CHAPTER I
CURRENT AND HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE TEACHING OF KANNADA LITERATURE

Introduction
This chapter attempts to describe the Kannada Literature Teaching (KLT, from now on) situation in terms of its current practice as well as its historical development, from the point of view of the forces that have influenced it. In the first part of this chapter, a specific attempt has been made to examine various sources to construct a picture of KLT, using both the perceptions of teachers and the literature available on the KLT curriculum. The second part provides an account of the historical growth of KLT. In the absence of a readily available history of KLT, or of sources within KLT that could be used to recover this history, Kannada Literary Criticism (KLC, from now on) has been used as a major source of data in this reconstruction.

Sources
The first problem in describing the KLT situation is the absence of primary sources dealing with the subject directly and explicitly. There are only some stray articles and statements briefly touching upon the problem. This lack of explicit sources of data compelled me to devise certain unconventional ways of collecting
data for the research from more implicit and indirect sources. Though no public thinking was available in the form of published documents, some thought had been given to the problem by several practising teachers of Kannada literature, which was available only in private, oral channels. Various field methods were adopted to tap the insights and experience of these teachers.

**Questionnaire**

A formal questionnaire (Appendix A) consisting of questions on teaching a specific poem 'Belagu' by Bendre was prepared. This poem was chosen because it is prescribed by all the universities in Karnataka at some level or the other and would enable a large number of teachers to respond to the questions, basing it on their own experience of teaching the poem. The aim of the questionnaire was to draw a profile of KLT from the data of practising teachers. This questionnaire was published in the literary quarterly Ruluvathu (No.17, 1985) with the expectation that it would be read at least by college teachers. Since no responses to the questionnaire came in, copies were sent to a few individual teachers spread across Karnataka. In addition, a meeting of volunteer teachers of local colleges in Bangalore was organised and more copies were distributed. In spite of this only two teachers responded to the questionnaire.
1.2.2 **Private interviews**

Simultaneously, three teachers, recognised by the teaching community as committed and capable teachers of Kannada literature, were interviewed informally but at length. These private, informal, oral communications have provided a very authentic picture of KLT: an insider's view of the situation. Using this technique, it was possible to collect the kind of data which no amount of published research alone would have provided. Hence this thesis has had to use private communication as a legitimate source quite extensively.

1.2.3 **Classroom observation**

The teachers who were interviewed, allowed some of their lessons to be observed; this has helped me to get a 'feel' of the Kannada classroom at the undergraduate level.

1.2.4 **Published material**

Apart from copies of the syllabi, text-books and question papers of the various universities, one or two reports of seminars on the subject and a few public statements made in speeches or paper presentations in the literary criticism context also form another source of data.
1.2.5 Workshops
I was invited to attend two workshops; one on 'The Problems of KLT at the Degree Level' in November 1985 and the other on 'Restructuring the Pre-University Kannada Syllabus' in January 1986. Both these workshops have only confirmed and extended the data which had been collected through more informal channels.

The picture of KLT presented here has thus emerged from a collation and interpretation of these various sources of data.

1.3 Defining the subject area
It has been mentioned earlier that this thesis is concerned with the teaching of literature per se and not with the likely use of literature for language teaching purposes. A great deal of confusion still prevails about whether literature is being taught to foster the literary ability or the language ability of the learner. This confusion is reflected in the syllabus, teaching and evaluation at the school and Pre-University levels, in which 30% to 50% weightage is given to the testing of language skills. At the post-graduate level, on the other hand, the focus is more on teaching the discipline of literary criticism. So it seems that literature is taught for its own sake only in the
undergraduate classes. This fact comes through clearly in the following statement:

(1) "The study of language and the study of literature have always gone hand in hand in our general educational system. We cannot deny that Kannada literature is a part of learning the language. But while the learning of the language stops at a particular phase, the learning of literature continues. At that point the study of language and the study of literature become separate. This assumption underlies the current practice of not having a language component - either Kannada or English - for technical, medical and other professional courses" (Krishnaiah 1985 : 458).

The assumption that literature is taught at the degree level for teaching literary abilities alone is further corroborated when we examine the Kannada question papers in which there is no weightage for the language aspect. Therefore, the teaching of literature at the degree level is used as a case study to understand in some depth the problems of literature teaching at large.

**Survey**

We can begin our attempt at understanding the current KLT situation by looking at the three most crucial and necessarily interdependent aspects of teaching viz. the syllabus, method and evaluation.
To consider the syllabus first, any syllabus in our educational system is at best only a list of topics to be studied in an academic year and the undergraduate syllabus for Kannada literature is no exception. If we examine the Bangalore University undergraduate syllabus for 1985-86 (Appendix B), for instance, we find the following information: the level of students (I or II year, B.A./B.Sc., etc.), the number of papers, the number of teaching hours for each text; marks allotted to various topics within each paper. The main body of the syllabus provides details about the texts prescribed. Normally, poetry (an anthology or parts of it) and drama are prescribed for detailed study; fiction and discursive writing are meant for non-detailed study. Upto the Pre-University level, these texts are accompanied by very inadequate and sketchy supplementary material, mainly in the form of questions essentially testing the students' ability to paraphrase the text. But at the degree level, even this 'teaching aid' is absent. The appendix at the end of the syllabus provides a list of concepts/facts to be taught and a list of reference books. Given the prevailing conditions in which college teachers have no formal training in teaching, one could reasonably expect the syllabus to provide some clear guidelines about the objectives and methodology of teaching.
literature. But our syllabuses are essentially teaching-content syllabuses which exclude considerations of teaching method. Thus the syllabus, which is supposed to help the teacher to translate the rationale behind the syllabus into classroom terms, offers little more than the contents page of the text-books.

1.4.2 Method

When we proceed to the next aspect, viz. the method adopted to implement the syllabus in the undergraduate classes, we are in the dark as there are no descriptions of how literature is being taught or prescriptions about how it should be taught. We can get some documentary evidence about the teaching at the school level in the 'Teaching Methods' component of the TCH or B.Ed programmes. But at the college level, as the 'lecturers' are not required to have a teaching degree, we have no access to their principles or practices of teaching. However, the consensus that seems to emerge about the teaching at this level is that the teacher uses 'the lecture method'. If there are variations within the lecture mode, as there are bound to be, they are not recorded or discussed anywhere in the literature. So we have to admit that we do not know enough about what actually happens within the Kannada literature classroom.
1.4.3 Evaluation

We do not face this problem of lack of information when we turn to the evaluation system, because, the sole tool of evaluation - the exam question papers are available for scrutiny (Appendix C). These question papers are set for one hundred marks and are to be answered within three hours. Typically, the literature paper at the undergraduate level has the following break-up:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Type of question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Both short answers and medium length answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-detailed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fiction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 35% marks for the detailed texts is further divided into

- (a) text explication - 5
- (b) annotation - 6
- (c) short notes - 4
- (d) essay - 10 x 2

while the 15% marks for the non-detailed texts is earmarked entirely for just one essay question.
Though different types of questions are asked, the difference is only one of length or quantity. For instance, the difference between an annotation and an essay is merely one of length, as both expect from the students a knowledge of facts and the understanding of the text at a very literal level. So it is the marks allotted to the question which point to the expected length of an answer. Consider this example:

(2) Annotation: "Explain with reference to context any two of the following sentences:
e.g. 'Nee Heenga Nodabyada Nanna'"

3 marks

(3) Essay: "Comment on the merits of the poem 'Nee Heenga Nodabyada Nanna"

10 marks

In addition to evaluating the students' knowledge of textual facts, the questions focus only on the content of the literary text to the total exclusion of form. Though various genres of literature are represented in the syllabus, the differences between them are rendered inconsequential in testing. All the answers are bound to be factual paraphrases of the bare story-line of the text with no regard to its form or structure. The truth of this came home to me while looking through some II P.U.C answer scripts: students who had written
brilliant and original essays on given themes on a free composition task could not write half as well while answering questions based on the text. They were better than the others in their class only in that they provided more details around the episode/event they were asked to describe. But their answers to the textual questions were qualitatively no better; they were no more perceptive or critical than their less able peers. This reflects the vague, unfocussed and mechanical way in which questions are framed. Questions require students to 'explain', 'elaborate', 'depict', 'describe', 'summarise', 'consider', but the difference between these words is never made explicit. In the absence of clear instructions, examiners are content with answers that simply give the plot-line of the texts. Such a rendering of the original texts with fewer or more details is considered adequate even by many teachers, and so students are guided to provide such answers.

Another severe problem, which literature shares with other subject areas, is that these texts are entirely based on the students' ability to memorise. For instance, in the undergraduate paper, there is only a 5-mark question on the explication of a given text, the rest of the 95% is based on solely on how much a student remembers of what he has read. Thus our evaluation
system is more preoccupied with testing the learner's memory of facts, and their writing speed than their ability to read, understand, think and write intelligently and independently.

An analysis of the relationships between syllabus, method and evaluation

Having discussed the three important aspects of the teaching situation separately, we can now attempt to study the relationships between them, as it is in these interrelationships that the more problematic issues of the teaching begin to surface. Our survey has led to the observation that the syllabus only specifies the content of teaching, that there is no data on the methodology used and that the evaluation system is not satisfactory. But these findings by themselves do not reveal much. We have, for instance, no basis to explain our objection to a teaching-content syllabus or no yardstick to evaluate our evaluation system against. It is only when we realize the basic relationships between the syllabus and the evaluation system, for instance: that the examination is after all only a means to test the adequacy of the syllabus and the method, that we are able to point more precisely to the root of the problem.
This analysis reveals that there are two questions which the literature we have so far surveyed on the subject does not answer. They are: why should literature be taught? And how should it be taught? We can answer the second question about which method/approach to adopt to achieve the objectives only if we know the answer to the first question, viz, what the goals of literature teaching are.

Unfortunately, this fundamental issue of the objectives of a literary pedagogy has not been given the attention it merits. It is either considered too obvious for comment and hence left unstated, or, it is stated in terms that are unhelpful to teachers. None of the KLT syllabuses of the three major universities in Karnataka specify the objectives of its training programme. The few references to objectives which we find in the literature are vague and loosely-worded.

The confusion about whether literature is taught for language or literary purposes is reflected in the views expressed by two practising teachers from the same college during the November 1985 workshop on KLT.

(4) "We need to create in learners the interest to read Kannada literature deeply, widely and critically while exposing them to the more appealing parts of Old and Medieval Kannada literature" (Gopalakrishnaiah 1985).
As I understand it, the main goals of teaching Kannada are the competent use of the Kannada language in speech and writing, and literary appreciation (Raghavendra Rao 1985).

This lack of clarity in defining the objectives has forced teachers to interpret the terms in their own way, revealed in the phrase 'I understand' in the above quotation. Even two teachers in the same institution do not share the same perceptions about the goals of literature teaching. Even if we manage to cross this first-level hurdle and decide that our main goal is literary, we still have a problem. What we have as objectives for literature teaching are phrases like literary appreciation, literary sensibility, etc. whose content needs to be drawn out as they are not self-explanatory. The vague and loose use of these terms does not really help the teacher to convert these general notions into real, immediate and short-term classroom objectives.

In the absence of clearly stated objectives the evaluation system, which is only a means to assess the achievement of objectives, has become an end in itself. The rationale for selecting and teaching texts is geared to the requirements of the examination. Most teaching in the Kannada classroom takes the form of preparing
students for the end-of-the year exam. According to the current policy, the marks obtained in the language papers are not even considered for entrance to any advanced, professional course. Therefore the motivation to study literature seriously is naturally on the wane. There is neither extrinsic motivation, in the form of an examination which matters, nor intrinsic motivation which teachers could promote if they knew more clearly the function of literary study in the overall educational context.

1.5.1 Inadequacy of recent proposals for change

This dissatisfaction with the teaching situation has been felt by the Kannada teaching community and has found expression in various forums. Discussing Kannada teaching at the high school level, Hebbar writes

(6) "... education is reduced to transferring the contents of the teacher's notes to the learner's note-book and learning has come to be equated with acquiring the ability to answer examinations, today" (1985 : 24).

The frustration of the practising teacher's reality - that of facing unmotivated students on a routine basis - comes through most vividly in the following quotation:
"Classes which do not require the learners to be involved in the learning become an unbearable 'bore' to the teacher and the learners. Kannada teaching has become a Harikatha/Shivakatha discourse in which the students, who come to class for 'attendance', suffer these discourses in silence. They even manage to pass the examination with the help of market guides which provide answers to every question in the form of content summaries of the text" (Ramadas 1975:51)

Naik also writes about the Kannada teacher who needs to humour the students constantly to keep the class 'going':

"... one reaches the conclusion often that to be a successful teacher is to be a successful clown. ... On the whole, the prevailing situation is capable of debilitating the moral courage of teachers" (1975:88)

The teaching community, having perceived that their profession is problematic, has proposed varied solutions. Most of the suggestions seem to operate with the assumption that if only our text-books were 'better', teaching would not be problematic. In other words, it is perceived that the root of the problem lies in the selection and grading of the text-books prescribed. This line of thinking is quite dominant as revealed by the titles that are given to the small number of books and papers available on the subject. For example, consider 'Anti-life Stances in Text-books
'Kannada Text-books' or the description of the thrust of 'oregallu', a collection of seminar papers on Kannada texts as

(9) "This is a touchstone which puts to test our syllabus and text-books" (Renukaprasanna 1975 : 9).

Even at the November 1985 workshop on KLT, most of the fluent and ready discussions centred around the nature of change in the choice of text-books. The most concrete proof of this is the new text-book that was prepared for I Pre-University class at the January 1986 workshop. Even when the working group was given total freedom to restructure the entire syllabus, the nature of the change was limited to an alternate set of texts.

Yet another solution proposed focuses on reform in the present examination system. It is argued for instance that the essay-type question, because it does not adequately test the learner's grasp of the facts of the text and allows for subjective assessment, should be replaced by short-answer or multiple-choice questions (Thippeswamy 1975 : 85). Here again the assumption is that the problems of KLT are due to the problems in the examination system.

These proposals for solving the problem do not consider the problem in its entirety; instead they take an atomistic, piece-meal approach and suggest that the
malady lies in one aspect or another. Even as a critique of any one aspect they are not penetrative enough; for instance, critiques of the syllabus restrict themselves to a critique of the content and do not consider it necessary to focus on problems of methodology, which is arguably as important as content in syllabus design. Most of these suggestions overlook the fact that the problems of KLT arise because many fundamental issue are left unquestioned within the community; instead, they gloss over the issue by pointing to the more obvious aspects, often aspects which can be reformed once the basic questions are raised and answered.

Though a majority of teachers subscribe to this atomistic solution, a few others have attempted to go beyond the obvious to examine what is in fact the root of the problem. Naik (1975) for example, argues initially that the most obvious culprit is the committee in charge of text-books, which operates with arbitrary principles. However, he hastens to add,

(10) "But because we do not have the system of prescribing text-books against the background of a principled pedagogic base, we cannot blame the text-book selection committee alone for the present state of affairs" (ibid : 89)

While Naik points out the lack of a principled basis for text-book selection, Ramadas goes a step further when he writes
(11) "We do not have a definite framework pertaining to the content and methodology of Kannada studies at various levels, starting from the primary to the post-graduate levels. However Kannada studies have been going on based on some general precepts and unformalised procedures passed on from generation to generation" (emphasis added) (1975 : 47-8)

Based on all these candid accounts of teachers' experience, we can conclude that there is at present no coherent theory for the teaching of literature in the first language. In the absence of a theory and of any formal training (even if of doubtful value), a major question is how have teachers coped with their problems all these decades. Generations of teachers could not possibly have functioned without some theory, even if only implicitly and unselfconsciously. What have been their aims in teaching? What have been their models? The last quotation seems to provide the clue to the answer. Ramadas suggests that all of present-day teaching has been sustained by following the 'beaten track' i.e., by teachers trying to approximate their teaching to the teaching that they had themselves received as students. This suggestion was intuitively appealing and the possibility was confirmed further in informal discussions with various teachers.

To understand the current model/models of teaching we need to study the tradition of teaching which has come into being
after Kannada became a subject of study in University education. Further this study, apart from answering the question of the how of KLT, may also help us to look for an answer to the why of KLT. In other words, it is just possible that we might be able to infer what the teachers are able to achieve (i.e., their hidden objectives) using the models they do. Such a study necessitates a historical perspective on KLT.

1.6 A Historical perspective on KLT

1.6.1 Aim of this survey

The aim of the historical study at this point is not to recreate chronologically the sequence of events with facts and figures, as such a study is worthy of being a separate research project. The purpose of our study is to trace present-day KLT to its origins and build up a picture of the tradition of Kannada teaching, tracing only the broad contours of its development. Here again we face the same problem of lack of sources such as a history of KLT, records reports on major changes, policies, etc. In the absence of such usable data, this study has had to reconstruct a profile of the tradition of Kannada teaching, using quite indirect sources, suggested by the 'informants' of this research, i.e., practising teachers

1.6.2 Background

Kannada literature was introduced as a subject of study at the school level in general education around the 1850s.
Twenty years later Madras and Bombay universities included Kannada studies in their intermediate and B.A., courses. The status of Kannada studies was further enhanced when Mysore University started its post-graduate programme in Kannada in the 1920s.

Over this period, one can discover two major influences on KLT: The Pundit Approach and modern KLC. While the Pundit Approach held sway for roughly one half of this period, modern Kannada criticism started establishing itself as a dominant model in the 1930s. While the Pundit Approach was gradually receding to the background, the B.Ed. method of teaching was promoted as the sanctioned model for KLT at the school level. But for reasons to be later discussed, the B.Ed. method has had little impact on KLT and hence we can still argue that the Pundit Approach and KLC have been the most dominant influences on KLT. It is necessary to bear in mind that KLT has not grown as a unified, monolithic structure across space and time. While KLC has wielded more influence on teaching in the Bangalore-Mysore area it has had to fight a stiffer and longer battle in the Bombay Karnataka, Hyderabad Karnataka, and Madras area, where the Pundit Approach had deeper roots. Thus it should be possible for us to see varied, complex and heterogenous models of teaching in any random cross-section of the teaching situation even today.
1.7 The Pundit Approach

1.7.1 A definition

The term 'Pundit Approach' derives from the word 'Pundit' in Sanskrit which means 'scholar'. Gundappa describes the ancient Pundit model as follows:

(12) "Traditional scholarship was characterized by these features: complete and systematic knowledge of an ancient discipline coupled with knowledge of academic disciplines such as Sanskrit grammar and literature, wide reading and an ability to quote from involved texts; and the brilliant oratory that results when all these features come together" (1973: 83).

He contrasts this notion of the Pundit with the more recent use and writes:

(13) "Though the word 'Pundit' has very noble connotations in our ancient scriptures like the Bhagavadgeetha, in the current context it refers to a particular profession. 'Pundits' are those who teach the literary texts of either Sanskrit or one of the vernacular languages like Kannada" (ibid: 82).

1.7.2 Origins of the Pundit Approach

Much before KLT gained a place in the general education system, Kannada literature was taught in Mutts and Pathashalas, under the patronage respectively of religious priests and the Royalty. The Pundit model is thus
associated with the pedagogic system followed in these Kannada Pathashalas, which in turn modelled themselves closely on the lines of the Sanskrit Pathashala system.

Though the Pundit Approach drew extensively from Sanskrit teaching and Sanskrit poetics, it is not a consolidation and practical working out of the literary theories that Sanskrit poetics put forward. It seems to have drawn more from the early Alankara Prasthana, which views literature only as an exemplification of language use without considering its larger context, and not so much from the later Dhvani school. Also, when the Pundit Approach was forced to go beyond text explication and interpret regional Kannada texts, essentially religious in nature, it had to rely on non-literary sources for its commentary such as those provided by the heads of religious institutions.

In addition, literature was not considered an autonomous subject worthy of independent study in the older system of education. As in the Middle ages in Western history, even in the Indian context literature was seen as a means for a discussion of logic and philosophy on the one hand, and for the study of poetics and grammar, on the other.
1.7.3 Decline of the Pundit Approach

When Kannada studies were introduced in Mysore University teachers trained in Pundit schools started teaching literature even at the M.A. level. It was only when subsequent generations of students graduated and started teaching that the Pundits receded to the background. In the meanwhile under the Maharaja's continued patronage the Pundit school continued to produce more Pundits. It came as a big boost to the Pundits when the Karnataka Government recognising their degree as valid, fixed them on a scale within the service giving them all the benefits that Government employees receive.

Addressing a congregation of Pundits in 1940, Gundappa analyses the socio-economic reasons for the gradual degeneration of the Pundit school. With the introduction of general education, a great many Pundits competed for the posts of teachers and accepted very low salaries in contrast to teachers of other subject areas like English or Science who were fewer and so demanded higher salaries. Gradually when urbanisation increased with the attendant material comforts, Pundits also felt the need for this upward social mobility but found salaries too low to provide for their needs. And so

(14) "While a Vedic way of life, characterized by other-worldliness was on the decline, materialism started its ascent. Dedication towards scholarship decreased while the search for patronage increased" (Gundappa 1973: 84).
Further, Gundappa argues that the Old-world scholarship, dilutely perpetuated by the Pundit school was seen as irrelevant to the changed times and to modern, liberal education. Also because of the new and exciting developments becoming available in all fields through English education, the stagnant Pundit scholarship was found to be particularly unattractive. Gundappa attributes this degeneration to yet another sociological factor following from wider opportunities for education becoming available to all castes of people. He complains of falling standards even within the Pundit school.

The turn of the century brought a significant cultural upheaval, influenced by Western liberal thought and education. Comparisons of English literature with ours had begun by this time. In the light of this experience the Pundit Approach was found too 'Punditic', limited and narrow. Consider, for instance, the claim made in the following quotation from D.L. Narasimhachar, himself working with a Pundit model, in the preface to his work *Pampa Bharatha Deepike* (1971):

(15) "I believe that this commentary is going to render some assistance to the sophisticated students of this work and other lay readers. This commentary is constructed quite elaborately explaining every word in the text. Various source materials such as grammar, prosody, annotated references, etymological
discussions, original sources etc are dealt with in sufficient detail”
(ibid : xiii-xiv)

This claim is borne out in the actual commentary he provides as can be seen in the illustration given in Appendix D. Every single word/phrase in the stanza is identified and glossed for its specific meaning and often the etymology of the words are also traced. The assumption here seems to be that understanding the meaning of individual words in isolation precedes interpretation. Therefore the total meaning/experience of the stanza is never the focus of the study. If understanding one stanza involves this level of dissection and analysis, we can imagine the magnitude of the effort required to appreciate the entire work.

It is easy to understand why modern KLC, which explored new forms, new attitudes and thus captured the spirit of the renaissance, managed to fight the stronghold of the Pundit model and forge itself as an alternate movement. This tension between the two influences is recorded in the literature in the work of M.R.Srinivasamurthy (1922), quoted by Mitra (1975 : 3):

(16) “In the absence of an adequate way of studying poetry and appreciating poets, the pursuit of literary appreciation has become problematic. Added to this, the modern critics who claim to be broad-minded as a result of their Western
education, are setting themselves up against the Pundits who follow traditional mores and this has made the function of literary criticism very complex".

The inadequacy of the Pundit model in the emerging university set-up is pointed out by Narayana:

(17) "KLC took on a new responsibility when the tradition of Kannada studies began in an organised way at the university. ... (then) it was found necessary to go beyond parsing and summarising texts which were the conventional practices of KLC" (1984a : 1)

In addition, the political climate of the time was favourable to the new movement. The struggle against colonial rule had created a new self-consciousness, a certain quickening of the national spirit, all of which is reflected in the creative writing of the period. The criticism of the time kept pace with the new awakening by reviving Indian values, ancient literature and philosophy on the one hand and justifying the new writing on the other. In this changed context, it is not surprising that the Pundit Approach, which involved a micro-level analysis, was found inadequate to handle the enormity of the upheaval at a macro-level.

Another significant fact is that the renaissance movement originated in the Mysore area, the cultural and political
capital of the State, ruled by a patron of the arts.

Hence the movement swiftly gained momentum as a prestigious one. Further facilities for dissemination of ideas, such as the opening of the first post-graduate programme in Kannada studies in Mysore, publication of journals like Prabuddha Karnataka and Jaya Karnataka provided an added impetus to the growing movement and helped to establish it as a major alternative to the centuries-old Pundit Approach.

**Kannada literary criticism**

It is common knowledge that the literature teaching and learning community is the major consumer of critics' evaluations. Teachers of literature have always used the insights, interpretations and critical tools of critics in their teaching. Kannada criticism is widely used by teachers in two ways: one, the available criticism on particular texts is used mostly and maximally for the opinions it offers on these texts; Masthi's comments on Bendre's poem 'Belagu', or T.N.Srikantaiah's comments on 'Muvatthamurukoti', another Bendre poem, are standard comments quoted (parroted) by most teachers, passing it on as a legacy for future teachers; two, rarely and only minimally, the method behind a critic's opinions is used in the classroom as a tool for interpreting a given text.

In this aspect literature teaching in the Kannada context is no different from literature teaching in the context of other languages.
1.8.1 The dynamic relationship between KLT and KLC

Though most literature teaching is based on the critical writing prevalent at the time, KLT is probably exceptional in that it shares a reversed relationship with KLC in that it is not a simple, one-sided, KLC→KLT phenomenon. KLC and KLT, till very recently shared a very dynamic, complex, cyclic and mutually-dependent relationship with each other, which can be represented as KLC↔KLT. As a result of this, they have largely evolved and grown in a uniform manner and in the same direction. Because of this mirror-image relationship between them, we can use KLC materials to reconstruct the history of KLT. What is even more interesting is that KLC has been an offshoot of a bilingual, bili- terary teaching situation. Both the teaching of Kannada and the teaching of English literature have influenced the evolution of KLC. The influence of English literature teaching has been both direct and indirect in that most critics, being either students or teachers of English literature, have used the English literary critical model in their own criticism which eventually fed back into teaching. The Navodaya model, scanning three decades 1910-1940 (this division is not very authentic as the Navodaya model is still in use, suggesting that various schools within KLC seem to co-exist. This division only indicates that the movement was at its peak during this period) has played a crucial role in determining the inherent structures of both KLC and KLT.
We may first consider the socio-cultural context of the times which resulted in KLT sharing a mirror-image relationship with KLC. The 1920s and 1930s were a transitory period of assimilation and growth for KLC. All the critics of the time without exception had their base in Sanskrit poetics. Their English education had exposed them to the Western philosophy, rhetoric and criticism of the late nineteenth century. Most of them were creative writers themselves. Further, all of them with a few exceptions were themselves teachers of literature, either Kannada or English or both. More often than not, they were writer, critic and teacher all in one. Thus literature teaching was one of the major influences on KLC among others such as Western philosophy and criticism, English literature teaching, Sanskrit poetics and their own creative writing.

But it was the literature classroom which provided the immediate context and impetus for their literary critical writing. This is reflected in the fact that most Kannada criticism published at this time consisted of critiques of classics in poetry and drama prescribed for the B.A. and M.A. courses. B.M. Srikantaiah, T.N. Srikantaiah, A.R. Krishnashastry, D.L. Narasimhachar wrote on Shakespeare, Greek tragedy and Pampa because they had started teaching...
these texts in the classroom. Without a culture of seminars and conferences, the classroom probably became a forum for thinking and formalising their thoughts on specific texts or writers, which were finally written up and published as critiques in literary magazines like *Prabuddha Karnataka*, a practice which continues to this day.

In addition to providing a context for critical writing and setting a pace for it (since various texts had to be dealt with in the class), KLT also forced KLC to become more rigorous. KLC when it began evolving, was content to make available general literary theories from Western poetics and Sanskrit poetics as in D.V.Gundappa's 'Jeevana Soundarya Matthu Sahitya' for instance. Yet another kind of writing was the justificatory criticism which creative writers like Masti and Govinda Pai wrote in defence of the new creative writing they did. But with the introduction of various texts from medieval and contemporary English and Kannada literatures, KLC was obliged to explain their inclusion in the syllabus, and to interpret and evaluate these texts. While Sanskrit poetics was useful for their theoretical discussions, KLC could not see it as a very useful practical, analytical tool except for the micro-analysis that the Pundit Approach could provide. But the pedantic Pundit Approach had become anathema to most critics by then.
The influence of Western literary criticism on KLC

The situation described above resulted in KLC being influenced by English Literary Criticism (ELC) indirectly through English Literature Teaching. Exposure to English literature and critical tools, both as students and teachers, enabled these critics to use these as productive tools in their own criticism. So they turned to the Western critical model then available in India, as represented by the work of Saintsbury, Bradley, Hudson, Carlyle and others (private communication, M.V. Seetharamaiah 1985; Giraddi Govindaraj 1984). A curious fact about this period is that the Navodaya critics were not influenced by their contemporaries writing in English like Eliot, Richards or Leavis. Krishnamurthy (1975) and Amur (1982) have raised this issue. But the explanation seems fairly simple. Even till as late as the early 1950s, only one copy of Eliot's 'Tradition and Individual Talent' was available in Bangalore (Sheshagiri Rao 1975: 13) though it was a prescribed text. The two world wars had made books and publications current in the West inaccessible to the Indian readership.

We can now examine the nature of the influence that the English literary critical model wielded on the KLC approach to individual literary texts. Categories such as plot, characterization, the story-line paraphrased-
features of this trend, were used to make sense of texts. This resulted in a macro-level analysis of the text, which led to a more secular and liberating outlook. This approach was truly introductory and descriptive, interspersed with a few laudatory remarks. The critics attempted to recreate for the ordinary reader the joy that they themselves had experienced while reading the text. Krishnamurthy (1975) comments on this feature of their work:

(18) "Because of the notion of literary criticism as a 'pl"asure trip' that a sensitive reader undertakes in the beauteous landscapes created by the poetic genius, the practice of paraphrasing and describing the poem, interspersing it with a few critical remarks must have taken root. ... The desire to share with other readers their own experience of the work (possibly in their anxiety that the readers may not experience the poem on their own) led to the bulk of descriptive criticism that dominated KLC" (ibid : 217-8).

This critical model concentrated mainly on the thematic content of the work and its effect on the individual reader-critic who merely described this effect. Krishnamurthy points to another feature of this criticism:

(19) "Even when the Sanskrit rhetors had been operating on the premise that literature is essentially a linguistic phenomenon, the Navodaya critics did not pay attention to the use of language in literary works (ibid : 219)."
and attributes it to the prevalent model of English criticism as represented by Hudson, Bradley and others.

In their zest for creating an extensive readership for Kannada literature, probably justifiable at the time, these teachers and critics accepted this model of textual criticism which provided short cuts to the text. Basically this model offers an oversimplified, thematic, descriptive and introductory approach to the text which resulted in the creation of 'substitute-texts'. These texts made access to the original text more easy by paraphrasing it in modern Kannada prose whatever be the genre or period of the original.

1.8.3 Reasons for the dominance of the Navodaya model

Having traced the origins of the Navodaya model of text criticism to English criticism, and having described this model, we can now try to understand why this brand of Navodaya criticism has had such a longlasting and predominant impact on both KLC and KLT.

To do this, we need to draw up a profile of the span of the last six or seven decades. The movement of the schools, based on major movements recognised within KFC, is convenience of argumentation. It is possible to question the equation of certain critics with certain schools, but this is not an attempt to place individual critics within the KLC tradition, but a survey done for heuristic purposes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navodaya</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.H.Srikantaiah</td>
<td>A.K.Krishnashastri</td>
<td>P.T.Narasimhachar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.V.Rangananda</td>
<td>T.S.Venkannaiah</td>
<td>D.V.Gundappa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.N.Murthy Rao</td>
<td>Kuvempu</td>
<td>Masthi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.K.Gokak</td>
<td>V.Seetharamaiah</td>
<td>Basavanal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.L.Narasimhachar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T.N.Srikantaiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G.S.Shivarudrappa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bendre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.V.Seetharamaiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G.P.Rajathatham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragathisheela</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.Ananthanarayana</td>
<td>A.Na.Kri.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ta.Ra.Su</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niranjana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navya</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gopalakrishna Adiga</td>
<td>G.H.Naik</td>
<td>K.S.Nissar Ahmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.R.Ananthamurthy</td>
<td>H.M.Channaiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.G.Krishnamurthy</td>
<td>G.S.Siddalingaiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajeev Taranath</td>
<td>N.S.L.Bhatta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Lankesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatindra Nadig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.Kurthakoti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giradi Govindaraj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.S.Amur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.Shantinath Desai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.G.Raghava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bandaya</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polanki Ramamurthy</td>
<td>D.R.Nagaraj</td>
<td>Thejaswi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baraguru Ramachandrappa</td>
<td>Kalgudi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.K.Manipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.S.Seshagiri Rao</td>
<td>H.M.Nayak</td>
<td>S.L.Bairappa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.P.Mokashi</td>
<td>K.V.Rajagopal</td>
<td>Gowrish Kaikini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.K.Ramanujan</td>
<td>C.Kambar</td>
<td>G.Karnad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Damodara Rao</td>
<td>K.I.Ram.Nagaraj</td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.V.Thirumalesh</td>
<td>V.M.Inamdar</td>
<td>G.Rajashekar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.L.N.Swamy</td>
<td>H.S.Raghavendra Rao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.P.Ashoka</td>
<td>K.V.Naryana</td>
<td>S.Diwakar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satynath</td>
<td>Sathyanarayana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Vijaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarvamangala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.P.Bhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Chidanandamurthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.S.Venkateshamurthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table highlights these facts about the KLC context:

(a) KLC is dominated by critics who are teachers, of either Kannada or English literature/language. In fact the ratio of teaching critics to non-teaching critics is approximately 3:1 (54 : 14)

(b) KLC has developed in a bilingual, biliterary context, as can be seen in the ratio of English literature teaching critics to Kannada literature teaching critics which is nearly 1:1 (25 : 29).

(c) After the Navodaya movement, we see a noticeable number of non-teaching critics only in the last decade.

(d) While we see a ratio of 1:2 critics teaching English and Kannada in the Navodaya school (4 : 9), we find that in the Navya school there is a predominance (nearly 3 : 1) of English teaching critics (11 : 4).

(e) It is only within the Pragathisheela school that the ratio of non-teaching critics is higher to teaching critics (3 : 2)

The question before us now is: Why does the Navodaya approach to the literary text continue to dominate teaching and criticism after all these decades and after three major literary movements have taken place? We have discussed earlier that the Navodaya period was one of swift transition
and therefore the critics/teachers of the time had to find immediate answers to pressing problems. The problem that confronted the teachers then was how to deal with a literary text and they found their solution in the ELC model. This is not to say that all of them made use of this approach uniformly; there were variations here as well and we can see the two ends of the spectrum in T.N. Srikantaiah's approach to text and K.V. Puttappa's. But it was the brand of Navodaya work best represented by Puttappa that had a predominant influence.

The Pragathisheela movement which followed the Navodaya school was a non-university, left-oriented movement and understandably, we do not see any academicians (most of them salaried servants of the government) participating in it. Predictably the movement did not contribute significantly to literary criticism or teaching, though its contribution to creative writing, particularly to the novel is considerable.

The Navodaya model faced a genuine threat within KLC when the Navya school started establishing itself. Most of the heated debates in the history of KLC surround the confrontation of these two schools and their assumptions. In spite of it, within the KLT context the Navya school despite its sound theoretical base and able critics could not make much impact. This is probably because of the predominance of English teaching critics over the Kannada
teaching ones in the Navya school. It seems strange that ELT/ELC, a creative and unifying factor which benefitted the Kannada literary world in the Navodaya movement turned out to be a dividing and unproductive influence just thirty years later, during the Navya movement. Within this span, the Kannada departments had become independent of English departments; the English influence had been assimilated, and accepted into the Kannada fold and had become an orthodoxy in KLC and KLT. The need to revise this orthodoxy was not felt and therefore the Navya school, which had the potential of a competing model, was rejected totally as a 'borrowed', 'imported' movement from the West. The small number of Navya critics who teach Kannada literature in these departments, thus, have not been able to make much impact on KLT, by and large.

Like the Pragathisheela school, the Bandaya school also does not pose a challenge to the Navodaya model's essential structure. In fact it has managed to accommodate itself within this larger paradigm. While the basic approach to a text remains the same, what does differ is the content of the opinion or interpretation. So typically we find that a paraphrased version of the text is followed by a leftist, Marxist interpretation which more often than not remains unrelated to the text.

It is only in the last decade that we see a whole generation of critics who are non-teachers. Also it is only
now that we find many critics who are writing from outside the mainstream of the literary critical movements. This has, to some extent, distorted the mirror-image relationship that KLC had with KLT all these long years and now KLC is trying to develop in a direction away from KLT.

But KLT itself has not been able to break away from the stubborn structures of the Navodaya model. It is possible to ask how a small group of teaching critics could have influenced teaching across 4-5 decades? But we realize that this is exactly what happened when we consider the overall KLT situation:

(a) Most of the critics writing in the Navodaya period were teaching in prestigious colleges in Mysore and Bangalore. Given that there was only one postgraduate centre for literature, in Mysore, for a long time, these teachers-cum-critics influenced students who later themselves became teachers and carried on the tradition.

(b) It is a curious fact that, by and large, the teaching critics have been more influential than the non-teaching ones. Even though Bendre was a teacher for a while, he did not pursue it as a profession. He is better known for his creative writing than his critical writing, even when he has written *Sahityada Virat Swarupa*, a bulky collection and wrote more insightfully than many of his contemporaries. Narayana has this explanation:
"It is clear that his theory of literature did not grow to be a tradition of literary thinking with any following. The fact that Bendre did not have the facility of disseminating his ideas in the growing context of university teaching, unlike the critics belonging to the Old Mysore area, must have (in the main) contributed to this" (1984b : 23).

(c) In the absence of any formal training in teaching at the college level, teachers probably modelled themselves, consciously or not, on the teachers they admired in these colleges.

(d) Given that the Pundit Approach was dying and no other alternative influence such as Stylistics was available, KLC became the only source that teachers could fall back upon. Thus in the face of very inadequate supplementary materials on prescribed texts, whatever was published in KLC on these texts became the source material for interested teachers.

As a result of this complex interaction between KLT and KLC, the two activities of teaching and criticism have become practically indistinguishable. Essentially what happens in the bulk of our criticism and in a good majority of literature classrooms is the same. While in criticism the critic provides his opinions to the readers in the outside world, in teaching the teacher provides opinions, often borrowed from critics, to the student.
Thus there is a certain collapsing, a conflation of the teaching and the critical models, which are two related but essentially disparate enterprises. As we have already shown, the Navodaya brand of descriptive criticism was accepted both by KLC and KLT as the dominant one.

8.4 Problems with the Navodaya model

Discussing this kind of descriptive critical model in the context of critical work written on Kuvempu's works, Narayana (1980b: 156-7) outlines some of its advantages and disadvantages. Even though such criticism tends to reduce the suggested meaning of a text to a literal one, it might be of help in drawing a reader to a work. This might be acceptable when literature is in its infancy and the readership needs to be shown what to look for. But if it continues as a critical orthodoxy, without any historic inevitability, this model becomes unproductive. Experience has shown that, more often than not, most of this criticism is taken to be a substitute for reading the text. This offsets the claimed advantage that this model helps in extending a writer's readership, by obviating the need to read the work at all.

Yet another problem with such criticism is its inability to create and sustain a critical debate. If the aim is merely to describe the text in modern prose, then there
is no scope for another such work as it can only be repetitive. We do find a considerable amount of criticism in Kannada commenting on the same aspect/situation in a work. As Narayana rightly points out (ibid), various critiques of the same work are desirable, but it is useless when they also say the same things, which renders the enterprise of literary criticism static. This can be seen in the present situation in which most of this descriptive criticism is produced by teachers teaching these texts and by students who have grasped the text through these teachers. Thus these students, when they write criticism, not only choose descriptive criticism as their model, but also often adopt the same stand, only attempting to express it in their own words. KLC by not creating, through KLT, a productive readership which could question established literary opinion and thus contribute to the growth of criticism, has not only rendered KLT impoverished, but has pre-empted its own development. Hence Kurthakoti's assessment (1983: 419-23) made in the 1960s, that KLC has not evolved as an indigenous, full-fledged discipline, still holds as a description of current KLC.

1.9 The B.Ed method of teaching Kannada literature

As mentioned earlier, the B.Ed 'Methods' curriculum provided for KLT at the school level an officially sanctioned alternative to the Pundit approach. The
review of this method is based on a study of books which are used by training colleges and are fairly typical of this line of work (Ramana 1979, Krishnappa 1972, Krishna 1984, Anantharamu 1983).

What is most striking about these books is the uniformity in their approach to literature teaching - a brief glance at the 'contents' page reveals this fact. They have modelled themselves on similar books in English on 'Teaching Methods' for both first language and second language texts. They even quote the same writers. The same trend is seen in their methodology. All of them reject the Pundit approach as it involves analysis and parsing. For instance, consider this quotation (21) "The 'Atomistic Method' of teaching poetry can be characterized by the practice of breaking the poem into smaller units, interpreting every word, translating the poem into prose and thereby teaching the learners the gist of the poem. This practice is followed by untrained teachers who are unaware of the correct way of teaching the language. As this practice follows the traditional Pundit model, the essence of the poem is lost, thereby defeating the very purpose of teaching poetry" (Ramana 1979: 207).

This sentiment is faithfully echoed by the other four writers. For instance, expressing the same idea Anantharamu writes
(22) "A flower, in order to be appreciated, has to remain a whole. Similarly, a poem has to be seen as a whole to enjoy and appreciate the feelings of the poet. Hence a method which negates the essence of the poem by parsing and paraphrasing its meaning is not worthy of emulation" (1983 : 95)

and interestingly for us, quotes (ibid) from A. Haddow, (The Teaching of Poetry) "Parts are not be examined till the whole has been surveyed; ... A close approach shows the smaller niceties but the beauty of the whole is discerned no longer". This quotation is interesting in that it demonstrates the point made earlier in the thesis that ELT has made a deep impact on Kannada teaching. While KLT at the school level was widely influenced by the teaching of English literature in British schools, with its preference for an affective rather than an analytical base, KLT at the advanced levels was influenced by English literature teaching, which in its turn was heavily dependent on the prevailing Georgian English literary criticism.

This uniformity of approach among these various writers, denies the heterogeneity and variety that occurs in actual practice. It shows that these approaches are essentially prescriptive and bookish; even these prescriptions are borrowed from Western sources. This explains
to a very large extent the wide gap between theory and practice in our situation. The B.Ed 'Methods' component is considered by most trainees as a theoretical content area to be studied for the examination. The practical working out of this theory in the Teaching Practice sessions is only an exercise in producing and following a 'lesson plan', so rigid and inflexible that it does not make allowances for the human factor in any classroom. So, naturally, most teachers view 'Methods' as a necessary evil in the context of their training programme as well as later, when their lessons are 'observed' by a school inspector. Thus our training programmes have not helped teachers to cope with the reality of teaching a Kannada class. The report of the Central Institute of Indian Language's (CIIL 1977 : 20) on 'The Gap between Teacher Competence and Curricular Demands-Karnataka, A case study', which examines the TCH and B.Ed syllabuses for Kannada teaching, attributes the gap more specifically to "the gap between teacher's competence in terms of his professional preparation and the contents which he has to teach". This finding has been further strengthened in my own experience as a teacher-trainer.

Given this idealized, alienated nature of B.Ed 'Methods divorced from the untidy reality of the classroom and 'grafted on' (as it is not a result of a true exploration
of indigenous sources), it is not surprising that this approach has not become a competing model to KLC in the context of KLT. Given that this model has not been internalised as a teaching model, but only 'suffered' during training, it will be interesting to determine the model that has been actually internalised for use in the classroom.

It is my conjecture that the KLC influence has percolated into the teaching at the school level, where teachers, in order to qualify need a basic graduate degree and a degree in education. It is just possible, given a near-defunct model like the Pundit Approach or a near-pseudo model like the one advocated on B.Ed training programmes, that these teachers have modelled themselves on their teachers of Kannada literature at the college level, thereby causing the percolation of a model meant for higher levels into lower levels in the educational system.

1.10 Summary
We set out to conduct this historical survey to throw light on the current KLT situation, by recovering the origins of the dominant approach which a majority of today's teachers seem to be using. This survey has established that KLT, both at the school and at the college levels, first came under the influence of the
Pundit Approach and then gradually assimilated the features of KLC. Though there is an officially-advocated methodology offered during the B.Ed/TCH training programme, we have argued that KLC is still the more deep-rooted, subconsciously internalised model for teaching. We have further shown how KLC itself has not been a unified, homogenous edifice and have argued that the Navodaya model of KLC has been the most dominant influence on the bulk of KLT.

Having characterized current KLT as being predominantly based on the Navodaya model of KLC, we shall attempt to understand the nature and limitations of this model in KLT in the next chapter.
Chapter 1: Name

(1) 

(2) 

(3) 

(4) 

(5) 

(6)
(7) ಮಾರುತ್ತಾರು ಅನುಥತ್ರ, ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರೂ ಅನು ಸಂಘಟನಾ ಸ್ಮರಣಾಯಿತು
ಮಾರುತ್ತಾರು ಅಂತಾರು ಮಕ್ರಿಯೆಶಾದಿ. ಕಾಣದಯ ಮಳೆಯಂದ ಹೀಗೆ ತಾಣವು ಸಮಾವೇಶಸಾಗಿಸಿದ, ಮಾರುತ್ತಾರು ಅನು attendance
ಮಾರುತ್ತಾರು ಅವರು ಸೇವಿಸಿದ, ಸಂಘಟನಾ ಹಿಂದೇಶವನ್ನು
ಬಯಲಿಸಿದನು ಸಸ್ಯಾಧಾರಣ ಚಿತ್ರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಾರುತ್ತಾರು
ಎಂದು ಮನುಷ್ಯರು ಕರೆಯಿತು ಸಂಘ ಹೋಲುವವರು. ಓದುವ ಮುಂದಿಂದ
ಕುಭಿಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಸೇವಿಸುತ್ತಾರು. ಮಾರುತ್ತಾರು
(ಸಂಘಟನೆ 1975: 51)

(8) ಸಂಘಟನೆಯಾದರೆ ಅಪ್ರಮಾರ್ಧಿತಕರಿಗೆ ಸೇವಿಸಲು ಸಂಘಟನಾ ಅನುಸಂಧಾನ-
ಅಂತಾರು ಹೆಸರುವುದಾದೆ ಹೆಸರುವುದಾದೆ... ಸಂಘಟನೆ, ಅಪ್ರಮಾರ್ಧಿತಕರಿಗೆ
ಯೂರುಬಾಕ್ಕರು ಸಾರಿಯೇ ಹಿಂದೇ ಅಂತಾರು... (ಸಂಘಟನೆ 1975: 88)

(9) ಸಂಘಟನೆಯಾದರೆ, ಸಂಘಟನೆಯಾದರೆ ನೆನ್ನಿ ಹೆಸರುವುದಾದೆ... ಅನು (ಸಂಘಟನೆ 1975: 9)

(10) ಸಂಘಟನೆಯಾದರೆ ಹೊಸ ಸಂಘಟನಾ ಸಮಾಜವು ನೆನ್ನಿ ಹೊಸಾಗಿರುವುದೇನು

(11) ಸಂಘಟನೆಯಾದರೆ ನೆನ್ನಿ ಹೊಸ ಸಂಘಟನಾ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ
ಸಂಘಟನಾಗಿ ಕರೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದೇ ಸಂಘಟನಾಗಿ ಸೇವಿಸಲು ಸಂಘಟನಾಗಿ. ಒಬ್ಬರು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಾರಾಟದ, ಒಬ್ಬರು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಾರಾಟದ, ಸಂಘಟನಾಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಅತ್ಯಂತ
ಮಾರಾಟದೆಂದರೆ ಸಂಘಟನಾಗಿ ಸೇವಿಸಿದ್ದು ಸಂಘಟನೆಯಾದರು. ಸಂಘಟನೆಯಾದರು
(ಸಂಘಟನೆ 1975: 47-8)
(12)  ನಂತರ ಹೋಗಿರುವ ಚಲ್ಲಿನ ನೈಸರ್ಗಿಕ ಮಾರುಕತೆ -
 ಸತ್ಯ ಕವಿ, ಅನೇಕ ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಹೊಲ್ಸ್ಟ್ರಾ ಧರ್ಮ ತಪ್ಪು ನಿಧಾನ, ಮಹೇಶ್ವರ ಕುಮಾರಾಭದ್ರ, ಜಗನ್ಮಂಡಲದ ಪ್ರಭಾತಪುರ ತಾಲೂಕಿನ - ಅ ಸಂದರ್ಶಕರು ಸಮೂಹದ ಬಂದರಾಜ್ಯದ (ಅಂತರ್ 1971:43)

(13) ಮೂರನೇಯ ಅವಳ ಸ್ತ್ರೀಕಾಮ "ಹಾಡು" ಚಟುವ ಅಡುಗೆ ಬುದಿ ಪಾಲಿಯನ್ನು ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಕೃತಿ, ಎಂಬುದು ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಅದ್ಯಯಾಕಾರಮೇ ಮಾತ್ರ -
 ಸಮಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮುದಾಯದ ಹಾಡುಗಳು. " ಹಾಡುದ್ರೈ " ಸಾಧನ ಮಂಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಅದ್ಯಯಾಕಾರಮೇ ಸಮಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಹಾಡುಗಳು ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದರು. (ಎಡ : 82).

(14) ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಾರ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ, ಸೂತ್ರ ಗಿಡೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿಭಾಗದ ತಾಳೊಮೂಲಾತ್ಮಕ
 ಆಧಾರಾಧಾರದ ದೃಶ್ಯ (ಡೆಡ : 84)

(15) ಅವಳ ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಅದ್ಯಯಾಕಾರ ಮೂಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂಲಕ್ಕೆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಲಿದರು.
 ಅವಳ ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಹಾಡುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಾನಾಗಿ ಸಾಧಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.
 ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಕೃತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ರಾಜಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಕೃತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅದ್ಯಯಾಕಾರವಾಯಿತು.
 ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ, ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಹಾಡುಗಳು ಸಮಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಹಾಡುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದ್ಯಯಾಕಾರ ಸಮಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಹಾಡುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದ್ಯಯಾಕಾರ ಸಮಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿ (ಸಾಧನ ಶ್ರೇಣಿ 1971 : 67).

(16) ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಹಾಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡ ಸಮಾಮುಖ ಮಾರ್ಗವಾಗಿ ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಮಾಮುಖ ಮಾರ್ಗವಾಗಿ ಸಮಾಮುಖ ಸಮೇತ ಚಾಲುಚಾಲಿಯಾದ ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಆಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವಳ ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಸಹಾಯ ಸೇವೆಯ ಚಾಲು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಸೂಚಿಸಿದರು ಆಧಾರಾಧಾರದ ಆಡಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು. (ಎಡ : 1922).

(17) ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಡುಗಳ ಸಮಾಮುಖವನ್ನು
 ಮೂಲಕ ಆವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ, ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧನವನ್ನು ಮೂಲಕ ಆವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ.
(18) "" ಧೇಮಕ ಅವರು ನಂಬರ್ ಎಸ್ಸೆ ಮರಾದಂತೆ ನಟ್ಟು ಕೂಡಿದ್ದು ಸಹ ಕರೆಯಲು ವಾಸನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು ಪೂರ್ವಾಲ ತಿನ್ನುವುದು" ಎಂದು ಸೇರುವುದು ನೋಡಿದ್ದರು. ಅದರ ಅಂತಿಮ ಅಂಶಗಳು ' ದುರ್ಬಲತೆ ' ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂತರ್ಗತವಾಗಿ ತಿನ್ನುವುದು ಮಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಮಾಡುವ ಹೂದಿವುಳ್ಳ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಒಮ್ಮೆ ಸಾಮನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪುಸ್ತಕವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಲು ಸಿಳದಿದ್ದರು.

(19) ನಾವು ಪುಸ್ತಕವು ಮತ್ತು ಮೂಲಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗುವ ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯಲು ಇರ್ಜಿ ವಿಶೇಷಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದು. ಸಾಮಾಗ್ರಿಕ ಸಹಾಯದಿಂದ ಸಾಧನಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕು. ನಂಬಾರೆ ಪುಸ್ತಕವಾಗಿ ಮೂಲಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ತಿನ್ನಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಫಲಿತ ವಿಶೇಷಗಳು ಅಂಕಿಸಿದ್ದು ಸಹಾಯೀಯ ಸಂಬಂಧವನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಸಿದ್ದು. (ಭವನಾದಾ 1975: 217-8)

(20) ... ಒಂದು ನಾವು ದೇಶದ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮೇಲೆ ನಡೆದಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಳಕ್ಕೆ ಮಹತ್ವದ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಗಳು. ಇವುಗಳಿರುವಂಥ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾದ್ದು. ನಂಬಾರೆ ಪುಸ್ತಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಲೇ ಕ್ರಿಯೆಯುಳ್ಳದ್ದು ಅನುಕ್ರಮವಾದ ಅದರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಸಿದ್ದು. (ರಾಜಾಮೋಹನ 1984ಯ: 28)

(21) ಬಹುಮುಖವಲ್ಲಿ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಮೂಲಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದ ಅಂಗಗಳನ್ನು, ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಮೇಲೆ, ನಂಬಾರೆ ಪ್ರತಿಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಸಹಾಯಿಸಲು ಮೂಲಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದ ಸಾರಾಂಶಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲವ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಹಾಯ ಸೇವೆ.
( 1983:86 წლის 22 სექტემბერი )  ""..""
( 1979:20 წლის 27 სექტემბერი )  "".."
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