INTRODUCTION

Kannada is one of the major Dravidian languages. It is the regional language of the present Karnataka which is officially called as the Mysore State. As per the 1961 census there are roughly about 1,540,000 Kannada speakers spread over a vast area in the Western half of South India.

The two dialects of Kannada, chosen here for comparison, the Mysore dialect and the Dharwar dialect, show considerable differences. The Mysore dialect is the dialect spoken in the old Mysore State. In particular it is the dialect spoken in the Mysore, Mandya, Hassan, Tumkur and Bangalore districts, as my informants come from those districts only. The Dharwar dialect is the dialect spoken in the Belgam Bijapur and Dharwar districts. As the cities of Mysore and Dharwar form the cultural centres of the two areas respectively, their names have been given to the dialects. The Mysore and the Dharwar areas, situated in the Southern most and the northern most ports, have their own history. The following paragraphs try to give the geographical, political, historical and socio-religious backgrounds of the whole of Karnataka with particular reference to these two areas.

1. The Census figures are not yet available.
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONOLOGY</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORPHOPHONEMICS</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORPHOLOGY — THE NOUN</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORPHOLOGY — THE VERB</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDECLINABLES</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DERIVATION — THE NOUN</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DERIVATION — THE VERB</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNTAX</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE TEXT</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD LIST</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

Geographically Karnataka is in the Western half of South India. It has the Maharashtra State in the north, Andhra and Madras States in the east and Kerala in the south. In the west there is the Arabian Sea.

Within Karnataka, in the southern part, the river Kavery flows from west to east. In the northern part, similarly, the river Krishna flows from west to east. And in the middle, dividing the country into two halves, North and South, the river Tungabhadra flows from west to east. This geographical division of the country into North and South has been a prominent factor in the political division of the country for centuries. Similarly the coastal districts, Mangalore and Karwar, on account of the Western Ghats running through them, have been cut off not only from the rest of the country but also between themselves. This separation is so great that the Karwar district is called North Canara and the Mangalore district is called South Canara. Thus Karnataka can be divided into three major divisions:

(a) the coastal districts called the North and South Canaras.
(b) North Karnataka towards the north of the river Tungabhadra,
(c) South Karnataka towards the south of the river Tungabhadra.

POLITICAL BACKGROUND

Politically Karnataka, that is, the New Mysore State, is divided into 19 districts of which before the Reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis in 1956:

(a) Bidar, Gulbarga and Raichur were in the Hyderabad State and were together called as the Hyderabad Karnataka.
(b) Belgaum, Bijapur, Dharwar and Karnar districts were in the Bombay State and were together called as the Bombay Karnataka.
(c) Mangalore and Bellary were in the Madras State.
(d) Mercara was a separate State called Coorg.
(e) The rest of the nine districts, Bangalore, Mysore, Mandya, Hassan, Chikmagalur, Shimoga, Chitrardurga, Tumkur and Kolar were in the old Mysore State.

Thus, before the Reorganisation of States, Karnataka was divided into five parts under Bombay, Hyderabad, Mysore, Madras and Coorg.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The history of Karnatka may be said to start from about the 3rd century B.C. Asokan inscriptions in-

(a) Maski a village about 46 miles from Raichur,
(b) Siddapura in Chitradurga district
(c) Erragudi, near Cutti of Anantapura district (which is now in Andhra Pradesh), indicate that these parts of South India were at least well populated during the time of Asoka.

This is supported by other evidences also. It appears from Mahāvamsa, a Buddhist chronicle, that Asoka sent Buddhist priests to Banavāsi and also to Mahishamandala which is identified by some scholars as the old Mysore State. Some scholars believe that the Mauryan Emperor Chandragupta accompanied the Jain monk Bhadrabāhu to Sravanabelgola and spent the last days of his life there. It is possible that some parts of Deccan, including Karnatka, were under the Mauryas. But historians are not certain about this.

2. 'Sravanabelgola Inscriptions, Second Edition PP 36-42
3. Karnatka Arasu Manetanagalu by R.S.Panchamukhi Ch. I.
That 'Karnataka' was a name applied to this region and that Kannada was probably a spoken language even as early as the beginning of the Christian era is also generally agreed. That there are references to 'Karnātaka' in works like Mahābhārata and Merckhakatika, a Sanskrit Drama assigned to about the 2nd century A.D. and that Kannada words are found in a Greek drama of the second century A.D. may be cited as some of the evidences. Reference to 'Kannada language' and 'Kannadigās' in 'Silappadigāram', a Tamil work assigned to the 2nd century A.D. also supports this.

The history of Karnataka is considerably well known from the period of the Shatavahanas. They ruled almost over the whole of Deccan from about 200 B.C. to 300 A.D. Opinions differ as to their identity. They might have been either Andhras or Karnātakās. No conclusive proofs are adduced in this regard. The Shatavahanas probably ruled over the whole of Karnātaka and the Gūtus of the Śētakarnī family were ruling at Banvāsī as feudatories of the Shatavahanās.

4. History of Kannada language by R.N. P. 48
6. History of Kannada language by R.N. P. 48
The Kadambās of Benaṉāsi succeeded the Shātavāhanās. They reigned from about 300 A.D. to about 570 A.D. Their sway was practically unchallenged in the northern part of Karnātaka.8

Almost contemporaneously with the Kadambās, the Gangās of Talkād ruled in the southern part. Their rule, which started by about 350 A.D. lasted for about 650 years. Thus the Gangās of Talkād, along with the Nolamba and Bānās, kept the southern part of Karnātaka as a separate political unit, either independently or as feudatories, till the close of the 10th century A.D.

In the north, the Chālukya of Badāmi, who reigned from about 550 A.D. to about 757 A.D. succeeded the Kadambās.

The Chālukyas of Badāmi were, in turn, succeeded by the Rāshtrakūtās who reigned about the beginning of the 8th century A.D. till the close of the 10th century. It was during the time of the Rāshtrakūtās that the Gangās of Talkāc, who were ruling as independent kings in the South, became subordinate during the time of Būtuga in about 942 A.D.8

8. K.A.M. page 190
The Rāṣṭrakūṭas, in turn, were succeeded by the Chāḷukyās of Kalyāṇa in about 973 A.D., when the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, Karkara by name, was defeated by Tālā II. The Chāḷukyās of Kalyāṇa ruled from the 10th century A.D. to the 12th century A.D. During the time of Vikramaditya VI, the great Chāḷukyan king, who ruled from 1076 to 1128 A.D., the whole of Karnāṭaka came under a single sway for a short time only to break again into two halves, north and south, as the successors of Vikramaditya were very weak.

In the south, the Hoysalas of Halebidu or Dārasamudra built up an independent kingdom in the first decade of the 12th century, i.e. by about 1108 A.D., and in the north the Yādavas of Dēvaṅgiri succeeded the Chāḷukyās. Both the Yādavas of Dēvaṅgiri and the Hoysalas were equally strong and they remained in power as contemporaries for a century and half. Towards the close of the 13th century, when the whole of Karnāṭaka was in a disunited and weakened condition by frequent mutual wars, the Mohammedans invaded from the north and within no time became masters of the whole of Deccan.

9. Ibid page 98
10. The Heritage of Karnataka by R.S. Mugasli Page 93.
The Muslim rule was well established under the five Bahamani kingdoms, Gulbarga, Bijapur, Bidar, Ahmadnagar and Golkonda. This covered the whole of North Karnataka. The south remained separate under different chieftans, who, very shortly afterwards, came under the rule of the rising Vijayanagar Empire, very willingly.

The Vijayanagar Empire was a direct result of the popular indignation against the Muslim rule and most of South India came under its banner willingly. But north Karnataka remained in the hands of the Bahamani kings throughout. There were frequent wars between the Muslim kings and Vijayanagar. Finally, after living a glorious life, for about two centuries (1336 to 1565 A.D.) the Vijayanagar Empire succumbed to the united efforts of the Bahamani kings in 1565 A.D.

By the time the Vijayanagar Empire had become weak, the Odysars of Mysore had gained strength in the south and soon became independent. Thus after the fall of the Vijayanagar Empire, while the North was yet under the Bahamani kings, the South became independent and remained separate under the Odysars of Mysore and practically remained as a separate State thereafter.
In the North the rising power of the Marathas under the able leadership of Shivaji, devoured one by one all the Bahamani kingdoms. Towards the close of 1800 A.D., under the Peshwas, the whole of North Karnataka was brought under the rule of the Marathas. The Muslims managed to gain strength again under the Nizam of Hyderabad. The French, the English and the Portuguese also came into the political picture. The history of South India in the 18th and 19th centuries was one of frequent wars among the Mysore kings, the Marathas and the Nizam of Hyderabad, in which, the European powers took very active parts. It is well known, how the English finally subjugated all.

The first to succumb was Mysore under Tippu's rule. Mysore was annexed to the British territories. But later, in about 1836 A.D., it was returned back to the legal inheritors of the Odeyar family, whom Tippu had overthrown. Since then, Mysore remained under the Odeyars as a separate state and remained so till the Reorganisation of States.

By the time Mysore went to the hands of the Odeyars, North Karnataka was divided between the Marathas and the Nizam of Hyderabad. The Nizam was the next to accept the suzerainty of the English.
He continued to rule as their subordinate. Thus the three districts of Hyderabad Karnatak remained under the Hyderabad State till the Reorganisation of States.

The Marāthās were, anyhow, the last to succumb under Pēshwa Bōji Rao II and their territory was brought under the Bombay province, directly administered by the British. Thus, the remaining four districts of North Karnātaka were under the Bombay State till the Reorganisation of States.

This, in brief, is the history of Karnātaka and it will be clear from the above that the North and the South of Karnātaka have remained throughout as separate political entities.
Even in religious and social developments, the two parts, the North and the South, show considerable differences. Till about the 8th century A.D. Jainism was the more flourishing religion all over South India, though Brâhminism and Buddhism existed side by side.

But in the 8th century the rise of Shankârâchârya gave an impetus to the growth of Brâhminism. As in other parts of India Brâhminism became quite prominent in the whole of Kârâtaka. Shankârâchârya taught the tenets of the Advârita Philosophy.

In the beginning of the 12th century Râmânujâchârya the founder the Srivaishnava sect of Brâhminism, came away from the Tamil country and obtained shelter under the Hoysala king Râddhâcva. Râmânuja influenced the king to a great extent and probably converted him, who was a follower of Jainism, into Srivaishnavism. Thus in the South, under the Hoysalâs, Srivaishnavism attracted many devotees while it was not even heard of in the North. Instead, in the North, there was quite a different movement. Almost contemporaneously with the growth of Srivaishnavism in the South, the great Basavanna revived Virashaivism in the North. The teachings of
Basavanna, on account of their universal appeal attracted devotees from all parts of Karnataka and North became the stronghold of the Vīraśaiva Philosophy.

In the 13th century, Madhvāchārya evolved the Dvaita doctrine and devotion to Viṣṇu. Even this sect acquired a considerable number of devotees from all parts of Karnataka. But its stronghold was again the South where devotion to Viṣṇu was already prominent by the influence of Rāmānuja Chārīya.

Later influence of Islam and Christianity have, of course, been similar in every part of India and it is not different in Karnataka. Thus, we see that North Karnataka has been, since the 12th century A.D., a stronghold of Vīraśaivism while the South has been one of Viṣṇavism.

Social developments in India have always been parallel to religious developments as religion forms the basis of society in India. It would probably be sufficient here only to state that even on the social level, including habits of food and dress, both the parts, North and South, show considerable differences.

Thus, from the preceding paragraphs, we get a rough idea of the history of the two dialect areas, Dharwar and Mysore, and that, to some extent explains the dialectal differences that exist between them.
Method Followed

A wholesale structural comparison of the dialects appeared to be rather a very difficult task in the beginning. I could not find any published work which could serve as a model. C. M. Doke's 'The Southern Bantu Languages' gave me a rough idea as to how a comparison of two languages could be presented. J. J. Chirwa's "Phonology of three Hindi dialects" showed me the lines on which I could make a beginning. Then I actually commenced my work I found it easier to proceed on the same lines. As I was comparing only two dialects it was easier to place the dots side by side for comparison. I am not quite sure that I have done a good job of it.

My original plan of the study was to collect material for each dialect and analyse them separately. I could do this only for phonology. For morphology and syntax I had to carry out collecting material, analysing them, and comparing them, simultaneously because of unavoidable reasons. I had neither the financial resources, nor the time to devote myself completely for this work. As such the work has been done piece meal as and when I could afford to work for it. As a result I feel that there are naturally some inconsistencies in my statements.
here and there. These could have been avoided if I could go back and check with the informants. But this is no more possible as the time limit for the submission of the thesis is up and also that I am away from the field. My only aim here has been to present the dialectal differences as clearly as possible.

Comparison of two dialects which are so very similar and which have the same literary standard as the ones compared here present a number of difficulties to the linguist.

First of all it is not very easy to obtain from the informant unbiased material, which is not biased towards the literary standard. He is always prone to give the literary forms and say that he used them in his speech. He would be shy and some times reluctant to give forms which are not found in the literary standard.

Besides relying on the information of the informants I have based my conclusions on extensive observations of the speakers and I have lived in different places of the Dharwar area for sufficiently long periods. My statements regarding the frequency of occurrence of some forms as well as phonemes are impressionistic statements based on my observations.
In analysing the material from both the dialects I have been mostly guided by the following two works:

1. Structure of Kannada by Dr. R.C. Hiremath, M.A., Ph.D. Professor and Head of the Department of Kannada, Karnataka University, Dharwar.

2. Outline of Colloquial Kannada by William Light, Sometime Junior Linguistic Scholar, Deccan College Postgraduate Research Institute, Poona.

I have freely made use of their methods of analysis and I am indebted to them very much. Of course, wherever I have erred I have done so on account of my inability to follow them clearly.