

ROUMYANA PETROVA

CHILUKURI BHUVANESWAR (12 JULY 1951 – 23 JULY 2020) AND HIS KA:RMIK LINGUISTIC THEORY IN PROVERBIOLOGY

*Work as though you were to live forever.*

The great Indian linguist and proverb scholar Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar, whose life can be fitly described by the English proverb used as a motto to this obituary and who left this world suddenly in July of this year, has contributed enormously to proverb scholarship in ways which are yet to be critiqued and appreciated. It would indeed take practically years of research and quite a number of dedicated scholars versed in both traditional Indian scholarship and English language linguistics to truly unravel the outstanding contribution to what Bhuvaneshwar termed *proverbial linguistics* or *proverbology* and to properly assess his work. Being entrusted by Professor Wolfgang Mieder with the task of writing an obituary for Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar, which I am doing with great reverence, love and admiration, I must right from the start acknowledge to my readers my own limitations, as apart from my genuine long-standing interest in Indian philosophy, I realize I can make no claims whatsoever of being an expert in the field. It is hoped, though, that this obituary will set the beginning of a longer and more detailed in-depth discussion and critique of the remarkable genius of our late friend, which should best be undertaken by other scholars of his calibre, preferably among his Indian colleagues.

Before embarking on the main theme of this obituary, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Professor Wolfgang Mieder for his energetic support and encouragement in initiating its writing and its appearance on the pages of this year's (2021) issue of *Proverbium*, as well as to Dr Srinivas Gunturi, Professor Bhuvaneshwar's nephew, who kindly offered us a lot of biographical information about his uncle, which I am going to present in the paragraphs below in italics. I have taken the liberty to add my own remarks to Dr. Gunturi's account, as I have been very actively

PROVERBIUM 38 (2021)

involved with our great friend's work since 2003, when we first 'met' on the Internet. Our virtual friendship of nearly two decades started when he began publishing a long series of Sanskrit nyayas (wise maxims and expressions) on the Internet, which he used to translate into English and then interpret in the light of the philosophy of Vedanta advaita.

*Prof. Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar was born on 12 July 1951 in Bhimavaram, West Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh, India. After graduation from D.N.R college, Bhimavaram, he completed his MA Literature from Andhra University, in 1972. Prof. Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar continued to work for his Ph.D. at EFLU, Hyderabad and later joined as an Assistant Professor at University of Maiduguri, Nigeria in 1980. After working for 15 years he returned back to India and began teaching at the Department of Linguistics, Arts College, Osmania University, Hyderabad since 2014.*

Before returning to Hyderabad, in the course of several years Professor Bhuvaneshwar taught English in the University of Sebha, Libya.

*Prof. Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar was founder of Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory vis a vis the other linguistic theories. It has branches spreading into language teaching (Ka:rmik Language Teaching Approach) and literary criticism (Ka:rmik Literary Theory). His main area is proverbbiology. He initiated Proverbial Linguistics as a special branch. His interested areas are in theoretical and applied linguistics. He pioneered Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory. He loved horses and rode them when he was in Nigeria; planted trees and collected proverbs; he collected 325 Hausa proverbs on horses (**Hausa** (/ˈhɑʊsə/; Harshen/Halshen **Hausa**). It is a Chadic language spoken by the **Hausa** people, the largest ethnic group in Sub-Saharan Africa, mainly within the territories of Southern Niger and Northern Nigeria). It is the largest collection so far in the history of African oral literature; 157 Telugu proverbs on horses from books, etc.; and 150 Libyan Arabic proverbs on camels from field work and books. He discovered a sub-tale of folktales: equine folktales. He has given new definitions to: Proverb; Metaphor; and Culture. He initiated for the first time in Telugu and probably in any world language a functional-structural discourse analysis of proverbs by collecting 250 + prover-*

*bial exchanges from real life – mainly from his mother Mrs. Chilukuri Kantamanigaru – and proposed a discourse model. He also proposed the Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory – an event in Indian linguistic history. After Panini, no major linguistic theory has been proposed. He was interested in receiving proposals from linguists to apply Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory to their respective languages.*

In 2003, Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar also created and maintained a well-stocked site called *EProverbiallinguist* (*proverbiallinguists@yahoo.com*), where members of the *Proverbial Linguistic Group*, mainly from India but also from many other countries were invited to discuss and publish their research. This site contained not just proverbs from various cultures and diverse and highly innovative scholarly research on proverbs and other linguistic matters, but also pictures, poems (by established poets like Gondikatta Rama Subbarao) and various other works of art, mostly visual. It soon became the meeting ground of a large number of scholars and men of art, who freely engaged in interesting and rewarding discussions. It was indeed a joy to visit this remarkable site and participate in it.

*In February, 2014, Language Forum published Bhuvaneshwar's four articles on Ka:rmik Literary Theory and paved the way for a new literary theory in India after almost four hundred years. He was also the Editor-in-Chief of The Indo-Libyan Linguist, Sri Su:ryakalam Series of monographs on proverbs. His latest papers were "A Plenary Speech on Proverbs" at the University of Diderot, Paris and "Dissenting Voices" (against Derrida) in Language Forum. Later, he taught at Department of Linguistics, Arts College, Osmania University from 2014 until his demise. He taught Historical Linguistics, Government and Binding Theory, and Translation Studies. He supervised many M.A. Projects and conducted 4 conferences. His main research interests were on Linguistics, Language Teaching, Literary Theories and Proverbiology.*

*Prof. Bhuvaneshwar has established an association called Ka:rmik Linguistic and Literary Association (KLLAS). The Ka:rmik Linguistic and Literary Association is a registered linguistic association established on the auspicious day of Gitajayanti in 2013 to promote linguistics, literature, and language teaching through the model of Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory pioneered by Prof. Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar. He has extensively pub-*

lished his research papers on *Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory*. He was the Scientific Committee member of *African Proverbs and Phraseology Society (AFRICAPPS)*.

*The School of Languages and Culture, Sharda University, Gurgaon, India, organized Ka:rmik Literary Theory and Practices in collaboration with Ka:rmik Linguistic and Literary Association (KLT) and a one-day Workshop/FDP on Ka:rmik Literary Theory and Practices where Prof. Bhuvaneshwar delivered a lecture on Ka:rmik Literary Theory and Practices on 01<sup>st</sup> November 2018. This workshop was organized to popularize KLT as a holistic theory, the causal linguistic theory that integrates form-function-cognition into a unified theory of lingual action and provides a principled account of the creation, application, transmission, retention and perpetuation of language and to teach the application of KLT as an alternative approach to linguistics, language teaching, literary studies, translation studies and research.*

*On 23<sup>th</sup> July 2020 Professor Bhuvaneshwar left all of us on his heavenly sojourn after a brief ill-health.*

However brief, Dr Gunturi's account above clearly testifies to the magnitude, originality and unquestioned uniqueness of Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar's extensive work in the course of nearly five decades and his unparalleled commitment to what he saw as his great mission in life.

The discussion of Bhuvaneshwar's unique Ka:rmic Theory in relation to proverbs can much better unfold, if first we try to explain it in more general terms, namely, from the point of view of its role as an underlying linguistic theory *per se* with offshoots in second language teaching and learning, the study of literature, and elsewhere. The author, who himself was fluent in several languages apart from English, e.g., Telugu (his mother tongue), Sanskrit, Hindi, Hausa, and some more, has propounded his ideas in a series of papers (some of which listed in the Literature section), which reflect his extremely broad and varied teaching experience. Sadly, he did not manage to publish them in a book, although, as he shared with me late in 2019, he had already begun working on such a book, but his untimely death put a sudden end to his plans.

Below, I will attempt to outline the basic ideas regarding his linguistic theory. As his approach is very specific and truly complex, I would use the limited space of this obituary to present various aspects of it rather than explaining and critiquing it at the

depth it deserves. Hence, there will be many quotations from his various papers, which he sent to me some months before he left this world. I should however warn the readers of this obituary of Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar's very rich and somewhat 'dense' style, which itself presents a formidable challenge to the researcher. This highly specific, florid style truly reminds us of the well-known dictum 'The style is the man.'

Let me start with Bhuvaneshwar's broad definition of his own linguistic theory: 'KLTA [i.e., Ka:rmik Language Teaching Approach as an extension of his KLM/T, Ka:mik Linguistic Method, or Theory] is an integrated approach that takes an integrated view of form-function-cognition-disposition in a network and lays more emphasis on teaching language in a *cause-means-effect model through the construction of a dispositional (experiential) reality rather than communicative reality alone.*' (1, p. 2) Put another way, '[L]anguage is used as a resource for the construction of actional reality at the lower level, dispositional reality at the middle level, and ka:rmik at the higher level of a holarchy [i.e., a holistic system]. ... [E]ach reality from the top is realized as the lower reality by apparent transformation in an a:nushangik process [i.e., a process where the properties of one level are (automatically) inherited on the next]'. (8, p. 177)

In the lines below, by giving various examples, I will try to show how Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar understands and applies the term 'dispositional', which is closely related to his term 'ka:rmik' and which plays a central role in his linguistic theory. The dictionary meaning of *disposition* is 'natural temperament, tendency, inclination' (Longman), hence *dispositional* should mean 'pertaining to or having to do with all of these.' But when placed in the context of his Ka:rmik Theory, the term acquires some specific meanings, which build on these basic ones. We can see from Bhuvaneshwar's quotation above that *dispositional* has to do with personal experience, that is, with real life situations and the way they are experienced by the individual himself: '[k]a:rmik reality and dispositional reality are two terms which are *interchangeably used* in the discussion of the ka:rmik linguistic theory since ka:rmik reality is variable dispositional reality even though the former is a higher reality. In addition, dispositional reality is immediate and easily understandable whereas ka:rmik reality is remote and more

difficult to empirically understand. The term *dispositional reality* is only used most of the times since it refers to the individual.’ (8, p. 177) It appears then, that *ka:mik* should designate more generally human experience as such, where *disposition* (and by extension *dispositional*) should mean individualized experience, or to put it differently, the relation between *ka:rmic* and *dispositional* should resemble the relation between *-emic* and *-etic* (like the relationship between phonemics as the general discipline *vs* the concrete, specific phonetic system of a particular language). Both of these terms relate to his principal tenet that ‘according to the *Ka:rmic Linguistic Theory* all action [i.e., human experience as such] is generated, specified, directed, and materialized by dispositionally impelled desires. The Principle of Desire for Pleasure (*sukhe:chcha* in Sanskrit) is the most fundamental desire in all human beings – any activity that brings in pleasure is welcome and any other activity that begets pain is unwelcome. Thus, *pleasure* is a great motivator for pursuing action’ (9, p. 2), an idea which, if transferred to an European context, directly takes us to the stoicism and epicureanism of the Ancient Greek and Roman philosophical tradition. In the paragraphs below, both the term ‘*ka:rmik*’ and ‘*disposition*’ will be discussed at greater length.

The author maintains that ‘the focus of *KLTA* is essentially *dispositional communication*, concerned as it is with the goal of *successful experientiality* (with the goal of *dispositional competence* rather than *communicative competence* for experience of activity, where *dispositional competence* is the competence to use language to construct one’s *dispositional reality* in a context), in which *socioculturalspiritual communication* is a part of the whole among others: *dispositional*, *cognitive*, *contextual actional*, and *lingual actional*. Here, the whole is *greater than ...* the sum of the parts and language is even *beyond ...* the whole [the dots replace diverse signs that constitute *Bhuvaneswar’s* highly specific symbolic system, which includes arrows, stars, etc., and is used by the author to designate all possible logical relations]. It is so because social communication, which is undoubtedly an important part of language activity, is not *the end* in itself but only *one* of the major *efficient causes* of language activity, the main cause being *disposition* (at the individual level and *ka:rma* at the higher level).’ (1, p. 2, A) The term ‘*socioculturalspiritual*’ coined by the author

clearly points to his conviction that there is always a spiritual aspect to sociocultural phenomena.

His first paper on the topic, as its very title, *CLT and KLT: A Contrastive Review*, suggests, compares the traditional communicative approach in second language teaching and learning and his own Ka:rmik approach. The author claims that '[i]f social communication were the end in itself, all lingual social communication should be *monolithic*; there should not be any *social variation* within a group, and in addition, *no possibility* for future deviation and change, since the social structure is already instituted. However, in real life such a possibility is negated; new forms of language and communication come into existence within a society as and when dispositional creativity springs up in the users, and *fashions, innovations and systemic effects* spread in a society. These changes are I-I-Ily [an adverb deriving from Bhuvanewar's coinage 'interconnected-interrelated-interdepended' (12, p. 8] networked with socioculturalspiritual divisions and separation as societies function as dissipative structures.' (1, p. 2–3, B)

Further (1, p. 3, C) Bhuvanewar explains the variations in language use with the fact that 'language acquisition is more than the acquisition of form, function, and use; it is a matter of dispositional acquisition and internalization of the linguistic system for its dispositional application for its dispositional experience in its variety, range, and depth.' The repetition of *disposition* and its derivatives testifies to Bhuvanewar conviction in the prevailing subjectivity of language use. Then the author goes on to add that '*mechanical reproduction of language, focalization, mere utilitarian use* deny the learners 'the resources needed to develop a creative command of the language, which would enable them to express *their own individual and social meanings*' (author's emphasis). Ironically, the communicative approach could often stifle rather than promote the richest kinds of communication (2, p. 38). What is more, CLT is associated with cultural imperialism and denies individual expressivity. In KLTA, these problems are avoided by deriving culture from a higher level of disposition (and culture as dispositionally patterned behaviour). Therefore, there is scope for **delinking** the foreign cultural content and **re-linking** the native cultural content since knowledge is dispositionalized.' (1, p. 5, F)

Judging from this context, by dispositionalized knowledge the author, again, means knowledge that is subjectivized, tailored to the specific needs of the individual, i.e., understood, structured and applied freely and creatively from one's own personal perspective and experience rather than being a (comparatively) fixed, stable and enduring expression or vehicle of a particular linguoculture, which in and out of itself can be compared to a largely standardized and highly specific language mirror, or language picture, of the world that belongs to a particular (large) group of people, namely, the creators and speakers of this language (according to linguoculturology).

Below, in a nutshell, I will present the main points of comparison between CLT and KLT (1, p. 6–8) in a slightly abridged and adapted form. My comments will follow the original passages, quoted in inverted commas or given in summary:

***a. Language Theory***

1. 'In CLT, language is a system for the expression of meaning, while in KLT it is a means of the construction of experience; that is to say that meaning is a means for constructing experience.' Indeed, from a Humboldtian point of view (i.e., linguoculturology), a language is a storehouse of all the meanings that reflect the mentality, values, and particular way of life of the people who have been using it in the course of generations. In Bhuvaneshwar's understanding however, language is much more than that, it is a means of constructing one's own individual experience, an idea which, taken one step further, may lead us to the assumption that language may have certain 'magical' powers, i.e., it can not only reflect and present but also imagine and thus create highly diverse and individualized 'realities.'

2. 'In CLT, the primary function of language is for interaction and communication (illocutionary force) whereas in KLTA it is for the coordination of experience (with a perlocutionary force).' This thought, which is an extension of the preceding one, places the function of language firmly in the framework of the Speech Act Theory.

3. In CTL, the structure of language is said to reflect its functional and communicative uses, while in KLTA the latter are reflected through its dispositionally derived structure. Again, Bhuvaneshwar adds a further characteristic to language per se: it is not

just a tool for communication; rather, its functional and communicative uses are structurally determined by the personal experience, mentality, emotions, and worldview of each single speaker.

4. The fourth point is concerned with the main units of language in the framework of the two approaches: 'In CLT, the primary units of language are not merely its grammatical or structural features [by this Bhuvaneshwar obviously means the parts of speech, the parts of the sentence, and the clause or sentence], but categories of its functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse [again, the Speech Act theory is referred to, where the main unit is the conversational exchange]; on the other hand, in KLTA, the primary units of language are **experiential cognemes** (emphasis mine, R.P.) realized through formal, functional, and discourse features' (3, pp. 69–71, where the sources discussing the main views of the language theory in the context of the communicative approach are listed). This latter term clearly places Bhuvaneshwar's theory in Cognitive Linguistics.

Put in a more general way by Mohammed Ansari in his extensive study *Application of Linguistic Theories in Language Teaching: A Review of Formal, Functional and Karmic Linguistic Theories* (11, p. 273), according to the Karmic Linguistic Theory, '[I]language is not only used by human beings living in a context as a resource for the construction of dispositional reality but it is also produced by human beings dispositionally to live in the context. To explain further, it is first used dispositionally by the originators of a language, and then what is produced as a language is used to construct dispositional reality.' Ansari maintains that 'although KLTA is new, it deserves serious attention and further application in pedagogy for confirming its value as a viable alternative to the unsuccessful western theories of pedagogy in India and the other African and Asian countries.' (op. cit., p. 247)

### ***b. Theory of Learning.***

Going back to Bhuvaneshwar's first article (1), we see that after outlining the theory of learning that underlies the communicative approach [discussed at great length in sources 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 in the Literature section below], he highlights the main features of the theory of learning that underlay his Karmic approach. The author focuses specifically on practice: 'In CLT and KLTA, *practice* is a common feature in the learning process. However, in CLT,

practice is communicative practice whereas in KLTA it is experiential practice which includes communication. That means, in KLTA, learning is *personalized and subjective* whereas in CLT it is not. In that sense, there is scope for style variation and creativity in KLTA which is missing in CLT. [...] Furthermore, *memorization* is an important factor in KLTA (which is not in CLT) [...] However, rote memory [i.e., memorizing words without their meanings] is not encouraged; on the other hand, experiential memory – remembering language through experience – or even *bilingual memory* of cognates is encouraged in the initial stages until the second language memory is firmly established.’ (1, p. 7)

Further in the same article, Bhuvaneshwar explains why and how the first language is made use of in KLTA: ‘In our daily life, we already have our first language to construct our experiential reality but we need an alternate language to do so (in second language acquisition) and therefore to facilitate easier, quicker and efficient learning we make use of both the first language and experiential reality (as in the primitive stages of language development) to construct second language reality. The only difference is that in second language acquisition, there is already an established lingual reality.’ (1, p. 8) The author thus rightly places this phenomenon within the framework of semiotics: ‘Consequently, *the signified* (or *vachya:m* in Sanskrit) is remembered as the word in KLTA by using *experiential memory* because the *vasa:na:s* [i.e., habits] which impel man to a specific type of action without an antecedent or a precedent cause are stored in *Ka:rmik* memory.’ (ibid.)

Characteristically, as can be seen above, Bhuvaneshwar, who, it should again be stressed, is expertly trained in both the Indian and the modern Anglophone tradition in linguistics, spans a bridge between traditional Indian notions and their projected modern Western counterparts; one might wonder how far this discussion could have gone, had he also been familiar with the writings of Aristotle on semiotics twenty four centuries ago in the original Greek language...

In another article of the same series, *Introduction: Towards De-colonization of ELT Theory: A Critique* (9), the author once again promotes breaking away from the Western ‘atomic’ and ‘defective’ theories of learning and replacing them with a ‘wholistic’ [i.e., pertaining to the *whole* rather than atomistic] theory that is

specifically suited to serve the needs of learners in Asia or Africa: 'India is the mother of linguists which has given birth to such illustrious linguists like PaNini Mahamuni and his predecessors and Sri A:di Samkara Bhagavatpu:jyapa:dah who is the greatest exponent of advaita philosophy as well as an outstanding poet and logician, but all these years, the Indian linguists who did not make proper use of the great Indian tradition have followed and continue to follow these western theories without trying to break out of this lingual imperialism with the help of native intelligence. All these theories are in one way or the other not suitable to our conditions in Asia and Africa, particularly, India. Some of them do not pay necessary attention to the problem of varied pronunciation in India; some are not socioculturally suitable; some are not sensitive to the classroom needs since many are overcrowded; and all are atomic. Ka:rmik Language Teaching Approach is one such attempt to liberate pedagogy from *atomism* and experience the pleasure of *wholism*.' (9, p. 2)

In a third article of the same series, *Ka:rmik Language Teaching Approach (KLTA) and Ka:rmik Language Learning Strategies (KLLS): A Brief Outline* (10), Bhuvaneshwar aptly discusses his theory by explaining the meaning of the word ka:rma: 'Karma is a Sanskrit word derived from the root *kr* which means *to do, to make* and means *action, work and deed*. It is related to Avestan *kerenaoti* 'makes,' and Old Persian *kunautiy* 'he makes.' It has a proto-Indo European base *kwer-* 'to make, form.' This is the main meaning of the word karma. In its secondary sense, it has four meanings according to popular usage: 1. *object* (in grammar); 2. *ritual* (in Hindu religious ceremonies; 3. *fruit-bearing impressions of past actions in the past-present-future births* (in *Sana:tana Dharma aka Hinduism*); and 4. *atmosphere* (in Modern English) (10, p. 142).' The author then goes on to dwell on the non-religious meaning of his adjective Ka:rmik: 'This adjective *ka:rmik*, unlike *karmic*, has no reference to rebirth or destiny and it simply means 'fruit-bearing past actional impressional' in the Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory. This adjective as derived from the word *karma* with the meaning 'action' instead of fruit-bearing impressions of past actions in past lives' is associated with *karmaphalam* and *karmaphalabho:gam*. In other words, it is **a principle of cause-effect reality** where the impressions of the past actions are the CAUSE for the performance of the present actions which are the EFFECT.

The present actions as well as their consequent results are directly proportional to the nature of the cause and their experience is in the form of pleasure or pain. To explain it further, the adjective ka:rmik underlies **the experiential principle (of pleasure or pain) of cause-effect reality without reference to rebirth or absence of rebirth:**

*(1) Cause: Effect: Experience*

[which can be read as “A cause produces an appropriate effect according to its nature and the effect an appropriate experience according to the nature of the effect as it impacts on the disposition (personality) of the experiencer].” (ibid., p. 143)

Bhuvaneshwar then goes on to impress on his readers that his term ka:rmik has no religious underpinnings whatsoever and is therefore purely scientific, before embarking on the explanation of his other central term, ‘disposition’: ‘Disposition (svabha:vam) is a complex of three constituents: 1. Traits, 2. Knowledge, and 3. Va:sa:nas (internalized impressions of habituated actions). Disposition generates-chooses-specifies-directs-materializes all activity from its conceptualization-to-its-patterning and structuration-to-its-material realization. This concept lies within psychology and cognitive science.’ (ibid.) In other words, it wouldn’t be an exaggeration to say that, as commented above, disposition is what makes a person an individual human being, as it comprises his character, his knowledge, way of thinking, outlook on life, his habits and both his deepest and most immediate motives.

In an article on computer-assisted language learning, the author reiterates his definition of the Ka:rmic Language Teaching Approach, adding an important new dimension to it, that of joyful experience (12, p. 4): ‘[KA:RMICALL] integrates form-function-meaning-discourse levels of language in an atomic-holistic framework and introduces the concept of joyful experience of the teaching-learning situation by games and other extra-curricula activities in the Virtual Learning World of the Computer in ICT’ where language teaching becomes language playing tailored to the personal needs of the learner and placed in his own culture. Indeed, as the author states elsewhere (13, p. 1), ‘[a]ccording to KLTA, living is a matter of seeking pleasure by fulfilling one’s desires and language is used as a resource to achieve this goal. [...] So, if the learning materials can be turned into games, then the learning

burden will be reduced and playing becomes an intrinsic type of motivation in addition to the extrinsic type of motivation derived from it in the form of marks, prizes, etc.’ Or, put another way, in the light of the Theory of the Cultureme in linguoculturology (14, p. 288–299), the terms *ka:rmik* and *dispositional* can be seen not just as designating a whole new range of highly specific meanings but also as two culturemes that are unmistakably positively charged.

Now let us turn our attention to *proverbial linguistics and proverbbiology*, the latter term uniting proverb studies with paremiography. In one of his early paper on proverbs, which is about their indexical meaning (1) Bhuvaneshwar grapples with the semiotics of proverbs in the context of culture understood as communication. After tracing some basic definitions of culture in semiotics (developed by Keesing, Duranti, Geertz, Levi-Strauss, Silverstein, Ortner and others) he suggests the terms *proverbial index*, *proverbial indexical meaning*, and *proverbial indexicality* (op. cit., p. 2). Bhuvaneshwar bases his conclusion on the analysis of several Sanskrit and Telugu proverbs used in conversational exchanges. This study shows that ‘proverbs – apart from conveying the content meaning – also point out indexical meaning which can be general and/or specific. The general index meaning is based on the dialectal and sociolectal features of the spoken proverb while the specific index meaning is based on many features that point to personal characteristics, social relations and types of situations. The features that point to personal characteristics include the use of literary, common and vulgar proverbs as well as opinion oriented proverbs. An appropriate use of a proverb also points to the knowledge and the conversational abilities of the speaker.’ In this first and, to the best of my knowledge, single study on proverbs that has been published in *Proverbium*, Bhuvaneshwar does not mention his Ka:rmic approach. The reason is probably his desire to better prepare his (mostly Western) readers into accepting him as a proverb scholar before presenting to them what might seem his rather exotic theory.

In another study, titled *The Syntax of Proverbs I. The Sentence in American English Proverbs: A Case Study in Quirk’s Model*, which is a good 56 pages long and is part of Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar’s PhD dissertation, the author examines the syntax of proverbs according to the widely accepted model of the sentence in

English proposed by Quirk and Greenbaum (1989) (17). This very extensive in-depth analysis proves that ‘proverbs [both in English and Telugu] are represented in all the basic types of English sentence [which seems to reiterate Permyakov’s conclusion based on an even more extensive comparative analysis of proverbs in more than 200 languages] that they represent all possible features (syntactic structures included) of a language]...and *proves* that their syntax is not constrained to a limited set of structures.’ (16, p. 2) Bhuvanewar maintains that notwithstanding the (widespread) view that proverbs exhibit a limited number of syntactic structures, which is suggested by Dundes, Abrahams, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett and some other influential proverb scholars, the finding of his study clearly ‘rules out a syntactically motivated criterion for a definition of a proverb by showing the variability of syntax in proverbs within themselves with some structures present in some proverbs and some others not present (i.e., the syntactic criterion suffers from the defect of *avya:pti* (under extension). In addition, the structures present in proverbs are not unique to proverbs alone and hence a syntactically motivated distinction cannot be made between proverbs and other genres (i.e., the syntactic criterion also suffers from the defect of *ativya:pti* (over extension). Furthermore, it also indexes a positive defining characteristic, namely, prototypicality of proverbs, by contrastively underlying it as a constant factor among all the variable syntactic structures. What is more, it offers counter evidence to the formal (Chomskyan), functional (Hallidayan) and cognitive theories of language because the variation in proverbs is found to be neither genetically inherited nor socially generated nor cognitively anchored but dispositionally generated, specified, directed and realized which supports the Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory of Language.’ (op. cit., p. 1) The latter has to do with the use of proverbs: ‘As the proverb user uses a proverb, he so uses it as a means to coordinate the coordination of action to construct his own proverbial dispositional (ka:rmik) reality and experiences the results of his (lingual) action in terms of success and failure bringing in pleasure and sorrow.’ (op. cit., p. 54) Or to put it differently and in more simple language, the proverb lexis and structure is ultimately determined by the choice of the individual user made from a range of existing options in each instance he uses a proverb to pursue his own desires and intentions.

Let us now compare briefly the findings of two other studies, *The Clause in Proverbs 1. A Case Study of English* (18), and *The Syntax of Telugu Proverbs 1. The Sentence* (19). Overall, they compare meticulously and thoroughly the syntax of two large proverb corpora from the point of view of Quirk and Greenbaum in their *University Grammar of English* (1989) without relating it to KLT. In the case of the English proverbs, it has been found that 'the clause is represented in almost all of its basic structures ... and its representation is highly productive. Hence we understand that the choice of the clause in English proverbs is unmarked.' (18) As far as the Telugu proverbs are concerned, Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar first extensive study on the topic reveals that '[a]ll the four major syntactic classes of declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory sentences in their simple and complex sentence types with all the clauses except the adjectival clause are represented.' (19)

Another equally thorough and meticulously executed analysis on the same topic, *The Clause in Proverbs 2. A Case study of Telugu* (20), confirms that 'Telugu proverbs are not clause friendly when the same clause can be expressed as a PP [Participial Phrase]. It is also observed that the order in a PP sentence is the opposite of English. This is an interesting finding since it provides evidence for considering language as ka:rmik action ... instead of mental action as in the Chomskyan tradition or as social action in the Hallideyan tradition' (ibid.). Before making this rather challenging claim (given the authoritative position of the two giants, Michael Halliday and Noam Chomsky), in his concluding paragraph the author reiterates the claim made at the outset that 'in all the cases where a clause can be transformed into a participial phrase, the clause structure is abandoned and the PP structure favored. As such, it is a **stylistic choice** [emphasis mine, R.P], which can be motivated only through a ka:rmik linguistic analysis, proposed in Bhuvaneshwar (2002) (21)' (20).

These are by no means the only studies on the syntax of proverbs. They have been chosen as an illustration to Bhuvaneshwar's very demanding, meticulous, thorough and extensive style of writing. He literally leaves no stone unturned in his in-depth analyses. But when making his conclusions, the author always suggests that much work is yet to be done to further prove his findings and that his theses should be extended over more data by further research.

In a more recent work on proverbs and the Speech Act Theory placed in the context of his Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory (22), Bhuvaneshwar suggests that ‘it is possible to look at speech acts as dispositionally produced by human beings *by living* in a context and used dispositionally *for living* in the context and provide a principled account of how speech acts are *chosen*, and how their choice in turn contributes to the emergent discourse structure.’ (22, p. 1) After discussing Austin’s and Searle’s classifications of speech acts, Bhuvaneshwar states that ‘according to the Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory, language is a *dispositional* action instead of mere *mental*, or *social*, or *cognitive* action. As such, disposition (svabha:vam) generates, specifies, directs, materializes and impels the use of lingual action in all its variety, range, and depth and consequently *the choice of speech acts and the coherence and structure of discourse* also.’ (22, p. 2) This study contains several extremely complex graphs showing consecutively the network of sva:bhavam in conversational exchange, the network of talking options, the network of dispositional exchange, the network of type and order of speech acts, the combined triaxial quadrants of cognitive actionality, the materialization of lingual action, and the star network in operation: speech act cogneme – cognition. Several examples of proverbial exchanges are analyzed in very great detail through the speech act theory in combination with the KLT and with the help of the graphs. The study concludes as follows: ‘sequentiality in discourse is not only linked to what speech act utterances convey but also to the speech act selection made by the Speaker/Hearer. In addition, the choice of the speech acts and their propositional content for example, between direct and indirect speech acts or between an assertive and a question, and the textual composition of the speech act, for example, a proverb or a non-proverbial utterance in taboo or standard language also contribute to the emergent sequence of discourse. Furthermore, such choices at a higher delicacy are dependent on the psychological state and cognitive character of S/H. He may be co-operative or non-co-operative or neutral in his reply; he may like to use a proverb or no proverb, polite or rude language, straightforward or roundabout or confused explanation in his reply. All these differences affect the coherence and sequence in discourse. Therefore, speech act theory should be supplemented with further conditions on intentionality *for* speech acts in addition to intentionality *in* speech acts. In order

to do so, one should seek a dispositional sociocognitive linguistic approach to speech acts (as outlined in the Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory [discussed in sources 23, 24 and 25 in the Literature section below].’ (22, p. 12) Bhuvaneshwar suggests that the Speech Act Theory should also be supplemented by pragmatics and ethnography of communication, before closing his study with one more suggestion, namely, that this theory should also cover ‘The Principle of Expressibility: “The principle that whatever can be meant can be said” is further extended to cover its causality and restated in the Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory as *the Principle of Ka:rmik Experientiality: Whatever can be meant can be said but whatever is meant and said is meant dispositionally for the construction of one’s dispositional reality through speech acts.*’ (ibid.)

This last study, when placed in the context of his other works, illustrates how wide-ranging his scholarly interests were. With the exception of etymology and historical linguistics, almost no other major branch of linguistics has remained closed to his desire to explore how proverbs ‘fare’ in its specific context. While reading his works, one is left with the impression that the author is trying to do the job of an institute of proverbology staffed with a group of scholars, where each is an expert in a specific field. And what is really striking is that his diverse works, through encompassing several branches of linguistics, fundamentally are an ardent attempt at constructing a holistic system. His own ka:rmik approach is intended to do exactly that: unite many disparate blocks of knowledge and build a harmonious whole, at the centre of which is the human being with his inner world and deep, personal motives where desire for happiness, joy and pleasure rules supreme.

Had the author lived in an environment that could have given him greater opportunity for getting his works published, he would no doubt have produced a very substantial series of books, and gained the world reputation he deserves. Chilukuri Bhuvaneshwar spent most of his professional life working tirelessly and in isolation, quietly struggling for recognition even in his most immediate surroundings. Everything he created was a labour of love. For some great men true recognition arrives after they are gone. There is no doubt that now the time has certainly come when Bhuvaneshwar’s groundbreaking and highly insightful work will receive the profound interest and great admiration it richly deserves.

**LITERATURE**

Note: Many of the works below are manuscripts kindly sent to me by the author himself shortly before his demise. It is hoped that these papers should receive the due institutional attention and scholarly recognition they deserve and hence get properly edited and published in a book in its own right, which no doubt will be read in the future by generations of scholars across the world in the spirit of gratitude and reverence.

1. Bhuvaneshwar, Chilukuri. CLT and KLT: A Contrastive Review. – In: *KLAAS WEB*, pp. 1–20. Also in: *Al Mergib Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 2. (Ed.) Jagdeeshwara Rao. Ghasar Khair: Al Mergib University, 2009.
2. Cook, Guy. *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
3. Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S. Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
4. Johnson, K. Skill Psychology and Communicative Methodology. Paper, presented at the RELK Seminar, Singapore, 1984.
5. Savignon, S. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Reading, Mass. Addison-Wesley, 1982.
6. Littlewood, M. *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
7. Krashen, S. *Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.
8. Bhuvaneshwar, Chilukuri. RST Syllabus Design for Architectural Engineering: A Ka:mik Language Teaching Approach. In: *KLAAS WEB*. Also in: *The Indo Lybian Linguist*, University of Sebha, Sebha, Lybia, 2014, pp. 170–191.
9. Bhuvaneshwar, Chilukuri. Introduction: Towards De-Colonization of ELT Theory: A Critique. In: *KLAAS WEB*. Also in: *Post Colonial Pedagogical Issues, Strategies, Theories, and Practices in ELT*. (Eds.) Binod Mishra and Prashant Mishra. New Delhi: Adhyayan Publishers and Distributors, 2013, pp. 1–15.
10. Bhuvaneshwar, Chilukuri. Ka:mik Language Teaching Approach (KLTA) and Ka:mik Language Learning Strategies (KLLS): A Brief Outline. – In: *KLAAS WEB*, pp. pp. 140–156. Also as: Abdulgader, Mohammed Abubakar, and Bhuvaneshwar, Chilukuri. Ka:mik

- Language Teaching Approach (KLTA) and Karmik Language Learning Strategies (KLLS): A Brief Outline. In: *The Indo Lybian Linguist*, University of Sebha, Sebha, Lybia, 2014, pp. 132–149.
11. Ansari, Mohammed. Application of Linguistic Theories in Language Teaching: A Review of Formal, Functional and Karmik Linguistic Theories. In: *KLAAS WEB*, pp. 240–287.
  12. Kamil, Mariam, and Chuilukuri Bhuvanewar. Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) and its Development: A Review Towards KARMICALL. In: *KLAAS WEB*.
  13. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri, Fatima Zahra Omar Nasser, Omissad Mohammed Emhemmed, Khadija Attahir Ali, Nura Omar Nasser, and Sara Omar Nasser. Teaching English Vocabulary to the Lybian Preparatory School Students: A Karmik Linguistic Approach. In: *KLAAS WEB*, pp. 163–174.
  14. Petrova, Roumyana. Truth in Anglo-American Proverbs. In: *Proverbium 36 : 2019*, pp. 277–340.
  15. Bhuvanewar, Chilukuri. Culture as Communication: the Construction of Indexical Meaning of Proverbs. In: *Proverbium 20: 2003*, pp. 1–14.
  16. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. The Syntax of Proverbs I. The Sentence in American English Proverbs: A Case Study in Quirk's Model. – In: *KLAAS WEB*, pp. 1–56.
  17. Quirk, Randolph, and Sidney Greenbaum. *A University Grammar of English*. Harlow: Longman Group Ltd, 1989.
  18. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. The Clause in Proverbs 1. A Case Study of English. – In: *KLAAS WEB*.
  19. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. The Syntax of Telugu Proverbs 1. The Sentence. – In: *KLAAS WEB*.
  20. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. The Clause in Proverbs 2. A Case study of Telugu. – In: *KLAAS WEB*.
  21. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. “The Karmik Linguistic Theory”. A Part of the PhD Thesis *A Sociolinguistic Analysis of English and Telugu Proverbs*. Hyderabad, CIEFL, 2002.
  22. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. Speech Act Theory and Proverbial Discourse: A Karmik Linguistic Analysis. – In: *KLAAS WEB*, pp. 1–12.
  23. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. Karmik Linguistics. Theory and Practice 1. An Overview of the Karmik Linguistic Theory. Scribd Papers, 2010.

24. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. *Ka:rmik Linguistics. Theory and Practice* 1. An Overview of the Ka:rmik Linguistic Theory. Scribd Papers, 2010.
25. Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. *Ka:rmik Linguistics: Theory and Practice* 4. The Theory of Language Creation. Scribd Papers, 2010.

**REFERENCE SOURCES**

**Longman:** *Longman New Universal Dictionary*. Essex, England: Longman Group Limited, 1982.

*See also:*

Bhuvanewar, Chuilukuri. Down the Proverb Lane. Musings of a Paremiologist. An Interview with Wolfgang Mieder. A Festschrift for Mieder at 62. Hyderabad, India: The Proverbial Linguistics Group, 2006. 88 pp. and 22 illustrations.

Roumyana Petrova  
Department of European Studies and International Relations  
University of Rousse, m2G. 513  
8, Studentska Street  
7017 Rousse  
Bulgaria  
E-mail: Roumyana.petrova@yahoo.com