Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation

Dr. Meti Mallikarjun

==

Abstract

This paper explores the sociolinguistic struggles and conflicts that have taken place in the context of confrontation between Kannada and Sanskrit. As a result, the dichotomy of the "enlightened" Sanskrit and "unenlightened" Kannada has emerged among Sanskrit-oriented scholars and philologists. This process of creating an asymmetrical relationship between Sanskrit and Kannada can be observed throughout the formation of the Kannada intellectual world. This constructed dichotomy impacted the Kannada world in such a way that without the intellectual resource of Sanskrit, the development of the Kannada intellectual world is considered quite impossible. This affirms that Sanskrit is inevitable for Kannada in every respect of its sociocultural and philosophical formations. This is a very simple contention, and consequently, Kannada has been suffering from "inferiority" both in the cultural and philosophical development contexts.

In spite of the contributions of Prakrit and Pali languages towards Indian cultural history, the Indian cultural past is directly connected to and by and large limited to the aspects of Sanskrit culture and philosophy alone. The Sanskrit language *per se* could not have dominated or subjugated any of the Indian languages. But its power relations with religion and caste systems are mainly responsible for its domination over other Indian languages and cultures. Due to this sociolinguistic hegemonic structure, Sanskrit has become a language of domination, subjugation, ideology and power. This Sanskrit-centric tradition has created its own notion of poetics, grammar, language studies and cultural understandings. These particular thought processes reinforce the discourses of caste and religion hierarchies that have entered into mainstream Kannada intellectual world.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation 137

The present paper attempts to organize all of these different threads into a coherent picture by focusing on native distinctive sociocultural and epistemic patterns of Kannada culture and its intellectual world. That is, this paper affirms the need to revisit the interconnections between Kannada and Sanskrit languages.

Key words:

Introduction

The history of humanity is not only a history of socioeconomic activity, it is also a history of semiotic activity (M. A. K. Halliday:2003, pp 210)

The discussions between Sanskrit and Kannada are not linear, plain and unidirectional. But they are subtle and complex both in terms of structures and functions. However, this paper does not propose to resolve these complex and subtle realities; rather, it attempts to explicate the designs of linguistic hegemony and subjugation on one hand. On the other hand, it tackles the changing processes of power relations that have been associated with Sanskrit and Kannada. The colonial mindset and Vedic implications have privileged Sanskrit and English at the expense of modern Indian languages. Further, they have also created circuits in the relationship between Kannada and Sanskrit.

In all language-related debates, the issue of Sanskrit has been a site of controversy in the contemporary Indian situation. Further, a major source of contention regarding issues of identity and cultural authenticity is also connected to Sanskrit alone. On the one hand, this line of argument cannot be denied as regards the hegemonic condition of Sanskrit over the native languages of India. No doubt, I definitely subscribe to this argument. At the same time, I do contend it because the fact that Sanskrit is merely the responsible parameter for the present linguistic conditions of India should also be taken into consideration. However, this paper attempts to highlight how can Sanskrit be a major source of the problems that have occurred with regard to the native languages of India in general, and Kannada in specific.

The relation between Kannada and Sanskrit is very ancient. It is not possible to discuss all the changes, development, and negotiations in the relationship. Nevertheless, some important debates can be floated here.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   138

The Politics of Knowledge: Kannada/Sanskrit

It seems to be very fascinating to speak about the politics of knowledge in the context of Karnataka. At the same time, it appears to be a problem because "the debate about the politics of knowledge bears, as we have seen, a remarkable resemblance to recent debates about the notion and practice of development. Much of this latter debate focuses on the difference between "development from below" and "development from above", or between more localized and more globalized conceptions and standards of development. In much the same way, the debate about knowledge is characterized by a similarly polarized tension between knowledge that is more grounded in local and regional traditions and knowledge cultures, and knowledge that rather marches to the tune of universally validated standards and prescriptions. This dual debate is by no means over, and is still at the center of much international controversy, not least over the role of universities in fostering, preserving and advancing particular kinds of knowledge" (Weiler 2006, 2009, pp 08). It may be noted that Kannada was not unable to evolve epistemologies rather than knowledge systems through the lives of its communities. When Sanskrit came into contact with Kannada, the legitimization of epistemologies was consequently problematic and crucial. Sanskrit was always referred to as language of literature, aesthetics and many other knowledge systems, and Kannada was considered to lack all these epistemological realities. Moroever, Sanskrit was regarded as resource of all sorts of knowledge systems such as religion, philosophy and logic. This does not mean that Kannada has not responded to this potential threat by employing a resistance mechanism. Kannada literary history provides many examples to prove the way in which it has posed major challenges to Sanskrit in the contexts of literature and aesthetics. This controversy over the national and international politics of knowledge is very evident and has become a systematic critical inquiry in the present discourses politics of knowledge. The 12th century Vachanakars of Kannada composed many Vachanas [verses] refuting the Vedic hegemony and advocating a rational form of Bhakti allowing no middle man in the way of reaching the truth. This tradition prevailed throughout the literary history of Kannada right from Pampa unto the last.

Sanskrit-centric fierce ideological positions imposed on Kannada were/are justified and appreciated through the ages until the twenty-first century. Kannada poets and writers offer interesting insights into understanding the differences between Kannada- and Sanskrit-based

knowledge systems. Kannada and Sanskrit were never shown as equals; rather, dichotomies such as superior [Sanskrit] and inferior [Kannada] were created. Over a period of time, these dichotomies have converted into social realities. Obviously, these social realities have been accepted by various social groups of Karnataka in terms of patronized understanding. This kind of make-believe has become a strategy for all dominant languages in general and Sanskrit in particular. As a result, this particular perception causes the establishment of cultural faith among the speakers of a given language. These arguments delineate the way in which hegemonic structures emerge in any given speech communities across the globe. However, hegemonic structures may be perceived in different ways according to the communities' perceptions. Many a time, it has been realized that this is perhaps state-sponsored hegemony. However, the available historical records make it apparent that the politics of knowledge is always from above. This reaffirms the stereotype that epistemology is created from above and not evolved from below. Only such languages as those spoken in a given community can always evolve knowledge and epistemological paradigms in the community.

Cultural theorists have already discussed the ways in which epistemological discourses function as a medium for social voices. That is, knowledge discourse is the means by which notions of caste, religion and gender are structured and reproduced within society. It is necessary to reestablish epistemological discourses of Kannada from below to underscore and distinguish between Sanskrit-driven knowledge systems and knowledge systems evolved from/within Kannada communities. The issues raised here are of such scope that they are the relevant discourses of native perspectives that evolved from below. "The discourses of education are also analyzed for their power to reproduce dominant/dominated relations external to the discourse but which penetrate the social relations, media of transmission, and evaluation of pedagogic discourse. It is often considered that the voice of the working class is the absent voice of pedagogic discourse, but we shall argue here that what is absent from pedagogic discourse is its own voice" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 65).

The Death of Sanskrit: A Continuation of Sociolinguistic Hegemony

From a global perspective, the trend is the same: many smaller languages are dying out due to the spread of a few world languages such as English, French, and Chinese. (Romaine 1989: 39) There are many pitfalls in trying to generalize on a global scale about the reasons

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   140

underlying language attrition. As discussed above, there are many reasons for language shift and language death. Most studies on language shift have looked at a community's transition to the new language. However, in the Indian context, dealing with language endangerment is a problematic one. It is very subtle and complex phenomenon that cannot be analyzed based on western models alone. However, it can be argued differently. The language of Cosmopolis, i.e., Sanskrit (Sheldon Pollock) plays a very important role in India in the process of language shift/loss. We have always been aware of the ambience of many languages in our environment. Many languages are alive in our environment, and we have always perhaps switched from one language into another unconsciously (Ananthamurthy. U. R. 2009). The "ecologist" perspective is a useful focus for linguists who call for measures to reverse this trend of language shift. If we value biological diversity and strive to protect it, surely it is equally important to take moral responsibility for the conservation and development of linguistic diversity.

"The status of Sanskrit is an instance of this – for close to a thousand years, this prestigious language was the chief vehicle of the (exclusionary and undemocratic) transmission of knowledge; however, today it is this language, rather than the less prestigious Prakrit, that is dead. As Sanskrit-speaking ruling classes could only capture the public domain, the centuries of its dominance had no permanently crippling effect on the less prestigious Indo-Aryan, Austro-Asiatic and Dravidian languages that flourished alongside it" (Ayesha Kidwai 2008). This Sanskrit was still alive and implicitly spreading across India into languages and cultures. So Sanskrit did not die. It grew, developed and gradually split into Hindi, Marathi, Gujarati, and the other Indo-Aryan languages, and to some extent, Dravidian languages too, and it is still with us under those guises. There is something odd about lamenting the death of Sanskrit language when it has in fact branched off in this manner. Given the existence of modern Indo-Aryan, why be upset that Indians don't speak Sanskrit? Speaking Indo-Aryan pays homage to their Hindu-Vedic heritage without requiring them to have frozen their culture as it was in one place and time. Thus, language shift involves bilingualism (often with Diglossia) as a stage on the way to monolingualism in a new language. For example, Hindi has several dialects: Bhojpuri, Maithili, Awadhi, and so on. The fact is, these varieties of Hindi have never been used in the domains like education, administration, mass-media, literature (there may be some exceptions) and other public domains. The Sanskritized Hindi, i.e., Khariboli, took their place. This new avatar of Sanskrit is the revitalization of old Sanskrit. It also rejects the claim that Sanskrit is a dead

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   141

language. Standardization is nothing but Sanskritization of the Indian languages; it is not a new practice, and it has been present throughout history, i.e., Sanskritizing the nation. In my opinion, when Mahatma Gandhi suggested making Hindustani an official link language instead of Hindi, there was a lot of resistance to it. Hindustani is a combination of Hindi and Urdu in which Sanskrit had no place. It would have been a definite move to dehegemonizing Sanskrit.

Sanskrit established a clear-cut dichotomy among Indian languages, like 'Marga' (The world of Sanskrit) and 'Deshi' (Indigenous Languages). This can be understood with reference to Kannada. Unfortunately, these dichotomies are used as the qualifying characteristics of a standardized variety of languages, which result in the creation of vernaculars (i.e. Native Languages) and Cosmopolis (i.e., Sanskrit). Ananthamurthy. U. R (2009) describes it in an optimistic way: Vernacular has always had its advantage and use despite the power of the language of Cosmopolis – Sanskrit in the past and English in our times. It is very evident that Sanskrit is a kind of prevailing sociolinguistic hegemony on Kannada language and culture. It cannot be considered as an advantage.

There has been a strong resistance towards dehegemonizing Sanskrit throughout the history of Kannada language and culture. As a result, a sociolinguistic hybridity has been developed by our various poets through their works, for example, great Kannada poets like Pampa, Andayya, Nayashena, Kumaravyasa and the Vachanakaras (mystic poets), by combining marga and deshi, which is also a kind of resistance to Sanskritized Kannada. The concept of "hybridity" is important in understanding the multiplicity of language practice. "This concept is inspired by the work of Bakhtin (1981) on the hybridity of the dialogue of languages, by Anzaldu'a (1987) on the hybridity of being the 'borderlands' and by Bhabha (1994) on the hybridity of the postcoloniality" (Ofelia Garci'a 2009:33). As per Mohanty, "it is precisely this hybridity of language practices that is responsible for the maintenance of the many languages of the Indian subcontinent" (2009). This fluidity in multilingual interaction demonstrates that different cultures have different ideas about the integrity of their own group in relation to outsiders. If speakers of a minority language manage to find an ecological niche in the majority community which is conducive to language maintenance, they may have a better chance of survival.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   142

In many [minority] languages there are competing pressures towards (re)vernacularization and (re)standardization, which have their origin in the competition between the school and home varieties. There has always been tension between the standard dialect and other regional/caste dialects. These two tendencies of standardization and modernization have greatly affected indigenous languages in terms of their structural and functional loss. Bernadett Biro and Katalin Sipocz have identified language shift in two types of linguistic processes: functional loss and structural loss. Language shift can involve loss of function as well as structural loss; the former means a decrease in the domains of language use, while the latter refers to changes in the structure of the language occurring in the process of language shift. Due to the linguistic hegemony and cultural dominance of Sanskrit on Indian languages, all our indigenous languages are suffering from both functional loss and structural loss. The attitudes of Sanskrit towards the other Indian majority/minority languages can also play a decisive role in language shift. As far as functional language shift is concerned, a necessary condition for the survival of the indigenous languages would be the decrease of their functions. As far as the structural side of language shift is concerned, we can only sketch tendencies based on data provided by some case studies (e.g. P.B. Pandit, Sourashtrasi in Tamilanadu, D N S Bhat's on Kannada).

As if provincial languages are conspiring against Indian unity (U N Singh 1992], Suniti Kumar Chatterji (1943) made the following statement: "we feel that we ought to have a common language for the whole of India as symbol of common Indian Nationality". It was also the very clear opinion of the Language Planning Commission in 1957, as discussed by Sumathi Ramaswamy (2007) in her paper: "It is clear, however, from the report submitted by the Commission a year later on November 1957, that it saw its task as being more than just pedagogical, for at stake was the very survival of the emerging nation. The Commission was fiercely anxious about 'the growing fissiparous tendencies and linguistic parochialism which are jeopardizing the political unity of the country and are rocking the very foundations of our freedom'. A decade of linguistic jealousy and bitterness had marred the joys of independence; there had been much squabbling within the nation over state boundaries and territories; and Hindi, the proposed official language of India, had been found unacceptable by large numbers of its people. Everywhere, 'regionalism' and 'linguism' were on the rise. The Commission's solution to these problems was clear-cut: to put Indians on a good and steady diet of Sanskrit by making

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   143

its study compulsory in schools, and by instituting it as the official language of the nation. Sanskrit was ideally suited for this role, for it was the 'Supreme Unifier' (p. 201) and the 'Great Unifying Force' (p. 81). 'The Indian people and the Indian civilization were born ... in the lap of Sanskrit' (p. 85). It is 'in our blood' (p. 81). It is 'the breath of our nostrils and the light of our eyes' (p. 87). Mixing its metaphors, the Commission also variously described Sanskrit as 'the bedrock' of Indian existence, the 'main thread which runs through the entire fabric of the cultural life of an Indian' (p. 102), and the anchor that keeps the youth of India from losing their 'cultural moorings' (p. 51). 'If the binding force of Sanskrit [is] taken away, the people of India would cease to feel that they were part of a single culture and a single nation' (p. 70). So, by restoring Sanskrit back to its citizens, the nation, too, would be restored, and its troubled waters calmed. Sanskrit, it was declared, brings a 'symphony to our life' (p. 84)." These views signify a linguistic chauvinism and fanatical attitude towards Sanskrit and its religion. In my opinion, these are merely slogans and emotional bursts. It is quite true that they are also conspiring to establish the hegemony of Sanskrit with the sanction of the Indian constitution. Even otherwise, the continuity of Sanskrit is spread over across the other Indian languages and cultures in terms linguistic structure, functional usages and imbibed in cultural practices. This is to be considered a greater damage to all the indigenous languages of the Indian subcontinent.

Standardization, Modernization and Diglossia: the Status of Linguistic Diversity

Tribal languages and other minority languages do not institutionally support for their communicative functions. In addition, they have no written literary tradition and no access to technology and science. In any of these domains, equal potential and access does not extend to them. Language revitalization and maintenance are and have always been politically actioned. This is because language policies are always discriminatory, favoring certain privileged classes/communities. It is quite true that constitutional support and rights are extended to these communities in order to maintain their languages; practically, they are not in favor of minority languages. The possibility of recasting the communities' interests and perspectives is never taken into consideration in order to achieve their aspirations. "The processes at work in standardization and hierarchies of styles and genres also give rise to what Bourdieu calls legitimization and authorization. Both these turn on how language is socially evaluated. Legitimacy is accorded to selected ways of speaking or writing in that they are recognized by other producers, by the dominant classes and by mass audiences" [Bourdieu 1993, 331; Garnham 1993]. Differences in

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   144

social and economic position tend to be reproduced in unequal knowledge of legitimate language, which in turn reinforces constraints and access to power. However, censorship, authorization, and the reinforcement of the dominant languages are all traceable to the pervasive effects of power (Gal & Irvine 1997, Lindstorm 1992).

Standardization and modernization are a politicized discourse. "Standardization of languages can be regarded as a legitimizing activity expanding its institutional order through a 'programmed course' in socialization" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, quoted by U N Singh 1992). According to Fishman (1974), "the social context of language modernization is most commonly discussed in terms of (a) the growing identification with the standard version of the national language on the part of the general public, (b) the increased accessibility of all varieties within the speech community, (c) the more rapid diffusion of linguistic innovations and status markers, resulting in repertoire continuity rather than discontinuity across classes". This linguistic inequality leads to a mismatch between home and school languages. This tendency reinforces neglection of the mother tongues of the tribe and minorities as well. As a consequence, linguistic assimilation takes place, and in turn forces the tribal/ minority children into subtractive language learning in a form of submersion education in the dominant language. Institutions concentrating on education must promote mother tongue education in a multilingual situation.

Fishman (1971) divides all the multilingual developing nations into three clusters: nations with several Great Traditions, nations with one Great Tradition and nations with none (Quoted by Dua. H.R., Hegemony of English). Sanskrit took over every tradition into its account, considering that there is only one great tradition in India (i.e., Sanskrit). As a result, Sanskrit is considered the only language of knowledge, philosophy, literature, great tradition and resource of vocabulary. Due to its monistic attitude, it imposed its monistic realities on all other indigenous languages. As a consequence, linguistic homogeneity was developed instead of sociolinguistic heterogeneity. This is another way of leveling diversities and nullifying them in the domains of socio-cultural milieus. The knowledge systems and intellectual diversity were also integrated into Sanskrit tradition.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   145

Characterizing linguistic codes in terms of 'High' and 'Low' is another way of differentiating sociolinguistic and cultural hierarchy. This dichotomy is linguistically called as Diglossia. It is not just a linguistic reality, it is a sociolinguistic attitude. Primary speech varieties with localized or restricting domains as 'Low' (i.e., colloquial Kannada) and superposed varieties enjoying access wider or enlarging domains as 'High' (i.e., Standard Kannada) have led many investigators to attribute ad hoc values to diverse codes available in a community. Such studies focusing on language attitudes generally rate primary speech as conceptually "deficient" and sociologically as "deprived". This raises certain issues of a fundamental nature: How a language structures reality. How far do the differences in speech behavior reflect differences in adequacy as opposed to acceptable variation? In what manner do the 'highbrow' values of speech —uniformity, precision, elegance, purity of form, allegiance to literary tradition, elaboration of language through coining of new terms—actually meet with the demands of adequacy and effectiveness in everyday life communication in a society? (Khubchandani 1981).

The relationship between Kannada-Sanskrit and Kannada-English is also a Diglossic situation. The former deals with standardization whereas the latter deals with modernization. The hegemony of both Sanskrit and English is imposed on Kannada. As a consequence, Kannada has to struggle with both Sanskrit and English in order to retain its structural and functional usages. In formalized communication and in the domains like literature, criticism and other discursive writings, Standard Kannada (i.e., Sanskritized Kannada) is preferred. On the other hand, English is preferred in domains such as Science, Technology and Law. A similar situation can be found with regard to Hindi, which interfaces with Sanskrit alone: "Those bilingual speakers belonging to the North-Central region (characterized as the Fluid Zone, cf. Khubchandani 1 972a 1978) who retain their regional or caste dialects either of Western Hindi or of altogether different languages of the region (such as Pahari, Lahnda, Panjabi, Rajasthani, Awadhi, Chhatisgarhi, Bihari) for informal communication within their speech group, but prefer to use Khariboli (standard Hindi) for formalized communication. In this diglossia situation, these speakers think of Khariboli as having a more prestigious role than their native speech, which has a casual use. They regard their native speech habits as mere substandard variations of the all-powerful standard Hindi (Khubchandani 1981).

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   146

The distinctions between Standardized Kannada (i.e., pure, high, powerful, elegant and standard variety) and dialects (i.e., impure, low, powerless, non-standard, corrupted variety, substandard) are significant. As a result, caste/regional dialects are close to extinction. This leads not merely to ironing-out of the dialects alone, it also leads to cultural loss.

Sanskritization: Representation versus Misrepresentation

This part of the paper highlights how Sanskrit can be a major source for the problems that have been inflicted on the native languages of India in general and Kannada in specific. This whole linguistic process is called as Sanskritization. Sanskritization can be discussed over three broad perspectives:

    i.   Structural linguistics

    ii.   Sociolinguistics

    iii.   Diglossic Situation (a phenomenon of both structural and sociolinguistics).

Sanskrit language has highly influenced the Kannada structure from sound to sentence. Due to this influence, Kannada has borrowed sounds, lexical items, sandhi rules and their written representation from Sanskrit, for e.g., aspirated sounds like Ph, bh, kh, gh, chh, jh [ಫ್, ಬ್, ಖ್, ಘ್, ಛ, ಝ್], vowels like R[ಋ] aI[ಐ] and[ಔ], etc. Therefore, Sanskrit is very prevalent and predominant in the context of a high variety of Kannada, which leads to linguistic discrimination among Kannada speakers. Due to the process of Sanskritization, the actual usage of Kannada is restricted to a very limited domain. At the same time, the Sanskritized Kannada is not associated with the common people.

The pro-Sanskritization lobby is preparing an artificial Kannada that is highly Sanskritized, and only the literate would able to gain knowledge and information, restraining those who are illiterate from accessing information and knowledge. This language (low variety) can be used for interaction, and these languages are also the medium of knowledge dissemination and information sharing among common people. The pro-Sanskritization lobby pushed Kannada along the exactly opposite route, and excluded Kannada and other regional languages from the realm of education, journalism, literature and all other academic discourses. Instead of the

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   147

common people's language being encouraged, Sanskritized Kannada is promoted. Sanskrit has become the ultimate necessity of all the functional domains (education, literature, media, technology and social science). However, neither Sanskrit nor the lexicon of Sanskrit are protected by the common people in their day to day interaction. Further, this became a hurdle in acquiring knowledge and information.

Renowned linguist and cultural critic K. V. Narayana from Karnataka proposes an alternative model to understand the relationship that exists between Kannada and Sanskrit in the contemporary situation. The following tenets form the basic assumptions of his model:

Kannada and Sanskrit: A Readjustment

The relationship between Kannada and Sanskrit is very ancient. This paper does not intend to understand the process of this relation. However, this focuses on the following aspects to explicate the relation between Kannada and Sanskrit:

1. Sanskrit has highly influenced the Kannada (linguistic) sound system. As a result, Kannada has adopted many of its phonemes and their written representation.
2. Sanskrit did influence the Kannada lexicon in a great manner. Kannada has borrowed the lexicon directly from Sanskrit and also through Prakrit. The so-called standardized variety of Kannada borrowed Sanskrit vocabulary by probably more than fifty percentage.
3. Some of the word formational aspects of Kannada were highly influenced by Sanskrit. Consequently, many examples are available in the context of morphophonemic structures and compound formation of Kannada language.
4. The influence of Sanskrit on Kannada in some of the functional domains created a diglossic situation in Kannada. The prominence of Sanskrit lexicon is more in a higher stratum of social groups of Kannada and its standard dialect, whereas the prominence of the native lexicon is more in the lower stratum of Kannada groups.

These structural influences of Sanskrit on Kannada are the basis to understand the issues of standardization of Kannada.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   148

While determining the standard variety of Kannada, that form should be taken care to be remained in the model of Sanskrit. Most probably, all sounds of Sanskrit are considered as Kannada sounds. Those phonological variations and diversities that take place in Kannada are never legitimized in this particular determination of standardization. In the sense, only the written variety of Kannada is being considered as standard form. Even if there is a standardized spoken variety [pronunciation], it must be legitimized by written variety. However, sound structure and lexicon structures of Sanskrit dictate the standardization of Kannada. More or less, in various discourses of Kannada, the use of standard variety is more prominent. Thus, even in the present situation, Sanskrit still continues its dictation and domination of Kannada in its various functional domains.

It is possible to examine the relationship between Kannada and Sanskrit from one more angle. Aspirated sounds and fricative sounds like Ś/Ṣ [ಶ/ಷ] are less prevalent in oral performance, whereas, these sounds are more prominent and prevailing without any gap in written Kannada. But in the process of neologism or in coinage of new words, Kannada violates the relation with Sanskrit in many respects. This practice could be seen among grammarians of old Kannada. Such practices in the process of new coinage are generally considered *Arisamasa* (i.e., compound but hybridized). We see no hesitation among speakers while using such hybridized (Kannada and Sanskrit) forms that occur in Kannada. Further, in these new constructions of Kannada and Sanskrit, the rules of word formation and morphophonemic (sandhi) processes are used together. Let us see the sandhi rules in formation of a word like *Bh:ugaLLa* (Land Thief). There is a mere Kannada and Sanskrit word alignment in the given formation. However, the morphophonemic rule of this alignment is Kannada (i.e., **bhu:+kaLLa =bhu:gaLLa, k>g**). This is how, while combining both Kannada and Sanskrit words into Kannada, Sanskrit rules are more prevalent in such morphophonemic processes. The most prominent compound word in Kannada, is *u:To:pacha:ra*. In this particular combination, *u:Ta* (Kannada) and *upacha:ra* (Sanskrit) are incorporated. But the sandhi rule is Sanskrit (i.e., guNasandhi). In this way, Kannada has developed its own structural designs to mix with the Sanskrit structure. According to these structures, Sanskrit Kannadization (Samskrutada Kannadikarana) seems to be a strategy. This is why common people cannot make out (separately identify) Sanskrit words that they regularly use in their routine communication; they simply

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   149

consider them as Kannada words. At the same time, when Kannada borrows words and sounds from other languages, especially from English language, people think that Kannada loses its purity. Thus, we need to determine the Sanskrit linguistic aspects internalized into Kannada that are very transparent and visible.

Many times, Sanskrit lexicon and word rules are the main resources for many new morphological structures in Kannada. But such new word-formation happens only in Kannada. New words that are not practically used in Sanskrit are made use of by Kannada. This is the best example for signifying creative practice in the context of language contact. With the expanding of the domains of Kannada use, this unique relationship with Sanskrit facilitates Kannada to acquire new word formations.

With this linguistic assistance of Sanskrit, Kannada has formed new words. If not always, many times these Sanskrit forms replace Kannada lexical items that are constantly use in routine communication or they are also simultaneously used along with these Sanskrit words. For example, one can see that both *anna* and *ku:Lu* are in practice in Kannada. In this way, instead of the words or compounds that have already been made available in Kannada, the words which we acquire from Sanskrit, between these two structures a unique relationship established between Kannada and Sanskrit. This means that Sanskrit words attain positive connotation whereas Kannada words attain negative/derogative connotation. Words like *anna* and *ku:Lu* are the best instances to highlight this reality. The word *anna* in Sanksrit has a broader meaning *a:ha:ra* (i.e., food) and it is reduced to *akki* (i.e., rice) in Kannada. Similarly, the word *ku:Lu* has the same connotation as a:ha:ra, which is most probably prepared with the same ingredients, but now the Kannada word has acquieres a negative and derogatory meaning. Nonetheless, if Sanskrit forms are given more privilege and legitimation, Kannada forms remain very informal in the functional domains. In such situation, while there are no differences as far as meaning is concerned, there are restrictions in their usages. However, Sanskrit forms are afforded a prominent place in writing practices, whereas, Kannada words remain in oral practices alone. Due to the intrusion of the English lexicon, the consequences of diglossia are becoming more complicated.

The cultural and political status of Sanskrit and its support has uncovered another facet of the relationship between Kannada and Sanskrit in language politics. Sanskrit is present in the list

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   150

of languages that should be studied during schooling. It has been found that mother-tongue/first-language speakers of Kannada generally learn Sanskrit instead of Kannada during their schooling. This tendency seems to be confined to cities. Further, its impact is not so serious at the surface structure. Still, there is an option between Kannada and Sanskrit. There are no tendencies that because of Sanskrit, except Kannada, no other languages are sacrificed. Alternative syllabi like the central and autonomous ones in practice have kept Kannada outside the education. Because Sanskrit is a classical language, provisions are made to learn this language in school. This is how there has been a constant conflict between Kannada and Sanskrit. One can notice that many turning points took place in the language movement related to Gokak Report after 1982. In this movement, a kind of conflict was being portrayed between Kannada and Sanskrit on one hand. On the other hand, one could see several moves that marginalized the issue to lead to the public thinking that this issue was relatively unimportant. This problem has not yet been resolved in our schooling system. As a result, there is a possibility of not using secondary skills like reading and writing for Kannada children. This becomes a major hindrance for the progress of Kannada.

It is necessary to observe here one more aspect of the problem. While teaching Sanskrit as a classical language, one of the practicing written languages in a given situation is being used in the process of teaching this particular language. For example, even though students learn Sanskrit, but they write it in Kannada script. Even in examinations, questions on Sanskrit poetry and related texts are only being answered in Kannada. This model is very predominant in Karnataka. There also appears to be a strategy to stabilize this model. Those who wish to learn Sanskrit learn it through Kannada. Indirectly, they learn the secondary skills, *reading* and *writing* of Kannada. If Kannada is their mother tongue, the primary skills of speaking and listening are already known to them. In this way, the problem does not arise that students will not be deprived by learning Kannada.

As such, Kannada has utilized the impact of Sanskrit to strengthen itself. This is again regarded as a strategy. The structures of Sanskrit enter into Kannada, but they never appear to be alienated. It is necessary to have knowledge of Kannada scripts and writing systems to read and write Sanskrit. Therefore, it has become possible for Kannadigas to preserve the skills of Kannada in conjunction with being with Sanskrit. By adopting this model into our pedagogy

Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   151

very systematically, it is possible for us to develop a cordial relationship with Sanskrit. As a result, linguistic coexistence between Kannada and Sanskrit becomes possible.

==

Work Cited and References

- Halliday M.A.K , (2004), The Language of Science in the collected works of M.A.K. Halliday, Vol-05, continuum, London, P, 210

- Hans N. Weiler, (2009), Whose Knowledge Matters? Development and the Politics of Knowledge. Theodor Hanf, Hans N. Weiler und Helga Dickow (Hrsg.), Entwicklung als Beruf. Baden-Baden: Nomos, P, 485-496

- Hans N. Weiler, (2006), Challenging the Orthodoxies of Knowledge: Epistemological, Structural and Political Implications for Higher Education. Guy Neave (ed.), Knowledge, Power and Dissent: Critical Perspectives on Higher Education and Research in Knowledge Society. Paris: UNESCO Publishing, P, 61–87

- Bernstein, B. (1990). The structuring of pedagogic discourse: Class, codes & control, Volume IV. London: Routledge.

- Romaine, Suzanne. (1989). Pidgins, Creoles, immigrant and dying languagesi In Nancy C. Dorian (ed.) Investigating obsolescence (:) studies in language contraction and death, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 369-384

- Sheldon Pollock, (1996). The Sanskrit Cosmopolis, A.D. 300n1300: Transculturation, Vernacularization, and the Question of Ideologyi. In J. E. M. Houben, (ed.) The Ideology and Status of Sanskrit in South and Southeast Asia. Leiden: Brill, pp. 197 - 247.

- Sheldon Pollock. (1998a). India in the Vernacular Millennium:Literary Culture and Polity 1000n 1500. Daedalus, 127.3:1-34.

- Sheldon Pollock. (1998b). The Cosmopolitan Vernaculari, Journal of Asian Studies, 57.1: 6-37.

- Sheldon Pollock. (2001). The Death of Sanskriti, Comparative Studies in Society and History, 43(2): pp. 392-426

- Ananthamurthy, U.R. (2009).Globalization, English and Othere Languages in Social Scientist, Vol. 37

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   152

- Kidwai, Ayesha. (2008). Managing multilingual Indiai, The Marxist, Volume XXIV, No. 2: April-June

- Anzaldua, G. (1987). Borderlands/La,frontera: The new mestiza. San Francisco: Spinsters/AuntLute.

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Bhabha Homi. (1994). The Location of Culture. New York: Routledge

- Ofelia Garcia, Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres Guzman (ed.) 2009. Imaging Multilingual Schools. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan

- Mohanty, Ajit K. (2009). Multilingualism of the Unequals and Predicaments of Education in India: Mother Tongue or Other Tongue? In Ofelia Garcia, Skutnabb-Kangas and Maria Torres Guzman (ed) imaging multilingual schools. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, pp. 262-283

- Pogacnik, Bogdan. (1986), eThe Culture of Small Nations as a Communication Bridgei, Inter-Cross UNESSCO, No. 1, Paris

- Ramaswamy, Sumathi. (2007). Sanskrit for the Nation, Modern Asian Studies, 33 (2): 339-381

- Singh, U.N. (1992). On Language Development and Planning: A Pluralistic Paradigm. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study

- Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and Symbolic Power. Cambridge:Harvard University Press

- Burdhan, A. B. (1973). The Unsolved Tribal Problem, New Delhi: Communist Party Publications

- Chatterji, Suniti Kumar. (1943). Languages and the linguistic problem, Oxford University Press

- Gal, S. and Irvine, J. T. (1997). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: how ideologies construct a difference, Social Research, 62: 967 -1001

- Gal, Susan. (1979). Language Shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria. New York: Academic Press.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   153

- Garnham, Nicholas, (1993), Bourdieu, the cultural arbitrary, and television, in C. Calhoun, E. LiPumma and M. Postone (eds.) Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives, Oxford: Quality Press, pp. 178-92

- Lindstrom L. (1992). Context contests: debatable truth statement on Tanna (Vanuatu)'. In A Duranti, Goodwin (ed.), Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.101n24.

- Dua, H.R. (1994). Hegemony of English. Mysore: Yashoda Publications.

- Fishman, J. A. (1974). Language planning and language planning research: The state of the art" In J. A. Fishman (ed.) Advances in Language Planning. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 195-214

- Khubchandani, L.M. (1972a). Contact Languages of Tribals, New Delhi: Indian Council of Social Science Research

- Khubchandani, L.M. (1981). Language, Education, Social Justice. Pune: Centre for Communication Studies.

- Narayana. K.V. (2010). Tondu Mevu – Vol VI & VII Baraha Publishing House, Bengaluru

===

Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Associate Professor
Department of Linguistics
Sahyadri Arts College
Kuvempu University
Shimoga
Karnataka
India
meti.mallikarjun@gmail.com

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 17:8 August 2017**
Dr. Meti Mallikarjun
Kannada versus Sanskrit: Hegemony, Power and Subjugation   154