CHAPTER IV

SEARCH FOR A DISCOURSE MODEL: PERSPECTIVES FROM READING RESEARCH AND APPROACHES TO LITERARY STUDY

Introduction

Having argued in the previous chapter for the primacy of reading processes in a literary pedagogy based on an enabling model, we shall now attempt to provide a general definition of the reading process, drawn from a survey of recent applied linguistic research in reading. Further the criteria that emerge from this definition will be used to examine approaches to literary study within both the Kannada and English traditions to identify approaches which meet these criteria.

Applied linguistic research on reading

It is appropriate to turn to the applied linguistic research on reading at this point when we are concerned with developing a pedagogy based on imparting reading processes. The fact that the reading of literary discourse shares a lot in common with reading in general of any discourse makes it relevant for us to examine this area of reading research. In addition, because most research on reading also addresses itself to the problem of teaching reading, reviewing this research here becomes immediately necessary to establish a firm foundation for a literary pedagogy. What follows is a brief summary of the latest thinking and research on reading as formulated by the editors of a recent book on reading research, Alderson and Urquhart (1984).
4.2.1 A general definition of reading

At the outset we must realize that an overview of reading research is becoming impossible because of the vastness and quantity of the research and so to attempt to provide an adequate definition of reading becomes difficult. Yet it has become possible for us to reject general and all-embracing definitions such as reading being "the process of getting linguistic information via print" (Widdowson 1979) and move towards more specific and comprehensive definitions which see reading "as co-operation and negotiation, as a layered series of processes whereby from the discourse of the writer a text is created from which text the reader by his or her discourse creates a (potential) 'text' - a cycle of production and interpretation, evidenced by text and 'text'." (Candlin 1984 : x). This view of reading which differs from the traditional view assigns a different status to the text and the reader, the two necessary elements that reading undeniably involves. This view holds that no language text is ever 'complete in itself'; that texts only have a 'potential' for meaning (Halliday 1973) and that the nature of meaning is not unitary. What extends and further this limited base of meaning in the text is the meaning-making capacities of the reader of the text.
4.2.2 Reading as interaction and negotiation

In consequence this position holds that in order to be understood in a satisfactory manner, the text must be related to readers' background knowledge unlike in the traditional 'view of reading in which the reader was a passive recipient of absolute and definitive meanings emitted by the text. This definition of reading which sees reading as a process of relating text and background knowledge, as 'making sense of texts' involves the reader in an active role. Therefore recent research on reading emphasizes heterogeneity and divergence in readers rather than convergence. It underscores the need to distinguish readers while considering variables such as texts, background knowledge, cultural setting, reader-purpose and linguistic competence. Alderson and Richards (1977) (quoted in Alderson and Urquhart, 1984) suggest on the basis of their research findings that linguistic description of a text is a necessary but not sufficient guide to the problems that readers might have with that text and argue for the need to consider non-linguistic variables such as the reader's purpose and background, leading to the conclusion that reading is essentially an interactive process involving the reader as much as the text in the process of meaning-creation.

4.2.3 A process view of reading

However, traditionally, reading research has focussed on
the reader in its attempt to analyse the reading skills employed by readers into a series of sub-skills. Varied kinds of questions — factual, inferential, evaluative, etc — were assessed on given texts to test the learners' ability to understand the text at all these levels. But the definition of reading as consisting of a series of sub-skills is found to be problematic. Lunzer and Gardner (1979) (as quoted by Alderson and Urquhart 1984) report on research which failed to prove that the different questions called upon different sub-skills. They seem to suggest that readers approach the text more holistically than the sub-skills approach makes out. Further it has been pointed out that this approach of establishing the level of understanding that a learner has achieved may be more worthwhile for testing but not so for teaching. In addition, these levels of understanding do not relate to the process of understanding but to the product, which does not help us to understand how a reader arrived at that understanding. As a result there has been a shift in perspective within reading research from investigating the product of reading to a focus on the process. Hence experiments have been conducted and reported upon on the various factors that influence the process of reading such as those by Strang (1972) (as quoted by Alderson and Urquhart 1984) on the differing starting points of varied readers; by Royer et al (1984) and
Framson (1984) on reader's purpose and motivation. Alderson and Urquhart (1984) argue that a focus on product is inadequate as it does not provide us insights/knowledge about reading processes, essential for teaching. They write "The value of concentrating on process in research and teaching is that if processes can be characterized, they may contain elements that are general across different texts, that learners can learn in order to improve their reading". (ibid:xix).

What emerges from this review is the overwhelming support for the process view of reading spelt out in Chapter III. This survey provides a general definition of reading as an eminently interactive process involving the text and the reader. Using this process-orientation as a criterion, we shall now survey approaches to literary study to identify which approaches fulfil this criterion. In view of the fact that the Kannada context is essentially bilingual and more significantly biliterary as a result of the powerful impact of ELT and ELC, it might be useful to examine the various approaches to literary study within the twin traditions of Kannada and English.

4.3. A review of approaches to literary study

4.3.1 A conceptual map of approaches to literary study in Kannada and English

Widdowson (1975) provides a rough and ready framework for classifying approaches to literary study which we will use
here to draw a conceptual map of various approaches. In the perspective adopted in his book, we see the two major disciplines of linguistics and literary criticism as two polarized approaches to literature while stylistics is considered as the mediation ground in which the pre-occupations of the linguist and the critic come together. Widdowson assumes that the primary concern of the critic is to explicate the individual message of the writer in terms which make its significance clear to others and argues that the critic's interest in the linguistic code lies in the meanings they convey in particular instances of use. Whereas the linguist is seen to be primarily concerned with the codes themselves and particular messages are of interest in so far as they exemplify how the codes are constructed. Widdowson characterizes the linguist's approach which directs attention mainly to how a piece of literature exemplifies the language system as that which treats literature as 'text', while he describes the critic's approach that searches for underlying significance, for the essential artistic vision that the poem embodies as that which treats literature as 'message'. He argues for an approach to literature between these two which attempts to show specifically how elements of a linguistic text combine to create messages and characterizes it as an approach which treats literature as discourse. (see chapter III for a more detailed discussion of this notion). In accordance with this view,
he outlines the purpose of stylistics to be "... to link the two approaches by extending the linguist's literary intuitions and the critic's linguistic observations and making their relationship explicit" (Widdowson 1975: 5-6).

This view of literature as discourse operates with the notion that reading literature involves making explicit the links between the reader's response and the literary text. This is precisely the view of the processes of reading that emerges from the survey of the reading research provided in the last section. We therefore need to search among the existing approaches to literary study for approaches which approximate to this discoursal view of reading literature.

We have already indicated that this framework suggested by Widdowson is a rough-and-ready one which has been employed to place various approaches within a larger framework and to focus on one set of approaches thus delimiting our review. But even when Widdowson's framework is being used only heuristically, a few comments on the framework seem to be in order at this point. First, neither the discipline of linguistics nor criticism has grown as a single, unified body of knowledge. At any given time, it is only natural that there are varied practitioners operating within a field with various assumptions and so
we find this happening in linguistics and literary criticism as well. Accordingly we need to plot various approaches along a cline, indicating their closeness to one end or the other, as a stretch with overlapping boundaries rather than as a single, definitive point belonging to one extreme or the other. Finally, Widdowson gives the status of an integrated approach only to Stylistics. But reviewing the rich variety of approaches within KLC and ELC has revealed that there are some attempts, if only implicitly, at a similar integration. For instance, although literary criticism is predominantly message-based both in Kannada and English, characterizing all of it as message-based as does Widdowson is an over-generalization. As a corrective a third category of approaches, referred to as 'discourse' or 'form' - based approaches has been proposed here and an attempt has been made to identify and plot the various strands within both KLC and ELC along the cline in the spectrum, as represented in the following diagram,
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4.4 Text-based approaches (linguistic approaches)

4.4.1 Kannada

At the very outset we have to make it clear that there is no significant tradition of linguistic approaches to the study of literature, in Kannada. The studies that we do find are largely influenced by the Pundit school which adopted categories from Sanskrit poetics, especially from the Alankara school, for analysing literary texts. Rarely we also see studies which have used the frameworks offered by modern linguistics in English. For instance let us consider K. Narayana's (1984) linguistic analysis of a poem. He takes M.G. Krishnamurthy's critique of a vachana by Basavanna as a satisfactory interpretation and proceeds to do a linguistic analysis of the poem using categories of finite and non-finite verbs, notions of collocation and linguistic cohesion. His attempt seems to link systematically some of the unsubstantiated assertions of M.G. Krishnamurthy's text. We have a few other instances of the linguistic approach in work done by Havanur (statistical analysis), Ramachandra Rao (unpublished thesis on Pampa's texts).

Except for these few stray studies, linguistic approaches based on modern linguistics have not made any headway in the Kannada context.

However the linguistic approach based on the Alankara school of Sanskrit poetics has been comparatively more influential and popular as it was used widely within the Pundit Approach
to KLT. 'Alankara' essentially referred to literary devices like metaphor, simile, hyperbole, synecdoche, etc. which enhanced the beauty of the work. The votaries of this school like Bhamaha believe that these Alankaras form the essence of poetry. As a result, they attempted to classify, reclassify these Alankaras and came up with detailed taxonomies. But as T.N. Srikantaiah (TNS, from henceon) rightly points out, this approach to literature failed to indicate what was significant and what was not in a literary text:

(1) "They were content to pick up the trivia on the shores of the ocean of poetry. They did not venture into the depths of the ocean in search of precious pearls" (1968: 43).

TNS further provides a few counter examples to the definition of poetry which gives Alankara the prime status thus questioning the adequacy of the definition and showing that it is possible to find great poetry in which none of the conventionally accounted rhetorical devices are used. And in practice, it has often been realized that a purely linguistic reading of a literary text which is expected to conform to the frameworks provided by poetics is very limiting and is inadequate to explain the complexity of literature. But because it offers fairly sophisticated tools for a stylistic analysis, it promotes an adequate analysis of shorter discourses at the micro-level, i.e.,
at the level of an isolated stanza, or a cluster of stanzas. Yet it must be pointed out that these tools when employed, provides us only with a linguistic reading of the text and not a literary reading which takes into account the totality of the text and reader response. Because of its excessive attention to analysis, this approach seems to undermine the affective side of a reader's response. Thus reading literature in this framework has largely come to be associated with taxonomies and pre-determined categories such as Alankaras which are used as a yardstick to rate the literary work. Further these categories are not always subtle enough to capture and explain reader response to varied kinds of literature. With the gradual disappearance of the Pundit model from KLT, it is not surprising that this kind of linguistic approach is on the wane.

4.4.2 English
In the English context also we see these two streams within text-based approaches to literary study: one coming from traditional rhetorical studies and the other from modern linguistics. The part of traditional rhetorical studies that equated literary study with the study of figures of speech and other literary devices is probably very similar to the Alankara school. However while rhetoric developed as a separate area of study, distinct from aesthetics and poetics in the Western context, the Alankarashastra of Sanskrit poetics grew as a part of poetics in attempting to account for the same phenomenon.
Most of the linguistic studies in English (more abundant than Kannada linguistic work) was a reaction to the impressionism and subjectivity of traditional literary criticism and can be located within the work done in descriptive linguistics and early stylistics. The work of A.A. Hill and S. Chatman in the American Structural school; that of J. Miles within statistical linguistics; work by Levin, Ohmann and Throne within transformational-generative grammar, and Halliday's (early work) and Berry's within systemic grammar are a few examples. A common aim shared by all these various linguists working with different linguistic frameworks was the production of neutral, quantitative, linguistic descriptions of the literary text, which was simply reduced to linguistic data, that eschewed considerations of literary interpretation. By applying their separate frameworks, these linguists were able to indicate/describe where the text as linguistic data conformed to the rules provided by their frameworks or deviated from the specified rules. As a result, they remained content to simply describe the linguistic facts without accounting for how they are structured to create particular literary messages and effects.

From this cursory examination, we can conclude that neither in Kannada nor in English, these linguistic approaches meet the requirements of a discourse-based approach to literary study.
Message-based approaches

By and large, literary criticism both in Kannada and English is predominantly concerned with interpreting and evaluating literary writings and explicating the message/world view of the writer by linking it with the world around the writer and less frequently with the world of the reader. Hence it is possible to accept Widdowson's classification of literary criticism as being largely message-oriented. But for reasons discussed earlier, it is necessary to study the various schools within literary criticism to be able to decide whether all of them are equally and solely message-oriented.

These traditional as well as recent approaches within ELC and KLC share a few features. All of them believe, given their expressive-realist position, that literature expresses a reality that exists independent of its expression thus subscribing to the dichotomous view that form and meaning are separate in a literary work. They further believe that literature is valuable for its content/message (no doubt, it is) and therefore consider form sub-servient to meaning. Hence they do not seek the message of the writer in the body of the work but tend to look for it outside the text. If we can describe literary criticism as a phenomenon which begins from the literary text as a core and moves outwards centrifugally in varied
directions and define it as

(2) "Literary criticism is a realm of consciousness with literature at its centre, ever expanding in various directions"
(Nagabhushanaswamy 1985: 1)

then we can use this definition to understand message-based approaches within criticism.

4.5.1 English

What is common to the approaches listed here viz, and biographical, historical, Marxist criticism is that they do not move centrifugally but centripetally. Their starting point is not the core - i.e., the literary text, but their own non-literary preoccupations. These approaches attempt to understand the message of the work using frameworks anterior to the work and also judge the work using the yardstick offered by their respective frameworks. Therefore these approaches largely deal with the work deductively, starting with their own pre-determined frameworks instead of approaching it inductively, allowing the work to lead the way outwards, to the concentric circles around it to the historical, sociological or philosophical perspectives emerging from the text.

These widespread and flourishing methods of studying literature which are concerned with its setting, its environment, its external causes has been described as 'extrinsic' by Wellek and Warren (1949). These approaches
are in contrast to the 'intrinsic' approaches which begin with the interpretation and analysis of works themselves. Though extrinsic studies may simply attempt to interpret literature in the light of its social and historical context, most often, it becomes an attempt at establishing a causal relationship between these external antecedents and the work, thus trying to explain literature. Most of these approaches tend to isolate a specific series of human actions and creations, and to attribute to that a determining influence on the work of literature. Thus we have the biographical approach which considers literature mainly as the product of an individual creator and argues that literature should be investigated mainly through the biography and psychology of the author. We have a second approach, the sociological approach (Marxist criticism, for instance) which looks for the main determining factors of literary creation in the economic, social and political conditions - the milieu of the writer. Another related attempt seeks the causal explanation of literature in some collective creations of the human mind as the history of ideas, of theology, of aesthetics and the other arts. Given the deductive, extrinsic thrust of these message-based approaches in ELC, they do not fulfil the criterion of a discourse view of literary study.

4.5.2 Kenndal

This predominance of 'extrinsic' approaches can be found in the history of modern KLC as well, with a similar focus.
on the content/meaning of the literary text to a near-total exclusion of any consideration of form. We shall now examine the four established movements within the heterogeneous body of KLC to determine if any of them approximate to a discourse-based approach to literature.

4.5.2.1 *Navodaya*

While it is possible for us to characterize the Navya school as being closer to the discourse-based approach in our spectrum and the Pragathisheela and Bandaya as undoubtedly message-based approaches, the Navodaya school defies such easy categorising. Let us examine why.

As indicated in chapter I, Navodaya was a renaissance movement fuelled by the momentus historical and socio-political changes associated with the freedom movement. It is understandable therefore that the Navodaya period nourished and sustained creative writing much more energetically than the analytic and reflective activity of literary criticism. In fact their own self-consciousness as a movement came about post-hoc, when they wanted to differentiate their work from that of the Pragathisheela critics. Yet one can find a considerable crop of criticism written to fulfil varied needs. We find Gundappa and Masthi writing generally about literature; the thread of justificatory criticism trying to create
more conducive conditions for the new emerging literature in Kuvempu, Puthina and Govinda Pai; critics writing on individual texts they were teaching, often comparing them with European classics.

We have already established in chapter I the reasons why Navodaya criticism largely took the form of introductory, descriptive and content-based analysis of literary texts, which inevitably led to the undermining of the literary text. Even though this thrust of the Navodaya criticism can be justified historically, (as Sheshagiri Rao 1975, Krishnamurthy 1975 and Kurthakoti 1983 have shown in their state-of-the-art papers) it originated a whole tradition of criticism which was not concerned with accounting for literary appreciation. The sahrdaya notion was probably slightly overdone to the total denial of the text thus denying the enterprise of criticism any objective, common base for sharing. As a result, the bulk of Navodaya criticism remains impressionistic, in which subjective response is not validated by textual evidence.

We have already indicated the diversity and complexity of the Navodaya writing and hence it is necessary to emphasize here that the generalisations made do not apply to all Navodaya writers alike. It is possible to point to the rare but insightful criticism based on textual evidence written by important critics like Masthi (preface to
'Nadaleele', 1980), Bendre's (1974) analysis of the stanza beginning 'Alakam mandara shunyam' and Kuvempu (1981) 'sarovarada sirigannadiyalli'. We need to concede that there were attempts at preserving the primacy of the text but the point being made here is that this was not a dominant strand within Navodaya criticism. In fact we find a stronger and more consistent manifestation of a feeble strand - i.e. criticism which attempts to link text and reader response - in the work of critics like TNS and A.R.Krishnashastri, which is submerged in the more dominant message-based strand within Navodaya.

4.5.2.2 Pragathisheela and Bandaya

Though these are two separate movements in KLC history, it is possible to consider the Pragathisheela and the Bandaya movements under one head for our review, as they share a lot of assumptions about the nature and function of literature. They have considerable common ground especially in their commitment to the cause of the exploited classes and castes; indeed, Giraddi Govindaraja has labelled (1981 : 14) the Bandaya movement as 'Navapragathisheela'. Because these movements consider literature as an instrument of social change, their focus in literary study is solely the truth value/message of the work, with no attention to form. In fact, formalist approaches to literature are equated with the 'art for art' movement and condemned as being esoteric and socially irrelevant. Their preoccupation with literature
as message makes the thrust of their approach essentially extrinsic - interpreting and evaluating the text from their predetermined concerns. Such an approach tends to impose its own reading against the evidence in the text and so, a 'close reading' of the text often becomes inconvenient. As a result any objectification of response becomes impossible. In short, largely this approach is content to comment on the work and the world thereby undermining the uniqueness of the text and the individuality of the reader.

Interestingly, these two schools share another feature. While one can find a substantial body of creative writing, especially in the Bandaya school which has enriched the potential of Kannada literature by dealing with hitherto unexplored themes and preoccupations, the same abundance is not seen in their literary critical writing. In fact there is no critic worth noting in the Pragathisheela school and the Bandaya criticism is still emerging. Even when we empathise and share with the Bandaya school the common goal of raising the awareness of readers/learners through literature, the means envisaged are radically different and hence the incompatibility between the Bandaya approach and the approach implicit in this thesis. Given this situation and the fact that their approach to literature is extrinsic, the two movements do not offer much in our
search for a discourse-based approach to literary study.

4.6 Discourse-based approaches (FORM-based)
As we have already mentioned even though Widdowson considers only stylistics to be a discourse-based approach which attempts to integrate linguistic code and literary meaning, there are a few attempts within criticism which qualify to be included within this set. It is possible that some of these approaches have not used the word 'discourse' to define literature; nevertheless they have been implicitly operating with the notion that text and message are inseparable in literature, that form is content. For instance, while New Critics used the word 'form' (formal, formalist) to denote this notion, the Structuralists used the word 'structure' to refer to the totality of the literary text.

4.6.1 Kannada
4.6.1.1 Dhvani school
Modern KLC drew extensively from both Sanskrit poetics and ELC in the early part of this century when it had to chart a course for its own development. Hence it is of interest to see if we have any support for a discourse notion of literature within Sanskrit poetics.

The Sanskrit rhetors have divided vakmaya' (speech) into three categories: The Vedas in which sound is more important than sense (shabda pradhana); the shastras or analytic
disciplines in which the meaning is dominant (arthapradhana) and kavya (literature) in which the 'Rasa' or 'literary experience' created by the interplay of form and denotative meaning is most important. Significantly, another word for literature in Sanskrit is 'sahitya' and Bhamaha defines literature as "shabdardhau sahithau kavyam". Explaining the close interdependence of form and meaning that is implied in this definition TNS writes

(3) "There is no meaning without the word and the word does not exist without meaning. The two are interdependent. In poetic appreciation we do not perceive the word and the meaning separately. Our undivided consciousness perceives it in its entirety" (1968 : 156).

Further TNS provides a translation of Kunthaka's commentary on this issue:

(4) "A combination of word and meaning results in poetry. It is paradoxical to say that two entities combine to produce an integral whole. All that is intended is that neither a beautiful word nor a charming idea by itself is capable of becoming poetic. Poetry is born when a beautiful signifier and a beautiful signified merge into one another" (ibid : 156-7).

Although this was the view of literature that the various schools in Sanskrit poetics accepted in theory, the critical practice of these schools does not always reflect this
theoretical principle. We have already discussed how the early Alankara school is a linguistic approach. But the Dhvani school which followed comes closer to our notion of literary discourse in practice as well. The Dhvani theorists did not reject their predecessor's work; they provided a larger perspective in which the notion of Dhvani subsumed the notion of Alankara. The Dhvani theorists held that the aim of literature was to provide 'Āsanubhava' and that Rasa was the soul of poetry. They posited that this soul/essence can be realized only through the body of the work, the particular way in which language functions in literature to express the unique experience of the writer.

(5) "The founder of the Dhvani school brought to light the fact that the 'word' in poetry possesses a unique power, when he declared that the suggested meaning, though unstated, is the essence of poetry. In this view, both the word and its literal meaning form the outer layer of poetry while the suggested meaning forms the essence" (ibid : 51).

TNS defines Dhvani thus:

(6) "Dhvani in poetry is the suggested meaning which is of primary and paramount importance" (ibid).

He sums up the Dhvani theory as follows:
(7) "Rasa is the soul of poetry. Dhvani is the means by which the body of poetry expresses Rasa. Ouchithya is the coherence between the body and soul. Rasa-Dhvani-Ouchithya form the cornerstones of poetry" (ibid: 55).

Thus we see within the Dhvani school a preoccupation with the processes of interpretation by concentrating on the entire form of the work.

4.6.1.2 TNS

A similar pre-occupation can be found in the work of early critics like TNS and A.R. Krishnashastry who were working within the predominantly message-based Navodaya criticism. Let us consider the work of TNS who best represents this submerged track within Navodaya. His magnum opus 'Bharathiya Kavya Meemamse' (1968) was not merely a well researched, authentic delineation of the history of Sanskrit poetics. It was also an attempt to look for some theoretical base for the new criticism that was emerging. So it is possible to argue that TNS implicitly adopted the theoretical standpoint of Sanskrit poetics in his own criticism. When we study TNS as a literary theorist, we see that he has not written much on his own theory of literature except in rare articles such as 'Sannakatheyalli Vasthavikatheya athana'. Therefore we can turn to some of the critiques of individual texts he has attempted in order to infer his literary theory from his critical practice.
The bulk of his criticism follows closely the dominant trend of his day which produced introductory, descriptive criticism. This fact is widely commented upon by TNS's critics (Krishnamurthy 1975, Seshagiri Rao 1975 and Narayana 1984a). Yet within that limit, TNS gave much more importance to the text than other critics: just a quantitative assessment shows that the number of lines quoted from various texts in any given article is higher than what one can find in the other critics. Further, his handling of quotations is even qualitatively different. For example, compare Kuvempu's essay 'Sarovarada Sirigannadiyalli' (1981) with TNS's 'Munneru mundagi' (1970). While Kuvempu quotes the stanza and provides a competing prose version of the stanza, TNS provides an analysis of how he could derive a more convincing interpretation of the stanza based on a dialectal variation in the meaning of the word 'Munneeru'. One can see the beginnings of an objective basis in the handling of these critiques. In his essay on Gari (1958) for instance, he asserts that Bendre's early style which was highly Sanskritised and constrained by metrics (to the extent that form eclipses meaning) has made way for a more native, original and rich style. This does not remain a statement or an assertion as it would have with most of his contemporary critics, but translates itself into concrete textual evidence - TNS quotes actual stanzas from Bendre's early and later works to make his point.
What would be of immediate interest for us is his attention to the language of the text—the actual words, phrases, case markers, syntax, punctuation, etc. Consider his critique of Bendre's 'Ragarathi' (1958: 34-5). TNS interprets the word 'Kami' in the poem to mean a lover and develops his commentary using this meaning. But in the revised edition, he adds a footnote that his earlier interpretation was based on a misreading of the meaning of 'Kami' which in the Dharwar dialect refers to a female cat. Another example of TNS's language awareness can be seen in his comments on Ranna's stanza in which the word 'Kanda' is used. TNS points out (1968: 291) how the poet even when he had the choice of using 'Putra' or 'Duryodhana' uses 'Kanda' in order to lend greater emotional support to the 'Karunarasa' evoked by that part of the work. Here TNS is juxtaposing the word used in the poem against other available words in the language code to show what is gained by using the one that the poet has. This kind of critical work which bases itself on demonstrable textual data and describes how exactly the poem produces the kinds of effects that are felt by the reader is crucially relevant to our search for a discourse-based view of literary study.

This is not to deny the fact that TNS's work had its limitations. One cannot but agree with critics like G.H. Naik (private communication, 1985) and Narayana (1984a)
that TNS's framework suffers in that it deals only with parts of a work and not the whole work in its entirety; it concentrates more on the linguistic aspect and does not extend to the discoursal aspects; it confines its data base to the genre of poetry thereby ignoring major genres like fiction and drama. These, in addition to TNS's personal bias for highly emotive content in the choice of texts have come in for comment. Nevertheless TNS's work which deals adequately with parts of longer texts; short discourses is still useful for a teacher of literature as text-books typically consist of short texts and extracts. Further the emotive elements which is highlighted in his work helps to establish rapport with students more easily than a purely statistical analysis of the content of the work. But we have to recognise the fact that in the context of a longer work and genres other than poetry, TNS's approach would be found wanting.

Thus what we have in TNS is not a holistic, full-fledged framework for the analysis of a literary text. We only see an implicit theory conducive for teaching and the seeds of an intrinsic approach to literary interpretation. In fact, in TNS, we see in embryo the notion of Practical Criticism (Prayogika Vimarsha) which was to become an established movement in KLC soon after. We see in his work most of the features associated with Practical Criticism
such as recourse to textual data, language-awareness and anti-impressionism. This feature of TNS's work has been commented upon by critics like Shivarudrappa and Narayana. Shivarudrappa (1976:100) for instance, writes

(8) "The illustrative material and the commentary that follow in TNS throughout the chapter titled Vyanjaka Samagrigalu resembles what is known as 'practical criticism' today".

In this way we see TNS, possibly on the inspiration of the Dhvani school of thought originating what was to remain a feeble strand in KLC. We see a continuation and development of this strand, both as a statement of theory and a framework for analysis in a more self-conscious way in the Navya school of criticism.

1.6.1.3 The Navya School

This movement originated in the early 1950s when writers like Gokak and Adiga made a self-conscious attempt to break away from the Navodaya preoccupations which did not seem immediately relevant and was found inadequate to express the new feeling/perception of the younger generation. So we find Gokak pleading for a new kind of writing that would reflect the changing thrust and interests of his time, in his lecture on 'Navyathe matthu Kavya Jeevana' in the 1950s. Adiga, reacting to the largely subjective and impressionistic criticism of the earlier school, argued
for a more objective, cerebral and text-centred criticism. Significantly both these writers were teachers of English literature who were deeply influenced by the New Critical movement in the West. The work of Richards, Leavis, Empson, Eliot and the New Critics, both from England and America, made a very deep impact on the Navya critics. Even though one can find the beginnings of the formalistic approach in TNS and ARK, the Navya movement gained its inspiration and impetus solely as a result of the influence of the New Critics.

Like their counterparts in ELC, the Navya critics succeeded in liberating the literary work from its creator and provided the text the primacy that it deserved. They argued that the meaning of a text has to be sought in the language of the text and declared that the literary text was an autonomous object free from the intentions of the writer once it was written. For these writers the medium was the message and they did not subscribe to the dichotomous view that separates meaning and form. It was for this reason that they consistently demanded a 'close reading' of the text which pays attention to the formal properties of the text.

For the first time in modern KLC we find a school of criticism which provides a strong, theoretical articulation and argument for the centrality of the literary text.
In the Navya school, we have a truly intrinsic approach to literature that begins from the text inductively. But unfortunately, what we find in their precept, we do not find in their practice. In spite of the avowed text-basedness and objectivity, the Navya practice of criticism is not free from being arbitrary and impressionistic. Even though they asserted that their criticism was formalist, because they did not have a basic framework to explain literature as a linguistic phenomenon and the consequent lack of an objective and adequate megalanguage to share their work, their practical criticism remains unsatisfactory. Predictably enough, this is a failure they shared with their ELC counterparts. But within limits, in the work of critics like M.G. Krishnamurthy, U.R. Ananthamurthy and G.H. Naik, we do find much sharper tools for analysing literature.

4.6.1.4 Post-Navya Writers

We have mentioned earlier that there have always been a few critics who have written outside the four recognized literary critical schools. In present-day KLC, alongside the more dominant Bandaya criticism, there is a separate stream of writing, best illustrated in the critical writings of K.V. Narayana, H.S. Raghavendra Rao, D.R. Nagaraj, G. Rajashekar, K. Ram. Nagaraja and K.V. Thirumalesh, among others. I have labelled this stream 'post-Navya' as it is distinct from the Navya school even while sharing some of the basic
precepts of Navya criticism. Like the Navya writers, these critics have also adopted an essentially intrinsic approach to the literary text in that they also take the text as a starting point. They posit that the text is realized only through its form, through its linguistic structure, and argue therefore that the analysis of this text is the first step in any criticism. Consider this statement by Raghavendra Rao (1981: 114)

(9) "It is my opinion that all that a critic does is an honest exploration of the possibilities expressed in the body of the poem".

Further these post-Navya writers characterize most of past KLC as basically deductive in nature and argue explicitly and strongly against an extrinsic approach which attempts to locate the meaning of the work in disciplines/pheno-

mena extraneous to the literary text. Arguing against of the use/criticism to substantiate/express a worldview, Raghavendra Rao writes (ibid: 4)

(10) "In view of the foregoing discussion, it becomes clear that the idea of using literature to teach a particular ideology involves a blantant rejection of its literary nature. This tendency reduces the various dimensions of literary language, finally rendering it uni-
dimensional".

Questioning the deductive mode of functioning which believes in entering the work with a pre-determined literary thesis,
often borrowed haphazardly from other disciplines like Psychology or Sociology, Narayana (1983) posits:

\[ (11) \text{"But is not possible that our literary works contain within themselves the intellectual framework necessary for their analysis? Then the critic will not enter a literary work armed with the ideas borrowed from other fields of knowledge. On the contrary, he will perceive an intellectual universe within the work. Then his discussions will be confined to an analysis of the nature and authenticity of the ideas formulated within the text"} \ (\text{ibid : 5}). \]

What is of particular interest for us is that, unlike the Navya writers, we find a much more adequate and successful attempt here at putting into practice what they have expounded in theory. We also see a certain preoccupation among most of these writers with using the tools and the metalanguage that stylistics and Sanskrit poetics offer. Equally we see them continuing within KLC frameworks. We can find numerous practical critiques of poems in various collections of articles, journals, felicitation volumes (e.g. \textit{Ili}du \textit{Baa Thayi} (1977) on Bendre and \textit{Chandana} (1972) on K.S.Narasimhaswamy). But more interestingly we find, in addition, very adequate analysis of other genres and longer discourse such as
short stories (e.g. Narayana 1984c on Subbanna) epics (e.g. Rajashekar 1982 on Yashodhara Charithe) and novels (e.g. Nagaraja 1985 on Chikaveerarajendra or Raghavendra Rao 1981 on Shikari). We find parallel attempts at analysing shorter poems using tools from linguistics and stylistics as in Bhat (1983), Thirumalesh (1986), Hegde (1977) and Desai (1980). Thus the post-Navya writers have attempted to go beyond the Navya practice of criticism.

What emerges from this review of KLC is that, by and large, message-based approaches constitute the bulk of KLC. However, parallel to this dominant strand within KLC runs a more feeble strand of critical work which can be described as 'discourse-based'. While the origins of this strand can be found in the Dhvani theory, we can find a continuation of this stream in the work of TNS, the Navya school and the post-Navya writing. Because we have argued that the discourse-based approaches have more value for pedagogy and because this is a submerged strand within the Kannada context, we will take this set of approaches for deeper discussion in the next chapter.

4.6.2 English

While discourse-based approaches are found within the heterogenous body of literary criticism alone in the Kannada context, both linguistics and criticism offer
approaches which can be included under this category in
the English context. Applied linguistic research has very
faithfully reflected the advances within main-stream
linguistics. While early work in stylistics was content
to simply describe the linguistic features of the literary
text, later work has taken into account the immediate
context of the text (in keeping with the shift within
linguistics from purely descriptive linguistics to socio-
linguistics with its preoccupation with the 'context of
situation', of language use) and extended itself to inter-
preting the literary text. Hence Widdowson classifies
this later work in stylistics as discourse-based. Thus
while stylistics has been a contribution to literary study
from linguistics, literary criticism in the West offers
two schools viz. New Criticism and Structuralism which
can be included in our list of discourse-based approaches.

4.6.2.1 Stylistics

There is no question that the stylistic approach considers
the text as primary. With the linguist's preoccupation
with data, it is but natural that the literary text has
always been the centre of attention here. There is no
doubt that the stylistic approach is intrinsic. In fact
what has been questioned is that it remains just that,
content to provide a neutral description of the linguistic
aspects of the literary text. Realizing this problem,
later work in stylistics has attempted to relate description and interpretation in the analysis of literary texts. In some ways it is possible to view stylistics as beginning where New Criticism ends as it purports to relate form and function within a text. Further, as Widdowson has already convincingly made out a case for describing stylistics as an integrated approach that views literature as discourse, we can reserve a closer examination of this subject for the next chapter.

4.6.2.2 **New Criticism**

The most important aspects of this school of criticism have already been mentioned in the context of discussing the Navya school. This movement originated in Britain and America in the early decades of this century, in opposition to the older criticism which had largely concerned itself with knowledge extraneous to the work. The New Critics proposed that the work of art is autonomous and therefore it should not be judged by criteria beyond itself. Hence they argued that the work should be subjected to a close analytic reading without drawing on any corpus of information—biographical, sociological, psychological or historical—outside the work.

Their view of literature was monistic in that they did not believe in the distinction between form and content, that literary texts can be understood as messages wrapped in
emotions or as meanings decorated with imagery. They believed that the artist intuits his object/message in and through his medium. To quote Brooks (1968 : 173) "The poem, if it be a true poem is a simulacrum of reality ... by being an experience rather than any mere statement about experience or any mere abstraction from experience."

Given this perception of literature, it was natural that they argued for an intrinsic approach, a formalist criticism, which considered the literary text as essentially unique.

4.6.2.3 Structuralism

Scholars working in this area have acknowledged the problem of defining 'structuralism' on the basis of the word 'structure' and instead have proposed that it is best described as the name of a particular intellectual movement centred round the work of a few major figures in France, among whom the most important is Roland Barthes. Barthes himself defined 'structuralism' as a mode of analysing cultural artefacts that originates in the methods of linguistics. Explaining the linguistic foundations of Structuralism, Culler (1983) writes that structuralism, which views various phenomena as the products of underlying systems of rules, takes from linguistics two cardinal principles. They are "that signifying entities do not have essences but are defined by networks of relations, both internal and external, and that to account for signifying phenomena is to describe the system of norms that
makes them possible" (ibid: 79). Thus this method does not seek support in historical antecedents or causes but concentrates on the structure and significance of particular objects or phenomena by relating them to the larger system within which they function.

Even though the structuralists share with the New Critics a preoccupation with the literary work as an icon and hence an intrinsic approach to the text, they also went beyond the New Critics. Accepting the New Critical tenet that the text should be free from intentional fallacy, they probed further about the role of the reader in the context of reading and interpreting literature, thereby providing a most explicit and strong theoretical articulation of the nature of literary discourse. A deeper discussion of the views of the structuralist tradition will be taken up in the next chapter.

4.7 Summary

In this chapter we have attempted (i) to review the recent applied linguistic research on reading to arrive at a general definition of the reading process and (ii) to examine existing approaches to literary study in Kannada and English to determine how far they meet the requirements of this definition. We find many points of convergence among the three major fields we have reviewed, viz. Literary Criticism, Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, on major issues such as the definition
of reading as an interactive process, the dynamic and determining role of the reader and the nature of textual meaning.

Our review has shown that in the Kannada literary context, the feeble strand represented by the Dhvani school, the work of TNS, the Navya and the post-Navya schools come closest to a discoursal perspective on literature. In the English context, recent trends in stylistics, structuralism and New Criticism hold promise for a full-fledged discourse-based approach to literary study. In the next chapter we shall explore more deeply the processes of meaning-making implicit in these discourse-based approaches in Kannada and English.
(1) ಮೊದಲ ಚವಿ ಗೆಲ್ಲಲಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು, ಅನೇಕವೇಳೆಲ್ಲದೂ ಭೌಗೋಳಿಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಾಂಶ, ಅರು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಾಂಗಡಿಯನ್ನು (ತರುಂಬಾರಿ 1968: 43)

(2) ಇತರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮೂಲ, ಎಂಬತ್ತಿ ಮಂಜುನಾಡಿ ತಾಜಾ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಶುಲ್ಕ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ (ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿ 1985:1)

(3) ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಜೊತೆಯೇ, ಅರು ಕಾಲ್ಪನಿಕ ಅಂಶ ಕಡಿಮೆ. ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸದ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳಕು ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಂಗಳು ಸಹ ಹೇಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಗೆಲ್ಲಲಾಗಿದೆ, ಆದರೆ ಪರ್ಯಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಹೊಂದಿಕೆ (ತರುಂಬಾರಿ 1968:156)

(4) ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಜನರು, ವಸ್ತು ವರಾರು ವಿಭಾಗದೊಂದಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದುವರೆದಾಗ ಮುಂದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲಸದ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹ್ರಾಜಗೆ ತಯಾರಿಸಿರುವ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗೆಲ್ಲಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾಜಾ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತಾಜಾ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೊಂದಿಕೆಯಾಗಲು ಹೊಂದಿಕೆಯಾಗಲು ಹೊಂದಿಕೆಯಾಗಲು (ತರುಂಬಾರಿ : 156-7)

(5) ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಸಾರಿಯಾದ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಾಮನೇ ಹೊಳಪು ನಿರ್ದೇಶಾಂಶ ಸಹಾಯ ಗೆಲ್ಲಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟು ನಿರ್ದೇಶಾಂಶ ಗೆಲ್ಲಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟು ನಿರ್ದೇಶಾಂಶ ಗೆಲ್ಲಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟು ನಿರ್ದೇಶಾಂಶ ಗೆಲ್ಲಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. (ತರುಂಬಾರಿ : 51)

(6) ... ಚಿತ್ರದಿಂದ ಕಾಲ್ಪನಿಕ ಅವಸ್ಥಾಗಿರಿನ ಬೆಳಕು ರೂಪವಿದ್ದು ಅನೇಕಗಳು ಹಾಗೂ ಅನೇಕಾರು ಹಾಗೂ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹಾಗೂ (ತರುಂಬಾರಿ)

(7) ಚಿತ್ರದ ವಿಕಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಮಾ, ನಾಮ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಿಷ್೦ವು ತಮ್ಮ ವರಾರು, ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಚಿತ್ರದ ಇತಿಹಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಅದರ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯೆ (ತರುಂಬಾರಿ : 55)
(8) "ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುಧೀರ ರಾಮಾಯಂತೆ ಅವಿಶ್ವಸಿತವಾದ ಇತರರು ಉಳಿದುಕೊಂಡರು ಸಾರು ದೃಶ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಿಂದ, ಅನಂತರವಾಗಿ ಸೂರಾಳ ಅಥವಾ ಮೋಹಿ, ಸಾಲು ಲಾಭ ಸ್ವಯಂಭೂತವಾದ ಮಾರಾಟದ ತುದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಸಮರ್ಥಿಸಿತು. (ಧರ್ಮಾಂಗಿ 1976:100)

(9) ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೊಳ್ಳುವ ಹೊರಗಿಜನರು ಹಾಗು ಹೊರಗಿಜನರು ವ್ಯಾಪಕವಾಗುವ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಹೊರಗಿಜನರು ಅವರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಹೊರಗಿಜನರು. (ಧರ್ಮಾಂಗಿ 1981:114)

(10) "... ದೇವರುಗಳು ಕಾಕೆಯು ಲೋಪದ ಕ್ಯಾಲೇಬರಿ ಯುದ್ಧವಿಜಯವನ್ನು ಶ್ರೇಢಿಸುತ್ತಾನು ಆತನು ಮಡಿ ತಾನಿಗೆ ಯುದ್ಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಪ್ಪಿಯಾನು. ಸರ್ವತ್ತೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿ ಅಲ್ಲದೇ ವನ್ನು ಆತನ ಯುದ್ಧದಲ್ಲಿ ವೈಶ್ರಾಮ್ಯವಾಗಿದ್ದಾನು. ಕೂಡಲ್ಲೇ ಅನುಯಾಯಿ unidimensional ಅನು ಮ್ಯಾಂಗೋರಾಗೇಬೆ. ( ಧರ್ಮಾಂಗಿ 198:4)

(11) ಅಥವೆ, ಸರ್ವತ್ತೇ ವೈಸ್ರಾಮ್ಯ ಬಿಡುವುದು ಮುಂದುವರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಗಳು ಬಂತು ಮುಂದುವರಿಯ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಗಳು ಅಂತಾದನರು ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯದು. ಅಂತ ಸರ್ವತ್ತೇ ವೈಸ್ರಾಮ್ಯ ಬಿಡುವುದು ಬಳಿ ಕೆಲಸರಿಗೆ ವೈಸ್ರಾಮ್ಯಗಳು ಸಂಭವಿಸುವ ಅಥವಾ ವೈಸ್ರಾಮ್ಯಗಳು ನಿತ್ಯವೊಮೆ ಸಿಗೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಅಥವಾ ಸಂಭವಿಸುವಾಗಿ, ಕೂಡಲ್ಲೇ ವೈಸ್ರಾಮ್ಯಗಳು ಬಂತು ಮುಂದುವರಿ ವೈಸ್ರಾಮ್ಯಗಳು ಸಂಭವಿಸುವುದು ಎರಡುಸೇರಿದ್ದ್ಯಾಗಿದ್ದು (ಧರ್ಮಾಂಗಿ 1983:5)