conducive for iconic translations. In other words the contemporary notion of translation was not prevalent in ancient or medieval India. (See also Dash and Pattanaik 2002). Though translation qua translation was not available, there were many retellings of the puranas in ancient and medieval India. The writing of *purana*s and *upapurana*s and their many retellings were due to a complex intellectual inheritance of this genre. Though *purana*s were written in the Sanskrit language by the Brahmin class, a design to disseminate knowledge among the common people was implicated within it. Knowledge was orthodox

metaphysics, but folk and heterodox narrative elements were amalgamated into its structure. Though *Ramayana* was initially a kavya and Mahabharata was an itihas (history) they came to the popular imagination in the form of puranas. This composite nature of *purana*s resulted in its many retellings. After the modern Indian languages evolved, these *purana*s came to be recreated in those languages, retaining their complex intellectual inheritance. The complexity of the field deepened further when various Bhakti cults/sects proliferated in response to the teachings of Ramananda, Kabir, Alwars and others during medieval times. The earlier Shaiva/Shakti cults had substantially transformed the character of the dominant Vaishnav *purana*s according to their own ideologies. Now the theological formulations of the saints were also incorporated into the discourse. Thus towards the later part of medieval times Indian society and the cultural practices therein had become truly composite.

In Orissa, however, the socio-cultural spectrum had been a composite phenomenon for a long time. Here the aboriginal and *lokayata* elements were in close proximity with the heterodox systems and had assumed a dominant position. The *lokayata* icons like the goddesses and Shaiva deities were worshipped along with Lord Jagannath the presiding deity, who was claimed by all the belief systems i.e. by the Sabara, Jaina, Buddhist and Vaishnav (=Brahmin) faiths. Brahminisation, which began towards the 10th century AD, continued till early 15th century during Somavanshi and Ganga dynasties. Brahmins captured the cultural-political space and assumed a hegemonic position during this period. The multi-cultural character of Lord Jagannath was repressed under Brahmin suzerainty. Lord Jagannath was reduced to a monocultural Vaishnav deity. Only in the 15th century, with the advent of Kapilendra Dev as the king of Orissa, the multi-cultural character of Lord Jagannath was restored. Hitherto marginalized forces and belief-systems again aspired for ascendancy during Kapilendra's rule and Kapilendra

allowed equal space for all of them in the power-spectrum as is evident from the Srisailam record:

> Kapilendra, in his Srisailam record called himself Purana Vaishnav, Purana Maheswar and Durgaputra. Thus, he was a Vaishnavite, a Saivite and a Shaktaite at the same time (Satyanarayan 1983).

Sarala's *Mahabharata* and other writings, which were produced during Kapilendra's rule, demonstrate the composite nature of the cultural and religious affiliation. Jaina and folk elements jostle to find expression within the predominantly Brahminical text, resulting ultimately in the subversion of Brahmin ideology. This cultural diversity had to face a challenge again from Islam during the 15th century. A major part of Orissa came under direct Muslim control in the second half of the 16th century. However, indirect influences of Islamic culture had already been felt in the earlier centuries because several parts of India had come under Muslim administrative control before the end of the 14th century itself. Before the Muslims came on the Indian scene, the role of the Indian states in the cultural life of the people had been minimal. The royal administration confined itself to maintaining a standing army, and collecting revenue for the upkeep of the same. In matters of ethics and morality, adjudication of the rule of the law etc. people enjoyed a lot of autonomy. Only during transitional phases between the decline of one dynasty and the rise of another, there was disruption in this kind of autonomy. Since the rulers and the people belonged to contiguous faiths and religious practices under the broad rubric of Indian composite culture, there was a common ritualistic bond between the people and the state. This weakened with the establishment of Muslim domination. The hitherto dominant Brahmincal ideology received a severe setback due to such a weakening. The subaltern heterodox voices, which were recessive during the Brahmin hegemony, became more audible.

The articulation of heterodox voices resulted in various new cultural phenomena. Several historians like Tara Chand (1976) and Satyaranarayan (1983) have analyzed the impact of Muslim presence in India and the resultant cultural practices. The Muslim presence according to Tara Chand had a bipolar character. As a religion and system of faith, Islam was monotheistic, and in its earlier phase it had a democratic organization not admitting any kind of hierarchy like caste, common to Brahminic practices. However, by the time it entered north India as the religion of the conquerors, its democratic character had been diluted and the fraternal impulse had given way to the logic of conquest. Thus, we witness two faces of Islam in India between 12th and 15th centuries – one preaching universal brotherhood and equality before religion and the other practicing the marauding rule of the sword and the silencing of dissent by extermination. That is precisely the reason why the character of Islam in the south where it was not primarily a religion of the conquistadors, is vastly different from that of the north. However, towards the last part of the 15th century the character of Islam even in the north underwent a change. Political compulsions fragmented the bonding within Islam itself. Now various groups professing Islam were struggling for power in the north and to a lesser extent in the south. There were victors and victims within the people professing the same religion and trying to retain their hold over power and subjects too. A new cultural practice of religious tolerance emerged because of these political compromises. The hitherto antagonistic religions began to accommodate each other at the ideological level. While some people professing Islam participated in the Hindu rituals, there were attempts at modification of Hindu religious practices according to Islamic tenets. The Satya-pira worship and the spread of the Bhakti cult are the results of such ideological accommodation. Because of its vantage geographical location, Orissa was privy to the accommodative ideological shifts taking place in both the north and the south. We have mentioned earlier that until the 15th century, the indirect influence of Islam was

felt in Orissa because its political contact was mainly with the south, and it was more or less a benevolent kind of Islam, as practiced in the south. By the time Orissa came under the direct Muslim rule of the powers of the north, it was again the influence of tolerant Islam, which encouraged heterogeneity. Thus, throughout Orissan history, there was an ambience of peaceful existence between the two religions. Therefore, the incidence of forcible conversion, seen in northern India, was rare in Orissa. Concurrently Brahminical Hinduism, which was more orthodox elsewhere, resulting in mass conversion like in Bengal and parts of Kerala, was less so in Orissa, accommodating subaltern groups within the Hindu fold. This fertile field of religious tolerance and accommodation both by the Islamic groups and Brahminical orthodoxy could be one of the reasons of Chaitanya's phenomenal success in Orissa compared with his native Bengal. The other reason of Chaitanya's acceptance in Orissa was the political disempowerment of the Gajapati Kings after Purushottam Deb (Sahoo 1968: 7).

Chaitanya's advent had a profound bearing on the ideology of translation in Orissa. However, the full significance of the role played by Chaitanya on the translation scene cannot be realized without having a glance as well at the relationship between political power and the languages implicated in the translational practice. It is common knowledge that written languages are intimately connected with structures of political power and are important sites of ideological struggle. With the rise of Muslim rulers to seats of political power in India, it is natural to expect that Persian or Arabic would assume the hegemonic position replacing Sanskrit. Nevertheless, because of the peculiar power equation in operation during that time, Sanskrit did not face a direct confrontation with Arabic or Persian. First, the Kshyatriya chieftains, who opposed the Muslim rulers militarily, were merely patrons of Sanskrit. They didn't know or identify with the language. The Brahmins who

identified with or in a manner of speaking, 'possessed' the language were prepared to shift their allegiance to the new power-establishments. The Muslim rulers also reciprocated by avoiding confrontation with the Brahmin caste and patronizing Sanskrit language for their own legitimacy. Thus, a complex relationship between Sanskrit on the one hand and Persian and Arabic on the other grew during medieval times. Shervani characterizes this relationship as non-existence of confrontation, mutual admiration and as a process of assimilation (Shervani 1968: 69-70). However, though there was no direct confrontation between Sanskrit and other languages imported by the Muslim invaders, we would like to argue that an indirect impact of Islam brought about a change in the status of Sanskrit as a language. Sanskrit literature, of course, had its usual growth in the changed scenario, but the Sanskrit language was no more the only language of theological and political eminence. This diminution of Sanskrit's privilege and aura as a language revealed by the gods, resulted in the quick consolidation of regional Prakrit languages as a vehicle of theological exchange. People's languages acquired the authority to confront textual wisdom directly. This phenomenon can be compared to preaching by various Bhakti cults during that time, which advocated the establishment of the individual's direct relationship with god without the mediation of the priestly class. In this linguistic context, the message of Chaitanya's cult of bhakti converged with the translational enterprise of the Pancha Sakha and others in Orissa. For example, after Chaitanya proclaimed *Geeta Govinda* as his favorite text, several translations into Oriya ensued. Even the literary-erotic significance of the text was undermined in order to project it as a sacred devotional text of the Vaishnavas. Vaishnavism, preached by Chaitanya, was adopted by several Oriya dynasties, and then many Vaishnav texts were translated into Oriya. Texts like *Geet Govinda* and *Adhyatma Ramayana* were translated several times. Jagannath Das's translation of the *Bhagavata* was canonized as a major text after its adoption by the Vaishnavites as their sacred book. In a manner of speaking, it

can be argued that the ideology of the Bhakti cult was a major facilitator of translational practice. Brahminical ideology ensured the dominance of the priestly class in theological matters by recognizing Sanskrit as the only language of the scriptures. When Bhakti cult sought to dispense with the role of rituals and priests in the individual's relationship with god, it was quite natural to make the scriptures available to the common people in their languages. It is worthwhile to remember here that saint-poets like Kabir had not only expressed their disapproval of the priestly cult but also castigated the Sanskrit language. Balaram Das, the Oriya saint-poet and a contemporary of Chaitanya also claimed that, not the mastery of a language, but the cultivation of bhakti within one's own self is the real prerequisite for approaching god/wisdom.

As has been discussed earlier, Chaitanya's advent in Orissa coincided with the weakening of the Gajapati kings. The hitherto powerful Kalinga Empire fragmented itself into three major Oriya-speaking principalities. Once the central power lost political control, there was a social and economic chaos of sorts. The so-called centre was transformed into a mere ritual figurehead. The changed nature of relationship between the center and the margin can be perceived from the construction of Jagannath temples in smaller principalities. During the heydays of the Kalinga Empire, the construction of the Jagannath Temple was not allowed outside Puri and Cuttack. The rulers of smaller principalities not only built Jagannath temples but also maintained their own court poets and scholars. All those court poets and scholars were not necessarily writing in Sanskrit alone. They were also using the Oriya language. Toward and after the later part of the 16th century therefore a multi-lingual aesthetic-religio-political transaction became the norm, making the field of translation more fertile. This political equation between the centre and the margin was replicated in the relationship between the dominant and the subaltern segments of the society too. The confrontational

relationship between various segments gave way to a collaborative one, within the framework of the courts of the small principalities. This collaborative relationship was the springboard for many translations. However, the subaltern groups, which were outside the periphery of the court, continued their own translational enterprise. It is fruitful to remember here that these groups were instrumental in the subversive translational practices in Oriya in the initial phase. Thus there was in the changed political atmosphere a contest of sorts within the subaltern groups to establish their own hegemony over written discourse in Oriya. The proliferation of parallel translations of a single text was a manifestation of this assertion of identity by various subaltern groups both within and outside the court. This identity-assertion through the Oriya language is among the important factors driving the growth of Oriya nationalism. This language-based Oriya identity was also a troubled one because after the 16th century the Oriya-speaking populace remained divided among three major political centers of power located outside Orissa. These three power-centers were either apathetic or indifferent to the growth of the Oriya language. The apathy of the centre of power for the Oriya language was very much pronounced in the eastern segment. Coupled with this apathy, there was rampant economic exploitation of the people as well. The local chieftains did not have any surplus wealth to patronize cultural activity. The literary discourse and translational practice thus survived precariously on the strength of nascent linguistic nationalism and Vaishnav religious impulse. Translation, mainly of the Vaishnav religious texts during this phase, is an indication of such a phenomenon. After the shift of centre of power to Murshidabad in the last part of the 7th century, even this activity declined. Only *Mahatmyas,* which catered to the religious sentiments of rural womenfolk, continued to be translated from Sanskrit.

Similarly, the western part of Orissa had a dominant aboriginal population that was not conversant with organized

economic activity. Due to lack of surplus wealth and support of the ruling dynasty, there was virtually no growth of Oriya literature. Only three to four translations into Oriya can be identified as having been produced in this area during a time span of almost hundred years (Sahoo: 1969). Consequently, the Oriya-speaking populace became merely the receivers of the texts produced in the eastern and southern segments in the wake of Bhakti movement, and not participants in a vibrant literary/translational culture.

However, southern Orissa continued to be a site of literary and translational activity. The Qutbsahi rulers who occupied the south in 1574 were very liberal, They patronized the Telugu language and literature. The local Oriya chieftains also encouraged translation and literary activity in Oriya. The same state of affairs continued even after the Mughals occupied the region and it was ruled by the Nizam of Oudh. Therefore, whatever systematic development of Sanskrit and Oriya literature and translation activity we do come across can be located in the southern part of the province. Most of the palm-leaf manuscripts of translated texts discovered so far can be traced to this area.

The Bhakti movement and the political dependence of Oriya people on non-Oriya centers of power had a cumulative effect on literary and translational discourse. Earlier all the translational activity in Oriya was confined to the source language of Sanskrit. There were of course subversive translations of Sanskrit texts, but the dominant position of Sanskrit was implicit in that practice. The contact with contiguous languages like Telugu and Bengali had not been made popular. After the diminution of the status of Sanskrit and the loss of political independence of the Oriya-speaking people, translation activity from Bengali, Telugu and Hindi gained momentum in the later part of the 18th century. For example, Sadanand Brahma, a noted Sanskrit scholar himself, translated a

Sanskrit text through the filter language of Bengali. In his *Brajalilamrita Samudra* he admitted that it was a translation of *Radhakrishna Lila Kadambe,* the Bengali rendering of the Sanskrit *Bidagdha Madhaba.* Dinabandhu, a poet of southern Orissa of late 18th century, translated the Telugu text *Dahramanga Purana* as *Patibhakta Purana*. Towards the early 19th century, Tulsi Das's *Ramayana* written in a Hindi dialect was translated several times into Oriya. Moreover, some major Oriya writers of the period like Brajanath Badajena also started writing in languages contiguous with Oriya. Oriya writers like Pindika Srichandana and Shymasundar Bhanja demonstrated their mastery over contiguous languages by translating some Sanskrit texts like *Gita Gobinda* into Bengali. In order to gain access to a wider discursive practice, some other writers translated their own Oriya texts into Sanskrit. It was believed that through a Sanskrit translation a text could have a wider reach and gain acceptability in an elite circle. All these traits of translation are a sign of identity crisis within a social space fractured by political instability discussed earlier.

However, two trends in translation ran counter to this identity crisis. Firstly, the Oriya writers tested the strength and resilience of their language by translating a number of technical books like *Kama Sutra*, *Aswa Sashtra*, *Jyotisha Sashtra* etc. Moreover, for a long time they resisted the translation of the canonical literary and aesthetic texts in Sanskrit into Oriya, barring some exceptions like *Gita Gobinda*. On the one hand, through the translation of technical texts, they expected Oriya to graduate from a colloquial language into a more 'complete' language, and on the other by resisting translation of the literary texts; they expected Oriya literature to evolve such texts on its own.

The appropriation of scientific information and technical knowledge from other languages and evolving indigenous literary forms and expressions went hand in hand till the British occupation

of Orissa. The ideological structures and cultural practices under European colonization spawned various other translational practices in the Oriya language. Those cultural practices also resulted in new crises of identity and new forms of consolidation. The Oriya language and literature along with the translational practices became a contested field in which those crises were articulated and fresh consolidations were imagined. The politics of language and of translation practices occupied a predominant position in the imagined Oriya community that ultimately combined the majority part of the Oriya-speaking population with all the segments mentioned above of modern day Orissa.

Conclusion

We have so far given a chronology of translation in late medieval Orissa i.e. from the first decade of the 16th century to the early decades of the 19th century. In a historical perspective, these years constitute a period of social turmoil and political fragmentation in Orissan history. However, the impact of this period on Orissan culture has not been properly dealt with except for some isolated instances like in *Odiya Kavya Kaushala* by Sudarshana Acharya. Most of the histories have imposed the northern model of communal history, which sees the Muslim invasion as a main destabilizing factor that undermined all the healthy cultural structures at that time. Nevertheless, as all cultural transactions demonstrate, a new challenge to the established and traditional cultural modes, is not necessarily negative in its impact. The Muslim challenge to the existing Oriya socio-cultural situation was rather too complex to admit the prevalent simplistic and reductionist historiography, which is not only deficient in its conceptualization of Orissa, but also rather unsystematic in apprehending the cumulative significance of a fragmentary political situation for cultural life. First, the available histories do not deal with all parts of Orissa, like western Orissa, for

example, which was never under Muslim rule, where the Oriya language was used. In this essay, we have tried to train our attention on all these fragments, as much can be gained from a look at the context that surrounds texts translated into the Oriya language. This is a rather humble attempt, in the sense that it employs a novel method of constructing history, but is constrained by a paucity of factual evidence because of the very nature of methodology and enquiry.

We have tried to limit our enquiry to the system of knowledge-production and dissemination in medieval Orissa. This society was not very literate, if being literate meant having access to institutionalized knowledge, which was codified in Sanskrit. In such a society, translation has played a more important role than the so-called creative literature, catering solely to aesthetic enjoyment in mediating various types of knowledge and its dissemination within a very short span of time. Contrary to popular perception, we have demonstrated that much before Macaulay's time, a people's language was already privy to a vast body of knowledge that had been under the control of the elite only because of the intervention of translation as practice. Translation truly democratized the episteme.

Since ideology plays a crucial role in the institutionalization of knowledge, we have tried to unearth the ideological basis of translational practices in the Orissan society of the period under study. It is apparent that translational practice in Orissa has not been artificial or bureaucratic in any sense--- there have not been many instances of translation undertaken by learned men in various royal courts. It is rather, in Vazquez's words, a "creative praxis", enriching the social self (for a distinction between bureaucratic praxis and creative praxis, see Vazquez 1966: 200-214) and catering to social needs.

While fulfilling its social self, translational praxis simultaneously institutionalized a generalized way of looking at translation as an act, a generalized approach to it although it has not been consciously theorized anywhere. Dash & Pattanik 2002 hinted at the absence of such a theory even in Sanskrit aesthetics. When the process of translation began in Oriya, it started mainly as an institution of subversion of the hegemony of the Brahmin caste and the Sanskrit language. Towards the 16th century, other activities like annotation and explication were added while retaining the subversive dimension of translation in response to specific societal needs. The same societal needs also gave rise to actual literal translation in the 17th and 18th centuries. We have thus varieties of the translational process operating at the same time answering to specific needs of the society. Moreover, Sanskrit as the source text and the source language gave way to other neighboring languages gaining political and religious importance at various points of time.

We need at this point to remind ourselves that the variety of translational strategies employed in the praxis have consolidated the naturalness of the Oriya language for several reasons. First, translators, barring a couple of exceptions, belonged to the target language and were adept at using the language with some facility. Moreover, since the praxis was determined by the social need, there was an instinctive desire to reach out to the colloquial character of the Oriya language without doing much violence to its naturalness. Translational praxis has rarely targeted the so-called creative writing perhaps due to an instinctive realization that translation should fill in the gap in the knowledge base, rather than be a competing discourse of creative writing. Various creative art forms in Oriya language thus proliferated during this time, along with the translated texts. Many major writers who were great Sanskrit scholars themselves never undertook to translate Sanskrit art forms, though they often incorporated stylistic features of those art forms.

NOTES

1. Following the Hegelian model, conventional historiography divides Indian history into three periods: ancient, medieval and modern. For their administrative convenience, imperial historians highlighted medieval Indian history as a chaotic period. Although we retain such a traditional division for narrative convenience, we do not attach the same negative connotation to the medieval period. Beginning from James Mill, most of the historians have classified Indian history into three periods basing their argument on scant historical material. It seems the models of European historiography were imposed on a colony to perpetuate colonial control by positing colonial rule as modern, progressive and beneficial compared with the unwieldy chaos of medieval times. Subsequent discoveries of historical material by nationalist and subaltern schools have rejected this model. Medieval period in the history of Orissa can be divided into two phases, viz. early and late medieval. Like the other regions of India, state formation, development of architecture, literature etc. reached a state of maturity during this period in Orissa history. For a number of socio-political reasons Oriya emerged as a vehicle of literature and higher conceptual thought in the later phase of medieval Orissa. This might be considered a chaotic period from the point of view of political instability, but it did not hamper the growth of Oriya language or identity formation.

   The construction of the notion of Orissa proper or what was known as Cuttack was started only after the British occupation of the region in 1803. The various tracts of the Oriya- speaking people were under different administrations throughout Orissa's history. A separate Orissa province was carved, only in 1936, out of the southern, central and Bengal provinces under the British rule. It became the first Indian state to be constituted on a

linguistic basis. The norm of linguistic province became more widespread subsequently.

2. Various scholars like Nilakantha Das, B.M.Padhi, S.N.Das and K. C. Mishra trace the origin of the Jagannath cult to aboriginal, Jaina and Buddhist sources. However, towards the 11th century Jagannath was worshipped as mainly a Vaishnav deity.

3. If the dates ascribed to Chaitanya Das by J.K. Sahu (1969:46) are to be believed, there were instances of literary activity in the Oriya language in this region during Sarala's time. Chaitanya Das, who flourished during Prataparudra Dev-I of Patnagarh, Bolangir between 1470 and 1490, was the author of two voluminous Oriya theological texts titled *Nirguna Mahatmya* and *Bishnugarbha Puran*. Like Sarala he had come from a backward caste and his works were neither translations nor adaptations. His concepts like "sunya", "nirguna" etc. were developed later by the writers of eastern and central Orissa, but there was no concurrent development in the western Orissa.

4. A number of palm-leaf manuscripts containing the text of *Mahabharata* are available in Orissa State Museum. These are ascribed to Jagannath Das. R.N. Ratha of the Satyabadi Press, Cuttack, has also printed this set of Mahabharata between 1927 and 1928. Nevertheless, the most curious thing is that, historians of Oriya literature like Suryanarayana Das, Bansidhara Mohanty and Surendra Mohanty are silent about the existence of such a text.

   While editing the minor works of Jagannath Das, Bansidhara Sarangi and Kunjabihari Mohanty, have classified Jagannath das's writings into three categories viz. works that have been conclusively proved to be written by Jagannath, works that are probably by him and works that are definitely not by him. According to them, this *Mahabharata* belongs to the first

category. In *Jagannath Dasanka Rachanabali* (36) they opine that this *Mahabharata* belongs to one Jagannatha Das of Jaipur who is a 19th century poet. Moreover, as per a footnote in the text, information offered is contradictory and the source text that has been indicated does not yield any conclusive information whatsoever.

The language of *Bhagabata* and the mode of Bhanita (self-identification of the poet) there, are exactly replicated in this text. One of the early commentators of Jagannath's writings, Chintamani Acharya has accepted this text as Jagannath's without, however, offering any critical justification for the same. We do not find any reason either to support or contradict Achrya's claim. The claim of Sarangi and Mohanty is therefore rejected summarily as it is unreliable.

This *Mahabharata* is not a verbal translation of Vyasa's text. Though Das has divided Mahabharata into eighteen books on the lines of Vyasa, he has abridged the narrative part. He calls it a 'Sutropakhyana'- a brief story. In chapterisation and description, Das has taken much liberty. For example Vyasa's "Bana Parva", renamed as "Aranya Parva" by Jagannath, starts with the chapter relating to the exile of Pandavas into the forest and the treatise on "Golaka" or the abode of Vishnu, whereas in Vyasa's epic a long introduction has been given before the narration of the story of the exile.

5. Panchasakhas are five saint-poets of Orissa namely Achyutananda, Balaram, Jagannath, Jasobanta and Ananta. They lived between the late fifteenth and the first half of the sixteenth century. Balaram was the eldest of the group and Ananta was the youngest. This history is based upon Achyuta's *Sunya Samhita*, Dibakara Das's *Jagannath Charitaamruta* and Ram Das's *Dardhyata Bhakti*. With the advent of modern historiography historians like Shyamsundar Rajguru, Mrutunjaya Ratha, Nilakantha Das and Artaballav Mohanty went along with this

view. During the last fifty years Chittaranjan Das in his *Achutananda O' Phansakha Dharma*, *Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature of Orissa*, *Santha Sahitya* and *Balaram Das* reinforced the thesis that all the saint poets were contemporary and they consolidated the Oriya identity through their writings, bringing literature, society and religion on the same plane. However citing historical inaccuracies, contradictions Sachidananda Mishra provided an alternative viewpoint that the concept of the panchasakha is a myth, and does not stand the test of rigorous historical scrutiny. Later on Natabara Samantaray published two books titled *Sakhahina Panchasakha* and *Panchasakha Parikalpana* wh ich tried to prove that those saint poets in question were not contemporaries and there could be a gap of two hundred years between Balaram and Jagannath on the one hand and the other three on the other. There has not been any further study refuting the theses put forward by Mishra and Samantaray. Another historian Krushna Charan Sahoo puts forward an argument that there were several poets bearing the same name across these times, so the texts ascribed to each one of them could be doubtful. However, basing an argument on those doubtful texts alone, the entire concept of Panchasakha should not be discredited. For the present discussions, we go along with the view put forward by the latest one by Sahoo (Sahoo 1999-2001).

6. Most of the scholars of Oriya literary history have ascribed this text to Sarala Das because *Bilanka Ramayana* is by Siddheswar Das, which happened to be the original name of Sarala before he was blessed by the Goddess Sarala. In *Chandi Purana* Sarala declares that the *Ramayana* was his first work. Until the seventh decade of the 20th century, since no other version of *Ramayana* had been ascribed to Sarala, this text was commonly accepted as having been written by Sarala. In the seventies Satchidananda Mishra discovered a palm-leaf manuscript titled *Bichitra*

Ramayana having the Bhanita of Siddheswar Das. Its archaic language, subversive tone, and ethnic representation were closer to Sarala's style. He then argued that *Bichitra Ramayana* and not *Bilanka Ramayana,* was the text produced by Sarala. K.C. Sahoo has also argued that *Bilanka Ramayana* could not have been by Sarala because its source text, *Adbhuta Ramayana* was written only between the last part of 14th and the first part of 15th century, which is close to Sarala's own time. His second argument is that *Bilanka Ramayana* was influenced by *Jagamohana Ramayana* in more than one way. The language, style and syntax of *Jagamohana Ramayana* are more archaic than those of *Bilanka Ramayana*. Therefore, he places the text at the last part of 16th and the early part of 17th century (Sahoo: 1995 pp. 62-64). Snehalata Patnaik, the editor of the authoritative text of *Bilanka Ramayana*, is also of the same view. Hence, the scholars now seem to have reached a consensus that *Bilanka Ramayana* was not authored by Sarala but by someone having a similar name.

REFERENCES

Bishop, D. H. (ed.) 1975 **Indian Thought** New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Pvt. Ltd.

Brahma, G.K. (ed.) 1960 **Ichhabati** Bhubaneswar: Orissa Sahitya Akademi.

Chand, Tara 1976 **History of the Freedom Movement in India Vol. I**. New Delhi: Publication Division.

Chari, V.K. 1993 Sanskrit **Criticism** Delhi: MBD New Delhi Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

Chyaupattanayak, S. 1961 **Adhyatma Ramayana** Cuttack: Radharaman Pustakalaya.

Das, Chittaranjan 1951 **Achyutananda O' Panchasakha Dharma** Santiniketan: Visva Bharati.

_____ 1951 **Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature of Orissa** Santiniketan: Visva Bharati.

_____ 1982 **Balaram Das** New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

_____ (ed.) (undated) **Srimad Bhagabat Gita** by Balaram Das. Santiniketan: Visva Bharati.

Das, Nilakantha 1993 **Indian Learning and Culture** Bhubaneswar: Orissa Sahitya Akademi.

Das, S.K. (tr.) 1988 **Srimadbhagabat Mahapurana** Bhubaneswar: Orissa Sahitya Akademi.

Das, S. N. 1963-68 **Odiya Sahityara Itihasa.Vol.IV**. Cuttack: Grantha Mandira.

Dharanidhara (undated) **Gitagobinda Tika** Cuttack: Dharmagrantha Store.

Dharwadker, V. (ed.) 1999 **The Collected Essays of A.K.Ramanujan** New Delhi: OUP.

Gramsci, A. 1998 **Selections from the Prison Notebooks** (tr.Q.Hoare and G.N.Smith) Hyderabad: Orient Longman.

Grierson,G. 1904 "Studies in Adbhuta Ramayana" in **Bulletin School of Oriental Studies** London.

Haque, M.A. 1980 **Muslim Administration in Orissa** Calcutta: Panthi Pustak.

Khadanga Dinabandhu Mishra 1988 **Srimadbhagabat Vol. I-III**. Cuttack: Goswami Press.

Mishra, Narendranath 1995 Balaram Das **Odiya Ramayana** *Santi* Niketan: Viswa Bharati.

Mishra, Nilamani 1976 **Alochana** Cuttack: Rashtrabhasha Samabaya Prakasana.

_____ 1976 **Prachina Odia Lipi Bhasha O' Sahitya** Cuttack: Grantha Mandira.

_____ 1982-86 **Descriptive Catalogue of Oriya Manuscript Vols. I to IV**. Bhubaneswar: Cultural Affairs (Government of Orissa).

_____ (ed) 1989-92 **Srimad Bhagabata** by Jagannatha Das Vols. I to IX. Bhubaneswar: Orissa Sahitya Akademi.

Mishra, Pramila (ed) **Suchitra Ramayana by Banamali**. 1972 Bhubaneswar: Directorate of Cultural Affairs.

_____ (ed) 1996 **Srigitagobinda by Jagannath Misra**. Bhubaneswar: Directorate of Culture.

Mohanty, A. B. (ed) 1970 **Siva-Swarodaya** Bhubaneswar: Utkal University.

_____ (ed) 1973 **Rasabaridhi** Bhubeneswar: Utkal University.

Mohanty, B. 1970-77 **Odiya Sahityara Itihasa** Vol.I-III. Cuttack: Friends' Publishers.

Mohapatra, G.C. (ed) 1965 Mahabharata Bhubaneswar: Orissa Sahitya Akademi.

Mohapatra, R.C. (tr) 1997-2000 **Valmiki Ramayana Vol. I-III**. Bhubaneswar: Orissa Sahitya Akademi.

Nayak, K. 1989 **Sanskrutare Srimadbhagabatam O' Jagannath Dasanka Anudita Odia Bhagabata" Konarka Vol VI.-3**. Bhubaneswar: Orissa Sahitya Akademi.

Orissa Cultural Forum (ed) 1979 **Odissara Sanskrutik Itihas** Cuttack: Grantha Mandira.

Panigrahi, K. C. 1972 Prabandha **Manasa** Cuttack: Kitab Mahal.

_____ 1975 **Sarala Das** New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

_____ 1986 **History of Orissa**. Cuttack: Kitab Mahal.

Pattanaik, D.R. 2002 "The Power of Translation" in **Changing the Terms** (ed.) Sherry Simon et al. Hyderabad: Orient Longman.

Pattanaik, D. R. and Debendra Dash. 2002 "Social Context of Translation in India" in **Journal of Contemporary Thought** (ed) PC. Kar. Baroda: Forum on Contemporary Theory.

Pattanayak, B. C. (ed) 1932 **Khadanga Bhagabata** Cuttack: Prachi Samiti.

Pattanayak, Dukhishyam (ed) 1970 **Arthagobinda**. Bhubaneswar: Directorate of Cultural Affairs.

Pattanayak, S. (ed) 1993 **Bilanka Ramayana** Bhubaneswer.

Rao, K.S. Ramakrishna 1975 "Jainism" in **Indian Thought** Ed. D.H. Bishop.

Ray, B. C. 1960 **Orissa under the Marathas** Allahabd: Kitab Mahal.

_____ 1989 **Mogal Orissa: Itihasa O' Sanskruti**. Cuttack: Vidyapuri.

Sahoo, K.C. (ed) 1980 **Jagamohan Ramayana (Adikhanda)** by Balaram Das Cuttack: Books and Books.

_____ 1981 **Odia Lekhaka Parichaya (1450-1850)** Bhubaneswar:Orissa Sahitya Akademy.

_____ 1995 "Bilanka Ramayana Eka Adhyayana", **Visva Bharati Dipika** Shantiniketan: Visva Bharati.

_____ (ed) 1996 **Haribansha I to VIII** by Achyutananda Das Bhubaneswar: Utkal Universtiy.

_____ 1999-2001 **Professor Krushna Chandra Sahu Rachana Sanmhara Vol. I to IV**. Bhubaneswar: Subarna Rekha.

Sahu, B. K. 1978 "Gitagobindara Odia Anubada" in **Konarka** Bhubaneswar:

Orissa Sahitya Akademi.

_____ 1984 "Gitagobindara Odia Anubada O' Anusarana" in **Odia Sahita: Udbhaba O' Bikasha** Ed. K.C.Sahu. Cuttack: Prachi Sanskrutika Parishada.

Sahu, J. K. 1969 "Literary Development in Western Orissa since Fifteenth Century A.D" in **Souvenir of Pragati Utkal Sangha** (ed N.K. Sahu). Rourkela.

Sahu, N. K. 1968 "An Outline of History and Culture of Orissa upto 1975" in **Souvenir of Pragati Utkal Sangha** (ed N.K. Sahu), Rourkela.

Samantaray, N. 1975 **Sakhahina Panchasakha** Bhubaneswar: Gangabai Samantraray.

_____ 1982 **Odisar Dharmadharare Panchasakha Parikalpana** Bhubaneswar: Gangabai Samantaray.

Sarangi, B.1984 "Jagannatha Dasanka Bhagabatare Anubada Kausala O Ehara Parinama" in K.C. Sahoo (ed) **Odiya Sahitay Udbhava O Bikasha** Bhubaneswar: Prachi Sanskrutika Parisad.

Sarangi, B. 2000 **Jagannatha Dasanka Rachanabali**. Bhubaneswar, Orissa Sahitya Akademi.

Satpathy, Natabara. 1990 **Purana Parisilana** Cuttack: SB Publications.

Satyanarayana, K. 1982, 1983 **A Study of the History and Culture of the Andhras Vol I & II**. New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House.

Shervani, H. K. 1968 **Cultural Trends in Medieval India** Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

_____ 1974 **History Qutbshahi Dynasty** New Delhi.

Simeoni, Daniel. 2002 "Translation and Society: The emergence of a Conceptual Relationship", in **Journal of Contemporary Thought** Baroda: Forum on Contemporary Thought.

Singh, Krushan (Undated) **Mahabharata Vol XI**. Cuttack: Cuttack Trading Company.

_____ (Undated) **Srimad Bhagabatgita** Cuttack: Dahrmagrantha Store.

Thapar, R. 2000 **History and Beyond**. New Delhi: OUP.

_____ 1982 "The Ramayan: Theme and Variation" in **India: History and Thought** (ed. S.N. Mukherjee). Calcutta: Subaranarekha.

Tripathy, K. B. 1962 **Evolution of Oriya Language and Script**. Cuttack: Utkal University.

Vazquez, Adolfo Sanchez 1966 **The Philosophy of Praxis**. London: Merlin Press.

Appendix: Names of Translated Texts

Sl. No.	Title of the Translated Text	Name of the Translator	Period	Remarks
1	*Abhinaya Darpan*	Jadunath Singh	Late 18th Cen.	A work of dramaturgy
2	*Abhinava Chintamani*	Dinabandhu Harichandan	-do-	A work on Ayurveda
3	*Adhyatma Ramayan*	Damodar Das	Early 17th Cen.	……..
4	*Adhyatma Ramayan*	Suryamani Chyau Pattanayak	1773-1838	……..
5	*Adhyatma Ramayan*	Gopal Telenga	18th Cen.	He belongs to Western Orissa
6	*Adhyatma Ramayan*	Gopinath Das	18th Cen.	……..
7	*Adhyatma Ramayan Tika*	Haladhar Das	17th Cen.	It is a translation with implication
8	*Adhyatma Ramayan Tika*	Narahari Kavichandra	Early 19th Cen.	……..
9	*Amarusatak*	Srinibas Rajamani	Early 19th Cen.	……..
10	*Arsa Ramayan(Ayodhya Kanda)*	Krushanachandra Rajendra	1765-1786	……..
11	*Arthagobinda*	Bajari Das	17th Cen.	Translation of Gitagobinda
12	*Ashadha Mahatmya*	Mahadev Das	Early 17th Cen.	……..
13	*Baidya Jivan*	Dinabandhu Hrichandan	Early 18th Cen.	Books on Ayurved.
14	*Baidyasarasvat*	Dinabandha Hrichandan	Early 18th Cen.	-do-
15	*Baisakha Mahatmya*	Rama Das	Early 18th Cen.	……..
16	*Baisakha Mahatmya*	Jagannath Mardraj	18th Cen.	……..
17	*Baisakha Mahatmya*	Madhusudan	Jagdeb	……..

		Harichandan	18th Cen.	
18	*Baisakha Mahatmya*	Bipra Madhu Das	17th Cen.	……..
19	*Baisakha Mahatmya*	Mahadeb Das	Late 17th Cen.	……..
20	*Baisakha Mahatmya*	Haraprasad Das	Late 18th Cen.	……..
21	*Baishnav Aldhiri Tika*	Harisebak Samantray	18th Cen.	Prose translation of Gobindalila mruth by Krushnadas Kabiraj
22	*Balabodha Ratnakaumudi*	Trilochan Mohanty	Late 18th Cen.	It is a book on Astrology.
23	*Balabodhini Tika*	Basudeb Rath	18th Cen.	……..
24	*Baman Puran*	--------	Early 12th Cen.	……..
25	*Baman Puran*	Balaram Das	18th Cen.	……..
26	*Baman Puran*	Krushna Chandra Pattanayak	18th Cen.	……..
27	*Batris Sinhasan Katha*	---------	From early 18th Cen.	This book of Sibadey has been translated by different persons in different areas in Oriya Prose
28	*Bedanta Ratnavali*	Ramachndra Birabara Hrichandan	18th Cen.	……..
29	*Betala Panchavansati*	Mukunda Das	18th Cen.	……..
30	*Bhagabat Gita*	Parameswara Das	Late 17th Cen.	……..
31	*Bhagabat Lahiri*	Bipra	18th Cen.	……..

	Harivansa	Achyutananda Das		
32	*Bhagavat* (*Balacharit*)	Gateswar	18th Cen	……..
33	*Bhagavat*	Srushnacharan Pattanayak	Early 19th Cen.	……..
34	*Bhagavat*	Goura Chandra Gajapati	18th Cen.	Only 10th book is ornate poetry
35	*Bhakti Ratnavali*	Bhim Das	……..	A part of Parasar Samhita has been translated
36	*Bhakti Ratnavali*	Chandrasekhar Das	18th Cen.	……..
37	*Bharat Harivansa*	Sarala Chandidas	16th Cen.	A free translation/ adaptation of Hrivansa
38	*Bhaswati*	Trilochan Mohanty	Late 18th Cen.	A book on astronomy
39	*Bilanka Ramayan*	Siddheswar Das	Late 16th Cen.	A part of 'Adbhuta Ramayana' has been translated.
40	*Bilanka Ramayan*	Baranidhi Das	17th Cen.	-do-
41	*Bishnu Dharmattar Puran*	Dwija Gangapani Mohapatra	Early 19th Cen	……..
42	*Bishnukesari Puran*	Mahadev Das	Late 17th Cen.	……..
43	*Bishnu Puran*	Padmanabh Das	17th Cen.	……..
44	*Bishnu Puran*	Prahlad Das	Early 19th Cen.	……..
45	*Bishnu Puran*	Ballabh Narayan Behera Mohapatra	18th Cen.	……..

46	*Brahmasanhita*	Sridhar	18th Cen.	……..
47	*Brajalilamruta Samudra*	Sadananda Kavisurya Brahma	18th Cen.	The original text is 'Nidagdha Mahava' in Sanskrit which has been translated into Bangali as 'Radhakrushna-lila-kadamba'
48	*Chanaky Nitisar*	……	18th Cen.	A prose translation
49	*Chandi/Durga Rahasya*	Madhusudan Harichandan Jagdev	18th Cen.	……..
50	*Chikitsamanjari*	Dinabandhu Harichandan	Early18th Cen.	A book on Ayurveda
51	*Charaka Datta*	Dinabandhu Harichndan	Early 18th Cen.	-do-
52	*Damodar Puran*	Gouranga Das	18th Cen.	An adaptation/free translation of Bhagabat
53	*Dwadasi Mahatmya*	Mahadeb Das	Late 17th Cen.	……..
54	*Ekadasi Mahatmya*	Harekrushna Chitrakar	Late 17th Cen.	……..
55	*Ekadasi Mahatmya*	Dwija Hari	18th Cen.	……..
56	*Ekadasi Mahatmya*	Dinkrushna Das	18th Cen.	……..
57	*Ekadasi Mahatmya*	Jagannath Das	Late 17th Cen.	……..
58	*Ekadasi Mahatmya*	Dibakar Das	Late 18th Cen.	……..
59	*Ganga Mahatmya*	Purushottam	17th Cen.	……..

		Das		
60	*Garuda Puran*	Dwija Gangapani Mohapatra	Early 19th Cen.	……..
61	*Garuda Puran*	Ghnashyam Pattanayak	18th Cen	……..
62	*Gitagovinda*	Uddhab Das	Ealy 16th Cen.	……..
63	*Gitagovinda*	Jagannath Mishra	17th Cen.	……..
64	*Gitagovinda*	…….	Early 17th Cen.	Known as keshb manuscript
65	*Gitagovinda/Govindagita*	Trilochan Das	Late 16th Cen.	It is a metaphysical interpretation and translation
66	*Gitagovinda Tika*	Ananta Rath	Early 18th Cen.	……..
67	*Gitagovinda Tika*	Dharanidhar Das	Late 16th Cen.	……..
68	*Gitagobinda Tikasara*	…….	Early 18th Cen.	……..
69	*Gitaprakasha*	Binayak Ray	Late 18th & early 19th Cen.	A book on music
70	*Gitarthasar Tika*	Bipra Janakiballabh a Kar	2nd half of 18th Cen.	A translation of Srimad Bhagavat Gita. The translation belongs to Medinapur
71	*Govinda Lilamruta*	Jadunandan Das	18th Cen.	……..
72	*Govinda Lilamruta*	Haribansa Ray	18th Cen.	……..
73	*Grahachakra*	Maguni Pathi	Early 19th Cen.	A book on Astrology
74	*Harsaduta*	Hari Baisya	Late 17th	……..

			Cen.	
75	*Harsaduta*	Chintamani Mohanty	Early 19th Cen.	……..
76	*Hanuman Natak*	Kishoricharan Das	18th Cen.	Translation of 'Mahanatak a' in verse
77	*Harsaduat*	Achyutananad a Das	16th Cen.	More an adaptation than translation
78	*Harsaduta*	Krushna Singh	1739-1788	……..
79	*Harsaduta*	Bipra Nilambar Das	Late 17th Cen.	……..
80	*Harsaduta* (I & II)	Bipra Narayan Das	18th Cen.	……..
81	*Harivansa* (Vol. III)	Balaram Das	18th Cen.	……..
82	*Harivansa* (*Swayambar Khanda*)	Bipra Gopal	Late 18th Cen.	……..
83	*Haribhakti Kalpalata*	--------	18th Cen.	Translated from Sanskrit and the title is unchanged
84	*Haribhakti Ratnamala*	Bipra Nilambar Das	Late 17th Cen.	Kriyaogasar a 'a part of Padmapuran ' is translated
85	*Hitopadesha*	Gatiswar Mishra	18th Cen.	A translation of Panchatantra in Oriya verse
86	*Itihas Puran*	Krushna Chandra Das	18th Cen.	……..
87	*Itihas Puran*	Kapileswer Narendra	18th Cen.	……..
88	*Jagamohan Ramayan*	Balaram Das	Early 16th Cen.	A free translation

				with additional new stories
89	*Jatakalankar*	Trilochan Mohanty	Late 18th Cen.	A book on Astrology
90	*Jyotishasarasangraha*	Trilochan Mohanty	-do-	-do-
91	*Kalagnyana*	Tripurari Das	18th Cen.	-do-
92	*Kalagnayana*	Hari Das	Early 19th Cen.	-do-
93	*Kalki Purana*	Krushnachandra Pattanayak	18th Cen.	……..
94	*Kamashastra*	Narayan Mohanty	Early 19th Cen.	……..
95	*Kapilasamhita*	Nilakantha Das	18th Cen.	……..
96	*Kartika Mahatmya*	Purushottam Das	18th Cen.	……..
97	*Kartika Mahatmya*	Dayalu Das	18th Cen.	……..
98	*Kartika Mahatmya*	Gobinda Das	Early 19th Cen.	……..
99	*Kartika Purana*	Mahdeb Das	Early 17th Cen.	A translation of 'Kartika Mahatmya'
100	*Katapaya*	Bhubaneswar Kabichandra	Early 19th Cen.	A book on Astrology
101	*Katapaya*	Tripurari Das	18th Cen.	-do-
102	*Keraladasa*	Tripurari Das	-do-	-do-
103	*Keraladasapurana*	Jadumani	Early 19th Cen.	-do-
104	*Keralasutra*	Maguni Pathi	Late 19th Cen.	-do-
105	*Krupasindhu Jnana*	Krushna Das	Late 18th Cen.	Translated by the author from Oriya to Sanskrit
106	*Ksetra Mahatmya*	Balabhadra Mangaraj	18th Cen.	……..
107	*Kestra Mahatmya*	Maheswar	Early 18th Cen.	……..
108	*Kestra Mahatmya*	Jayakeshari	17th Cen.	……..

		(Jaya Singh)		
109	*Laghusiddhanta*	Chaitanya Mohanty	Early 19th Cen.	……..
110	*Lilavati*	Dhananjay Dwija	18th Cen.	……..
111	*Lilavati*	Damodar Mohanty	Early 19th Cen.	……..
112	*Lilavati Sutra*	Krushna Mangaraj	18th Cen.	……..
113	*Magha Mahatmya*	Krushna Singh	1739-1788	……..
114	*Magha Mahatmya*	Gopi Das	18th Cen.	……..
115	*Magha Mahatmya*	Mahadeb Das	17th Cen.	……..
116	*Mahabharata(Drona Parva)*	Jayakeshri (Jaya Singh)	17th Cen.	……..
117	*Mahabharat*	Jagannath Das	16th Cen.	Abridged
118	*Mahabharat*	Krushna Singh	1739-1788	……..
119	*Mahabharat*	Kapilesh Nanda	Early 19th Cen.	……..
120	*Mahanataka*	Purushottam Das	18th Cen.	……..
121	*Margasira Mahatmya*	Kripasindhu Das	18th Cen.	……..
122	*Markandeya Puran*	Mahadeb Das	17th Cen.	……..
123	*Markandeya Puran*	Pitambar	Early 19th Cen.	……..
124	*Markandeya Puran*	Narasingha Das	18th Cen.	……..
125	*Mitaksara*	Srinibas Rajamani	Early 19th Cen.	……..
126	*Mukalatabali*	Srinibas Rajamani	-do-	A portion of Bhagabat has been translated
127	*Mukundamala*	…….	18th Cen.	Translation of Rajadhairaj Kulasekha

				written by the anonymous translator
128	*Nabagraha Dasaphala*	Trilochan Mohanty	Late 18th Cen.	……..
129	*Natyamanorama*	Gadashar Das	18th Cen.	A book on dramaturgy, translated in Oriya prose
130	*Nrushingjacharita*	Yuga Das	Late 17th Cen.	……..
131	*Nrushingha Puran*	Pitambar Das	18th Cen.	……..
132	*Padma Puran*	Mahadeba Das	17th Cen.	……..
133	*Padma Puran*	Bipra Nilambar	17th Cen.	…….
134	*Panchasayak*	Kabisekhar Narayan Das	18th Cen.	A book on Erotics
135	*Patibhakta Puran*	Dinabandhu	Early 19th Cen.	The title of the text in the source language Telugu is 'Dharmanga na Puran'
136	*Prachi Mahatmya*	Trilochan Das	Early 18th Cen.	……..
137	*Prnab Byahruti Gita*	Bipra Jambeswar Das	17th Cen.	The writer himself is the translator. Early specimen of Oriya Prose
138	*Premakalpalatika*	Sadanada Kabisurya Brahma	18th Cen.	Translated from a Bengali text with the same title, which in

				turn is a translation of Sanskrit text 'Gobindalila mruta'
139	*Purana Ramayana*	Keshav	Early 19th Cen.	……..
140	*Purushottam Mahatmya*	Trilochan	Early 18th Cen.	……..
141	*Ramayana*	Krushna	Early 19th Cen.	……..
142	*Rasabaridhi*	Brundaban Das	16th Cen.	A translation of Gitagobinda
143	*Rasadipika*	Ramachandra	18th Cen.	A translation of 'Gitagobind a in prose'
144	*Rutusambhav*	Nidhi Rath	18th Cen.	……..
145	*Sakuntala Chhanda*	Balaram Keshri/ Ananta Rath	Late 18th Cen.	A translation of drama 'Abhijna Sakuntalam' in verse
146	*Salihotra*	Dhanjaya Bhanja	17th Cen.	Translated from a Sanskrit book `How to Maintain Horses'
147	*Salihotra Roganidan*	Dinabandhu Harichandan	17th Cen.	……..
148	*Sangitaramayan*	Sadashib	18th Cen.	This book on music was written by an Oriya author, Gajapati Narayan

				Deb
149	*Siba Puran*	Bipra Manobodha Das	18th Cen.	……..
150	*Siba Puran*	Bhagirathi Das	18th Cen.	……..
151	*Siba Puran*	Dwaraka Das	1656-1736	……..
152	*Siddharatna Brudusara*	Tripurari Das	18th Cen.	A book on Astrology
153	*Siddhantasara*	Krushna Patra	Early 19th Cen.	-do-
154	*Sivaswarodaya*	Jasobanta Das	Early 16th Cen.	Translation of 'Svarodaya'
155	*Smarasastra*	Kabisurya Brahma	Probably early 19th Cen.	Translation of 'Kamasastra'
156	*Srikrushnachaitanyacharitramruta*	Sadananda Kabisurya Brahma	18th Cen.	Bengali transation of Chaitanya – chritamruta by Krushnadey Kabiray
157	*Srimad Bhagavat* (Eleven Books)	Jagannath Das	Early 16th Cen.	……
158	*Srimad Bhagavat* (Twelth Book)	Mahadeb Das	Late 16th Cen.	Completed the work of Jagannath Das
159	*Srimad Bhagavat*	Dinabandhu Khadanaga (Mishra)	18th Cen.	……..
160	*Srimad Bhagavat* (13th Book)	Dwaraka Das	1656-1736	……..
161	*Srimad Bhagava*	Bipra Janaki Ballabha Kar	18th Cen.	……..
162	*Srimad Bhagavat Gita*	Balaram Das	Early 16th Cen.	……..

163	*Srimad Bhagavat Gita*	Jaya Keshari (Jaya Singh)	17th Cen.	……..
164	*Srimad Bhagavat Gita*	Krushna Singha	18th Cen.	……..
165	*Srimad Bhagavat Gita*	Trilochan Das	Early 18th Cen.	……..
166	*Srimad Bhagavat Gita*	Sanyasi Madhusudan Puri	18th Cen.	……..
167	*Srimad Bhagavat Gita*	Sadhcharan Das	18th Cen.	……..
168	*Srimad Bhagavat Gita*	Gopinath Rajaguru	18th Cen.	……..
169	*Srimad Bhagavat Gita*	Harisebak Das	18th Cen.	……..
170	*Srimad Bhagavat Gita*	Narayan Das	18th Cen.	……..
171	*Srinivas Dipika*	Bhubaneswar Kabichandra	Early 19th Cen.	……..
172	*Sripati Paddhati*	Nimbadeba	Early 17th Cen.	……..
173	*Sriradhakrushna Vilas*	Gouranga Das	18th Cen.	An adaptation of ‘Gobindalila nruta’
174	*Sriram Bhakti Ratnavali*	Balaka Ramadas/Sebadas	18th Cen.	The original text is written by his teacher Ramday
175	*Suchitra Ramayana*	Banamali Das	18th Cen.	Translated from original Sanskrit ‘Ramayan Champu’ by Bhoja and Lakshman Suri
176	*Suchitra Ramayana*	Hari Baisya	18th Cen.	The book of

				Kalidas Chayan of Orissa
177	*Suddhi Chandrika*	……	Early 19th Cen.	The source text is by an oriya author Srinivas
178	*Shuddhilipika*	…….	-do-	-do-
179	*Surya Puran*	Dina Narayan	18th Cen.	……..
180	*Suryasiddhanta*	Nimbadeb	Early 17th Cen.	A prose translation
181	*Swarasarani*	Krushnasura Harichandan	18th Cen.	A book on Astrology
182	*Swarnadri Mahodaya*	……..	18th Cen.	…….
183	*Uddhava Gita*	Balaram Das	Early 16th Cen	A part of Bhagavat was translated
184	*Yogavasishtha Ramayan*	Lakshmana Rath	Late 18th Cen.	The poet belongs to Sambalpur.