

MAKE IT TELUGU

Legitimizing Patron, Author and Text¹

Srinivas Reddy²

Legitimization Via The Past

If we believe, as the poet W.H. Auden plainly states, that "there is only one thing that all poetry must do; it must praise all it can for being and for happening,"³ then we may ask, "Why does one feel the need to praise?" I would argue that it is to proclaim the value and legitimacy of a person, an object, or an idea. In South Asia, that legitimacy was established through the embodied representation of a particular tradition or lineage—a complex set of inherited norms and practices that defined a unique way of being and knowing. Regardless of discipline, all South Asian knowledge systems certify their authority by connecting to a canon of past masters and celebrated works. In the classical literature of medieval South India, a poem functioned as an artifact of such legitimization—a consciously crafted composition that concretized and promulgated specific cultural tropes that bound and informed the author, the patron and the text itself. Each one of these elements had a specific tradition that defined its normativity, and collectively, all three interactively constituted a symbiotic relationship that generated a cultural nexus uniting language and literature with politics and poets.

Although this paper focuses on what may be deemed the dominant brahmanic traditions of classical Telugu literature, the formulation of legitimacy as an act of recourse to an authoritative literary past is equally applicable to the so-called anti-brahmanic counter movements as well. Whereas a high-class court poet such as Nannaya paid due homage to the sanctity of the Vedas, a reformist Vīraśaiva poet like Pāṅkuriki Somanātha claimed that his compositions were tantamount in status to the sacred scriptures. The latter for example, clearly states in regard to his *Basava Purāṇam*⁴: "Let it not be said that these words are nothing but Telugu. Rather, look at them as equal to the Vedas" (Narayana Rao 1990: 5-6). In each case, regardless of impulse or effect, the Vedic corpus is never left unacknowledged, nor is it dismissed outright. Rather, both poets reify (in whole, or at least in part) the prevailing notion of Vedic prestige. So while Nannaya borrowed themes from the pan-Indic *itihāsas* (epics) and legitimized himself through the exalted stature of the Sanskrit tradition, Somanātha drew from oral sources and claimed authority by connecting to a lineage of local Śaiva masters. Both poets were compelled to merge with the flow of an established tradition, follow in the stream of past poets and bring new bends to a widening river of literary production.

In classical South Asian literature, the hegemonic influence of the Sanskrit tradition is evident in every region and every epoch. Along with well-prescribed criteria for genre-specific conventions, compositional style and aesthetic appreciation, this pervasive impact also carried with it the socio-political framework that defined and structured the patron-poet relationship. In particular, the classical Sanskrit model of kingship presents a mutually beneficial relationship between the mighty *kṣatriya* king and his wise *brahman* poet. In this paradigm, the poet praised (often fabricated) the king's noble lineage, extolled his patron's virtues and proclaimed his sovereignty through song. In return, the king supported the poet, lavishing upon him the most valued gifts, lands and honors. It was a symbiotic pairing that cemented the bond between the two upper castes (*varṇas*) and also concretized the literary themes and tropes that would define each of their roles. As the seventeenth century Telugu grammarian Appakavi succinctly states: "Just as a gem enhances a bracelet, and the bracelet enhance the gem, so a poet and his patron make each other famous"⁵ (Narayana Rao and Shulman 2002: 238).

Although this idealized model of the patron-poet relationship was disrupted and reconceived in medieval times due to shifting political scenarios and expanding modes of religiosity,⁶ the inspirational fount for classical Telugu works remained the Sanskrit corpus. Literature in Telugu only existed with a dedication (*ankitamu*), either to an earthly sponsor or a heavenly deity—the patron may be a Chalukya king on the Godavari or the great god Rāma, and the poet might be the king's poet laureate or a poor brahman farmer, but in all cases, the source text was always from Sanskrit. The South Asian vernacular revolution of the second millennium CE, of which classical Telugu is an important part, did little to refute the literary prestige of Sanskrit, to the contrary, it validated it—first through outright praise, then by conventionalized acknowledgement, and later by subtle critique and reformulation. To state the point more comprehensively: social, political and religious developments in medieval South India, including the birth of new literary vernaculars, did not subvert the preeminence of Sanskrit; in fact, it could be well be argued that they fortified it.

The key to this trajectory is the way in which a dominant, pan-Indic cultural mythos embodied in Sanskrit literature framed and inspired new regional literatures. It is an issue of an inescapable past, so deeply ingrained in the Indian consciousness that it could never be overturned. A poem, its author and its patron, all found legitimacy in the power and cachet of that which came before. Poets drew

thematic seeds from the two great epics (*itihāsas*) and the multiple old mythologies (*purāṇas*)—they aligned themselves with the “authoritative structure of the literary past, indeed, a canon of great poets”⁷ (Narayana Rao 2003: 390). Kings linked their genealogies with the *sūrya* (sun) or *candra* (moon) dynasties of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* respectively, and modeled their behavior on the celebrated monarchs of yore. The mythic hero kings and their exploits were known to most through osmosis⁸ and not through military conquest or political submission. In short, Sanskrit cultural hegemony was won by myth—though the circulation of tales and legends—sung by travelling bards, recited by village elders, and whispered within shadows as bedtime stories.

Mahābhārata and Bhāgavata Purāṇa

In this paper I will consider two seminal works of Sanskrit literature along with their celebrated retellings in Telugu. Composition of the Sanskrit *Mahābhārata* and the Sanskrit *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* are accredited to the mythic sage Veda Vyāsa, and both texts occupy a place of sanctity and prestige in the greater Sanskrit literary canon. The Telugu poets Nannaya Bhaṭṭu and Bammēra Potana rendered these works into classical Telugu in the eleventh and fifteenth centuries respectively. And although there were some striking differences that separated these authors (to be explored later), both were brahman poets who drew inspiration from venerated Sanskrit sources.

Nannaya is considered the *adi-kavi* or first poet of Telugu and his decision to compose the *Āndhra-mahābhārata* was a fully conscious choice, loaded with important socio-cultural and political ramifications for a newly literarizing regional culture. His work set the standard for all later Telugu poets, not only in terms of his innovative *campu* style that mixed verse (*padya*) with prose (*gadya*), but also in regard to diction, prosody and aesthetics. It is said that the *Mahābhārata* contains some things that can be found elsewhere, but many things that can be found nowhere else, including in this case, the standards for proper grammar. And as its name suggests, it is the great story of the land ruled by the legendary King Bharata, the land known today as India.⁹ To give it a vernacular voice would be to translate, absorb, and embody the entire linguistic/cultural complex of the classical Sanskrit worldview. Nannaya himself tells us that:

Those who understand the order of things
think it is a book about order.
Metaphysicians call it Vedānta.
Counselors read it as a book about conduct.
Poets read it as a poem.
Grammarians find here usage for every rule.
Narrators of the past see it as ancient record.
Mythologists know it to be a rich collection of myth.
Vyāsa, the first sage, who knew the meaning of all the Vedas,
Parāśara’s son, equal to Lord Viṣṇu, made the *Mahābhārata*
a universal text.” (Narayana Rao and Shulman 2002: 61)

The poet’s vision does not explicitly justify the creation of a new text, rather it highlights the multiple readings that a single text of such multi-layered richness provides. When Nannaya’s patron Rājārājendra asks him to clarify the “proven meaning bound to the *Mahābhārata* text,”¹⁰ (Narayana Rao and Shulman 2002: 59) there is an implication that the eternal message of the beloved epic requires commentary, interpretation, and explication. The garb that this exposition takes is a new language, thereby clothing the principal text¹¹ in a diction and register that would speak to a new readership in an enlightening new way. And although Narayana Rao observes that “Nannaya’s own intention was only to compose a Telugu work—not to begin anything, let alone a tradition,” (2003: 393) it is well accepted that the poet had no literary predecessors in Telugu. Unlike subsequent Telugu poets, he pays no homage to any previous Telugu author, only to the great Sanskrit poet-sages: Vālmiki, the *adi-kavi* and progenitor of all *kāvya* (poetry), and the prolific wise guru Vyāsa.

At the core of the *Mahābhārata* is a story of warring princes. From this kernel it expands into a *magnum opus* of unwieldy proportions, including a veritable mishmash of moral, scientific and narrative discourses. Its essence, however, is the delineation of *dharma*—the righteous conduct of man in the world—and more specifically, a model for Indian kingship and sovereignty. As such, Nannaya’s decision to retell this text in Telugu was critical not only to the emerging literary tradition, but also to freshly articulated (and localized) patterns of South Indian governance.

The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* is the most influential and widely read Sanskrit *purāṇa*. And like all *purāṇas*, it includes an account of the world’s creation, its dissolution, and a narration of the ten *avatāras* of the preserver god Viṣṇu. This particular work chronicles the amorous/epic adventures of the boy/god Kṛṣṇa, and soon became the foundational text for many rapidly proliferating sects of Kṛṣṇa devotion. The spread of these *bhakti* movements had a profound influence on the religious and literary

landscape of medieval Andhra. Poets once employed at royal courts in imperial centers now found succor at large temple complexes that dotted the South India geography. One poet who typified this transition from court to countryside was the mid-fifteenth century Telugu brahman Bammēra Potana. Early in his career he was court poet to a local potentate named Sarvajña Śingabhūpāla, but a transformative mystical experience seems to have inspired him to abandon court life and settle down as a simple farmer.

This self-styled *sahaja kavi* or natural poet, refused to dedicate his *Mahābhāgavatam* to his erstwhile employer. According to legend, Lord Rāma appeared to Potana and commanded him to compose a Telugu *Bhāgavatam*. As the poet describes in his preface: “The *Bhāgavatam* is what I speak, and Rāma makes me speak it. Speaking it relieves suffering, so why speak any other story.”¹² In this new relationship, the patron is god himself, and the poet but a humble devotee in service of his lord. Potana is a fascinating case example because his life embodies the shift from court poetry to bhakti poetry. Unlike Somanātha who was conspicuously positioned outside the cosmopolis, Potana occupied both spaces during his career—he belonged to the high brahmanic tradition, lived as a respected court poet, wrote secular works, but also, we are told, relinquished his possessions, shunned state patronage, and composed devotional poems. This dialectic plays out in the linguistic terms as well and the poet declares that: “Some like Telugu, others like Sanskrit, and some like both. So I’ll please everyone in different contexts.”¹³ The critical point is that even the divinely inspired Potana could not break free of Sanskrit literary models or texts of authority. His true innovation came through his earthy language, genuine devotional spirit and resistance to court sponsorship.

Commissioned by Kings and Gods

The poets of premodern South Asia functioned as media outlets for their patrons—they had agendas that were inherently political and their poems spread a message to readers and listeners well beyond their local domains. In this sense, poets could reinvent their patrons—they could wipe away blemishes and accentuate achievements, devise glorious genealogies and mythic histories, and effectively, or at least ostensibly, elevate a patron’s status. Whether they were supported by kings or inspired by gods,¹⁴ their works legitimized their patrons in powerfully eloquent and affective ways. For royal patrons, the choice of commissioning a work in a vernacular like Telugu often had a political rationale with concomitant implications for state governance. It has been posited for example, that Nannaya’s patron Rājarājanarendra, an Eastern Chālukya sovereign of Tamil stock who ruled from Rājamahendravaram (modern day Rajahmundry) in the heart of Andhra country, purposefully patronized a Telugu work in an attempt “to make himself more popular among his Telugu-speaking subjects” (Narayana Rao and Shulman 2002: 55). Half a millennium later, Kṛṣṇadevarāya, the iconic god-king of the Vijayanagara empire made a similar choice based on his predominantly Telugu constituency and court of warrior elites. In the king’s own *Āmuktamālyada*, the god Āndhra Mahāviṣṇu asks him in no uncertain terms: “Having spoken to all your lords gathered at court, didn’t you realize that Telugu is the best among the regional languages?”¹⁵

These sponsored works, though written in a new vernacular, still carried with them the age-old formula of describing a sponsor’s celebrated pedigree. These *vamśa-stutis* or celebrations of lineages precede the main text and constitute an important part of a work’s meta-narrative. A king’s legitimacy was constituted in large part by proclaiming his descent from the stock of exemplary ‘Sanskrit’ sovereigns, like the Six Universal Monarchs (*ṣaṭ-cakravartis*) and the Sixteen Great Kings (*ṣodaśa-mahārājas*).¹⁶ In Nannaya’s prologue, Rājarājanarendra proclaims: “Generations of my ancestors, originating from the Moon and descending through the illustrious monarchs Puru, King Bharata and Lord Pāṇḍu, ruled the earth and brought fame to my lineage. So whenever I hear the stories of the virtuous Pāṇḍava heroes, I want even more!”¹⁷ The king’s commissioning of the *Mahābhārata* is thus framed, not as a retelling of a great epic, far removed by time and space, but as an endearing account of his own beloved forefathers.

Potana on the other hand offers a stark contrast when he praises his celestial patron King Rāma and offers us a passionate critique of poets who wrote for human kings and lived off their worldly rewards:

Rather than giving my work to those vile lords of men,
and accepting towns, chariots and measly money,
I’ll leave this tired body without Death’s hammer blows!
For only I, Bammēra Potarāju, happily give my *Bhāgavatam*
to Śrī Hari, for the benefit of the world.¹⁸

In addition to praising their noble patrons, poets were also deeply concerned with validating their own personal genealogies and connecting themselves to a venerated literary lineage. Nannaya describes himself as “versed in the Veda corpus, having command over a vast vocabulary, and

fascinated with various *purānas*... famous for composing poetry in both languages... a worthy brahman son of the Āpastamba line and the Mudgala family...¹⁹ He makes clear his brahman pedigree and implies that his thorough knowledge of the high Sanskrit tradition will be brought to bear in his new Telugu work. As mentioned earlier, he also goes on to honor the mythic Sanskrit writers Vālmiki and Vyāsa and establishes himself as a worthy inheritor of their venerated tradition.

In the introduction to his *Bhāgavatam*, Potana also claims descent from the Āpastamba line but focuses on his ancestors' unswerving religious devotion to Lord Śiva rather than their brahmanic erudition. In terms of his literary lineage, Potana makes no mention of the great Sanskrit poets, rather he is fully rooted in the flourishing vernacular tradition and pays due respect to earlier Telugu poets, specifically mentioning Nannaya and Tikkana who he says Teluguized the Sanskrit *purānas* (*purāṇāvaḷur tēnugun ceyucu*).²⁰ Therefore, by the fifteenth century the Telugu tradition had matured enough that Potana did not have to trace his literary heritage back to Vālmiki or Vyāsa—his acknowledgement of the celebrated Telugu poets of the past was enough to confer the legitimacy he sought to project.

Later, a full-fledged *bhakta* like Annamayya, whose *padams* are often not even classified as poetry, found no need to legitimize himself or his compositions. “Without a patron who sought social and political status from the act of sponsoring poetry, Annamayya was his own grammarian, his own literary theorist, and his own master. His legitimacy as a poet did not depend upon the mention of a great poet, grammarian, or guru of the past” (Narayana Rao 2003: 409). This is what Narayana Rao calls ‘temple poetry,’ an area that has “yet to be seriously studied” (2003: 413). In this regard, Potana is an important transitional figure who bridges the highly refined poetry of courts with the unpretentious songs of temples—he provokes us to question and problematize the traditional bifurcations of classical/folk, cosmopolitan/vernacular, court/temple, aesthetic/devotional, and also, original/translation.

Translating into Telugu

It is now well established and accepted that translation as we conventionally understand it today—that is the direct transfer of inaccessible content from a source language to a disparate target language—was unknown in premodern South Asia. In this context, we must explore the dynamics involved when a known narrative or theme is rendered in a new language. Is the new work a translation or a (re)telling? How do these categories intersect, overlap and/or subsume each other on a potential spectrum of literary composition? Or more generally, are all translations types of retellings, and all retellings forms of translation?

The term *anuvādam* (Telugu)/*anuvād* (Hindi) is a neologism of modern Indian parlance that reflects a distinct historical shift in the conceptualization of Indian authorship, translanguistic comprehensibility and compositional originality. This transformation, largely a product of the colonial encounter, has been discussed by some scholars but still requires further exploration and theorization.²¹ From a historical perspective, premodern Telugu poets never used the term or anything like it. They preferred to speak of themselves as ‘remaking’ Sanskrit works in Telugu. A few textual examples will make the point clear. Nannaya is asked to “compose in Telugu to enlighten the inherent value of the *Mahābhārata*,” *mahābhārata baddha nirūpitārtham erpaḍa tēnuguna raciyimpu*²², while Kṛṣṇadevarāya is persuaded to “craft a work in the language of Āndhra,” *āndhra-bhāṣan... andun ōkka kṛtin vinirmimpumu*.²³ Lord Rāma commands Potana to “make the *Śrī Mahābhāgavatam* Telugu,” *śrī-mahā-bhāgavatambu tēnuṅgu seyumu*,²⁴ and, in a fascinating turn of phrase that verbalizes the nominal designation of the language, to “Teluguize this *Bhāgavatam*,” *bhāgavatamun dīnin tēniṅgiñci*.²⁵ Clearly these poets were working under a paradigm of translation that differs from our modern notion. The reasons for this phenomenon, especially in the context of South Asian heteroglossia, are profound and complex, and require a separate and more focused analysis.

In the case of Nannaya’s *Mahābhārata* and Potana’s *Bhāgavatam*, their translations were strictly what we would now consider retellings—new vernacular versions of Veda Vyāsa’s Sanskrit works that consciously sought to align themselves with the high tradition of Sanskrit learning and literature by drawing on thematic and narrative material from the ‘originals.’ In this process they edited out huge portions of the text, condensed and reworked others, added regional variations and sub-stories, but never, by any stretch of the imagination, did they produce slavish literal translations. In essence, they were creating true original works with powerfully inventive and significant meanings for new audiences.

As Narayana Rao rightly observes: “Veda by definition cannot be translated or even retold, while *kāvya*, too, is completely resistant to translation. Only *śāstra*, *itihāsa*, and *purāna* are available for translation; indeed, since their meaning can be constituted in different ways, they may be thought of as requiring repeated telling and reinterpretation” (2003: 422). Court patronage in particular actively supported the translation of Sanskrit works as a means of elevating the cultural capital of the state, thereby promulgating hegemonic forms and registers while relegating original, localized productions. In this context, a translation inherently privileged the source language even as it sought to enrich the

target language. The veneration and sanctity of the source text is reaffirmed, propagated and further legitimized while the target text gains a position of legitimacy and validity by aligning itself with the well-established canon of the high tradition. In doing so, a translation confers upon the target language a proprietary respectability which had hitherto been unavailable to it, if not inconceivable.

Citation and reference were certainly legitimizing actions for the translating poet, but they also had implications for altering the perception and reception of the root text. Just like today when authors refer to how many citations their paper has received, the work of a translator glorifies and validates the original as much, and sometimes even more, than the translation. Interestingly, premodern translations from South Asia seem to have reduced the original text's readership, for "before the twentieth century, no literary critic compared the translation with the original in order to comment on the quality of the translation. Faithfulness to the original was never an issue. Sanskrit originals apparently provided legitimacy, while Telugu renderings were actually read" (Narayana Rao 2003: 427).

Translation as Preservation

Today, hardly anyone actually reads the *Mahābhārata* or *Bhāgavatam* in Sanskrit, and contrary to the medieval period, even less so in Telugu. As India modernizes, interest in classical studies has waned in lieu of the immediate relevance of contemporary literature. As the classical genres of South Asia ceased to be living traditions, the only corpus to survive the rupture to any significant extent was that of Sanskrit. This speaks strongly to the powerful influence and level of prestige that the language of the gods commanded in the colonial period, and even continues to exert in the subcontinent to this day. When I tell people in Andhra that I study Telugu literature they often look at me with a puzzled sense of wonder, but when I add that I read Sanskrit as well, they appreciate my efforts to preserve our heritage. Sadly, the value of India's rich vernacular literary traditions seems to be lost among the present generation.

The Sanskrit literary tradition has received considerably more philological attention from scholars than any of the many regional vernaculars. Critical editions of several seminal Telugu texts are left to be compiled and thousands of precious palm-leaf manuscripts are quickly disintegrating under the ruin of neglect. Even the available printed materials of/on classical Telugu literature, mostly produced in the late eighteenth and early twentieth centuries, lie in dusty, dilapidated libraries—untouched, uncared for, and unread. In my own work as a translator of classical Telugu, I often see translation as an act of preservation—a way to connect an inaccessible past to a dynamic present and bring new life to a fading tradition. I can relate to Hugh Kenner when he writes that Ezra Pound "came to think of translation as a model for the poetic act: blood brought to ghosts" (Kenner 1973: 150). Translations revitalize and rejuvenate that which is deemed valuable from the past. They also prompt translators to determine which texts (from a vast constellation of works in the case of classical Telugu) are worthy of being surveyed, studied and translated. In this sense, even the modern translator joins in the continuous act of legitimization.

Translating the rarefied world of classical Telugu into modern English allows this rich literary tradition to speak to an international readership. Unlike the retellings of the past that we explored, these translations are most often precise and in direct, parallel correspondence with their source texts. For modern writers, this is what makes a translation scholarly, and ultimately authentic. In order to make them literary however, they mustn't become overly literal or restrictively scholastic. Finding that balance is what I see as the core philosophy of translating premodern South Asian literature into modern, living languages. Vamsee Juluri recently wrote a piece which poignantly describes the Telugu-speaking world's need to engage with English as well as other languages. He says: "Writing in English, I believe, can help us be vernacular without becoming provincial. Without English, or some sort of engagement with the world outside one's own, the vernacular can turn into an artifice, a state-supported pickle-jar exhibit, and worse, a language without a voice in the world to speak for itself...Most of all, we need to write, in English, and in other languages, and write our Teluguness into it" (Juluri 2012).

That being said, both the *Mahābhārata* and *Bhāgavatam* are still very much alive in Andhra and other parts of modern South and Southeast Asia, not as texts to be read but mythological metaphors to be experienced in new ways, and crucially, in languages other than Sanskrit. To put it another way, the textual lives of these seminal works live on in new media translations, from films and plays to cartoons and video games. What is central here is the power of myth and its remarkable ability to penetrate, endure and thrive. Translation, in its broader non-textual sense, provides the key to this robustness. The layers of meanings embedded within these cultural matrices of text and myth allow for them to be reformulated in a dazzling variety of forms and permutations. These translations thus enrich the lives of new generations of listeners, both in India and abroad. Or as Nannaya would say:

With words steeped in wisdom and glowing with multiple meanings
I became absorbed in composing the Telugu *Mahābhārata*
for the good of the world.²⁶

References

- Bronner, Yigal and Shulman, David. "A Cloud Turned Goose: Sanskrit in the Vernacular Millennium." *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 43, 1 (2006).
- Brown, C. P. *Telugu-English Dictionary*. Vijayawada: Victory Publishers, 2004.
- Hermans, Theo, editor. *Translating Others*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2006.
- Juluri, Vamsee. "Being Telugu in English." *The Indian Express* 29 December 2012.
<http://www.indianexpress.com/news/being-telugu-in-english/1051530/0>
- Kenner, Hugh. *The Pound Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Mitchell, Lisa. *Language, Emotion and Politics in South India: The Making of a Mother Tongue*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009.
- Nannaya. *Āndhra-mahābhāratamu*. Hyderabad: Osmania University Press, 1968.
- Narayana Rao, Velcheru. "Coconut and Honey: Sanskrit and Telugu in Medieval Andhra." *Social Scientist*, Vol. 23, No. 10/12 (Oct. - Dec. 1995), pp. 22-40.
- Narayana Rao, Velcheru. "Multiple Literary Cultures in Telugu: Court, Temple, and Public." in *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003, pp. 383-436.
- Narayan Rao, Velcheru and Heifetz, Hank. *For the Lord of the animals; poems from the Telugu: The Kālahastīśvara-śatakamu of Dhūrjaṭi*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Narayana Rao, Velcheru and Shulman, David. *Classical Telugu Poetry: An Anthology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Potana, Bammēra. *Śrīmadāndhra-bhāgavatamu*. Rajamundry: Rohini Publications, 2004.
- Pollock, Sheldon, editor. *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Pollock, Sheldon. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Pound, Ezra. *Make it New: Essays by Ezra Pound*. London: Faber and Faber, 1934.
- Rao, T. Koteswara. *Āmuktamālyada Saundaryalaharī Vyākhyānam*. Hyderabad: T. Koteswara Rao, 2001.
- Venkatarayasastrī, Vedamu. *Āmuktamālyada Āndhra-vyākhyāna sahitamu*. Madras: Vedamu Venkatarayasastrī and Brothers, 1964.

¹ A rough outline of the contents contained herein was first presented at the Fifth Asian Translation Traditions Conference held in Sharjah, UAE, 27-29 November 2012. I am indebted to the participants of the conference for helping me refine and give more definite shape to these ideas.

² Department of Humanities, Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, Ahmedabad, India. www.iitgn.ac.in, srinivas@iitgn.ac.in

³ From W.H. Auden's inaugural lecture upon accepting the post of Oxford Professor of Poetry, June 11, 1956.

⁴ This Vīraśaiva *dvipada* text tells the story of Basavanna, the tradition's founder. The choice of calling the work a *purāna* is again another example of resistance through reclamation of an established term and the redefinition of a genre's scope.

⁵ From the seventeenth century *Appakavīyam* of Appakavi.

⁶ See the Afterword in Narayana Rao and Heiftz (1987) for a detailed analysis of this evolution.

⁷ From Rāmarājabhūṣaṇa's invocatory poem to the goddess of speech in his *Vasucaritramu*.

⁸ I owe this metaphor to Professor Rajmohan Gandhi.

⁹ The geo-spatial imagination of the *Mahābhārata* extended well beyond the boundaries of the modern Indian nation. *Bhārata-varṣa* or *bhārata-deśam* included areas in today's Pakistan, Afghanistan, Nepal and other countries.

¹⁰ Translation of Nannaya's *Āndhra-mahābhāratamu* I.1.16 by Narayana Rao and Shulman. I offer another translation of the same passage later in the paper.

¹¹ We may question if there is such a thing as a principal text, an Ur-document that functions as an original and constant referent for all other tellings. The idea requires theorizing, but in regard to Nannaya, he clearly refers to the Sanskrit *Mahābhārata*, and is ever-conscious of Vyāsa's originality.

¹² Potana's *Āndhra-bhāgavatamu* I.18.

¹³ Potana's *Āndhra-bhāgavatamu* I.20. Note the highly interpretive translation of Potana's simple diction given by Narayana Rao (1995: 33): "Seeing its erudition, some say it's tough as Sanskrit. Hearing the idiom, other says it's nothing but simple Telugu. Let them say whatever they want. I couldn't care less. My poetry is the true language of this land."

¹⁴ There is a deep connection between the evolution of both gods and kings in South Asia. Local folk deities were constantly brought into the larger Sanskrit pantheon through their identification with the classical *purāṇic* gods and goddesses, particularly as forms of Viṣṇu, Śiva and Śakti. Poets composed *sthala-purāṇas* and *māhātmyams*, most often in Sanskrit, to formulize a local deity's genealogy within a *purāṇic* mythological framework, and, to graft grand geo-histories onto localized cults. In this way, kings and gods were both, for lack of a better word, Sanskritized through the medium of poetry.

¹⁵ Kṛṣṇadevarāya's *Āmuktamālyada* I.15.

¹⁶ cf. *Āmuktamālyada* II.80 which makes explicit mention of all 22 monarchs.

¹⁷ Nannaya's *Āndhra-mahābhāratamu* I.1.14.

¹⁸ Potana's *Āndhra-bhāgavatamu* I.13.

¹⁹ Nannaya's *Āndhra-mahābhāratamu* I.1.9.

²⁰ Potana's *Āndhra-bhāgavatamu* I.21.

²¹ See for example Harish Trivedi's "In Our Own Time, On Our Own Terms: 'Translation' in India" in Hermans (2006 Vol. I, pp. 102-119).

²² Nannaya's *Āndhra-mahābhāratamu* I.1.16.

²³ Kṛṣṇadevarāya's *Āmuktamālyada* I.13.

²⁴ Potana's *Āndhra-bhāgavatamu* I.17.

²⁵ Potana's *Āndhra-bhāgavatamu* I.21. *tēniṅgiṅci* is glossed with the neologism *āndhrīkariṅcu* = "to make Āndhra."

²⁶ This a loose translation from *Āndhra-mahābhāratamu* I.1.26, reformulated in the first person.