CHAPTER - II

OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE

When you take stuff from one writer, it is plagiarism: but when you take from many writers, it’s research.
—Wilson Mizner.

Quite a few relevant materials for this study could be gathered. Most of these materials are published literature, in the form of books, accounts and Notes, research papers, articles, journals, government publications, etc. Besides, there are also unpublished research works like dissertations/theses, mimeographs, etc. Some of these important published literature are more than a century old. They are mainly those Notes and accounts written by British administrators, political agents, anthropologists, and other social scientists. Of late, many native scholars have also contributed to the knowledge on the different socio-cultural aspects of the population of the study area. With the help of these sources, certain important, but neglected aspects of the people of Manipur are being explored.

The main broad themes of the research on which these collected data and materials are used to represent a cogent illustration, are given below:

i). Description of the state’s ethnic composition;

ii). Distribution of ethnolinguistic communities;

iii). Territoriality of speech groups;

iv). Measurement of linguistic diversity;

v). Patterns of inter-ethnic communication and communicativity of few dominant mother-tongues or languages in the state; and

vi). Comparison of areas of linguistic diversity and socio-economic development.

II.1. ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF MANIPUR:

There has been no specific work citable that is devoted entirely to the study of the ethnic composition of Manipur. However, there are some valuable studies that have partly recorded the presence of the various ethnic groups in the state. These are mainly the reports or notes written by British scholars and administrators.
missionaries, anthropologists, etc. From their documents and also work by Indian scholars the ethnic composition can be fully constructed and understood.

Some of the indispensable literature dealing on the themes are Avery, J. (1882), Daiton, E.T. (1872), Rowney, H.B. (1882), Dun, E.W. (1886), Carey, B.S. and Tuck, H.N. (1896), Johnstone, J. (1896), Grierson, G.A. (1903; 1904), Hodson, T.C. (1908), Shakespear, J. (1912), Reid, R. (1912), Shaw, W. (1929), Furer-Halmendorf, C. von (1939), etc. Their work or accounts mainly dealt the different aspects of the ethnic communities like possible origin, religion, socio-cultural elements, and political and some economic features. These literature are of immense value because their writings indicate spatio-temporal changes in various aspects of the natives.


territories based on ethnolinguial parameters; etc.1 Besides the above mentioned research works there are many others not cited here. Also, since 1987 several new studies have surfaced in many universities and institutes.

II.2. GENERAL WORK/STUDIES IN LINGUISTIC GEOGRAPHY

A major chunk of material for this theme is derived from the work of French, German, British, American, and Indian linguists and geographers. Most of their work appeared in the form of atlases, articles and case study reports. Only few studies on Indian states or language groups can be found. So far no major work has been done for Manipur.

One of the earliest known work on the distribution or spatial aspect of language was by A.J. Ellis in 1882, who had delineated territories of English and Welsh languages. However, the first dialect survey was systematically carried out in 1876 by G. Wenker. He had conducted and later compiled the results from the questionnaires sent to some German school teachers, which had list of sentences written in standard German. The ‘sentences’ were to be translated or interpreted in local dialects. Later in 1887, “J. Gillierson bought his assistant Edmond Edmont, a bicycle and despatched him to gather the dialectological information from which the ‘Atlas Linguistique de la France’ was compiled. This monumental work of Gillierson and Edmont appeared in 35 volumes, and was published during 1902-10.2

Other major work began to surface in many European and American countries only after 1900. Here are some of the important and earlier studies, arranged chronologically. Dominian, L. (1915) Roeder, E. (1926) were among the pioneers to analyse linguistic areas of Europe; Kurath, E. and company compiled linguistic atlas of England which appeared in 3 volumes; Dauzat, A. (1939; 1942; 1955) examined methods in linguistic atlas and regional French dialects; Alexander,

1. Research works mentioned here are those studies done or submitted at the Jaiwahari Nehru University, New Delhi. Studies done in other other Universities or institutes could not be added since they are not available.

By the Sixties, interest in the study of socio-linguistic matters widened and more works on diverse aspects of linguistic geography, also emerge gradually. Few important studies are cited here. Orton, H. (1960; 1962) compiled atlas of England based on dialect surveys; E. Jones and I.L. Griffiths (1963) worked on linguistic maps of Wales; H. Wagner (1964) and others compiled and studied dialect survey and atlas of Irish dialects; Kolb, E. (1966) did phonological atlas of Germany. These are some of the pertinent studies in the sixties. Many more studies surfaced from the Seventies onwards, focussing on the roles, problems, and distributions, etc. of language and dialects. J.C. Wells (1970) highlighted the presence of variations in local accents in Wales and England; Williamson and Burke (1971) studied American dialects; Green, E. and Green, R. (1971) studied place names and dialects in Massachusetts; R.J. Gregg (1972) on Scottish-Irish dialect boundaries; G. Jochnowitz (1973) on dialect boundaries in France; Thomas, A.R. (1973) worked on linguistic geography of Wales, etc.

Besides, more studies on some regional or case analysis on the aspects of linguistic geography can be found. Mentioned may be made of Allen, H.B. (1973-76) on linguistic atlas of Midwest, U.S.A.; Orton, H. and Wright, N. (1975) on word geography of England; Bowen, E.G. and Carter H. (1975) compiled

The above cited studies are mostly those available in English language. There are several studies done by French and German scholars on the various parameters of language and dialects. Such important work could not however be cited due to inability to read or decipher them.

II.3 STUDIES IN INDIAN LINGUISTIC GEOGRAPHY

In India also, there are hitherto many important studies on the various aspects of linguistic geography. Most of these studies are by linguists, who have not recognised its spatial dimensions. Of late, some geographers made a gradual effort-taking cues from European experiences to concentrate on this neglected field of language studies.

The earliest work in India is that monumental work by Sir G. A. Grierson (1903-28). His linguistic compilation of the subcontinent (one of the most detailed and systematic) languages and dialects appeared in eleven volumes, popularly known as the "Linguistic Survey of India" (LSI). Other studies are usually done by language institutes, etc.

Some of the pertinent and important studies, research papers, etc. are cited below (chronologically). Hodson, T.C. (1936) analysed bilingualism in India; Shafer, R. (1953; 1954) classified northern Naga languages, and Sino-Tibetan languages; Windmiller, M. (1954) on linguistic regionalism in India, Emeneau, M. B. (1954; 1956; 1974) dealt with important linguistic aspects. One main theme of his study was on the nature of India as a linguistic area and its complexities. Mention can also be made of contributions by anthropologists and other social science researchers. U. Weinerich (1957) on the functional aspects of Indian
biliguansm; Ferguson & Gumperz (1960) on linguistic diversity in South Asia; Vidhyarthi, L. P. (1959) highlighted the existence of cultural linguistic regions in India; Karve, I. (1962) also worked on this theme.


Besides these independent research articles, mention may also be made of some seminars/symposia where different scholars exchange ideas, views, opinions, etc. In 1969 Central Institute of Advanced Study held a Seminar on ‘Language and Society in India’. The various papers of the seminar are published. Some of the important studies are those of Broker, G; A. Bose; H.S. Biligiri; P.B. Desai; B.K Roy Burman; L.P. Vidhyarthi; K. Seshadri, etc.

Other seminars/symposia held in the Eighties which dealt with language and dialects are : 1). Commission on Linguistic Geography (Funded by National Association of Geographers and I.C.S.S.R) held 3 symposia, under the aegis of Professor Aijazuddin Ahmad of J.N.U (CSRD/SSS), in 1982 (JNU, New Delhi), 1985 (March 1-2-, Alwar, Rajasthan), and in 1986 (March 28-29, Jamia, New Delhi; and 2). A national seminar was organised by Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, in 1987 (28-30 Jan.). In both the seminars many distinguished scholars,
some from abroad, presented research papers and exchanged views on the state of linguistic geography, dialect studies, and research problems and gaps, etc. Both the seminars attracted many researchers relating to spatial dimension of linguistic studies, communication, and other language problems in certain areas, etc.

In the Seventies and Eighties, many more diverse interests and certain case studies emerged. Some of these studies added to the understanding and interest in linguistic geography. Besides they also highlighted gaps as well as opened new research avenues. Amani, K.Z. (1969; 1971; 1974) analysed linguistic geography of Bihar and Urdu language; T.T.L. Davidson (1969) on Indian bilingualism; Khubachandani, L.M. (1970; 1972; 1983) dealt extensively on language situation, multilingualism, plural culture and language, communication, etc.; J. Das Gupta (1970; 1975) described nature of language conflict, ethnicity, and its relation to national development S.S Hassan (1972) on dialects of Hindusthani; I.V. Sakharov (1972) examined the ethnolinguistic geography of India; H.S Gill (1973) systematically studied Punjabi and compiled the linguistic atlas of Punjab, illustrating distribution or territories of few words. This study is of great importance, based on 203 villages and 101 words, as done in many European linguistic studies. B.P Singh (1975) examined linguistic variation and caste system in South Asia; Masica, C.P (1976) taking South Asia, attempted defining linguistic Area; Sreedhar, M.V. (1979) on the position of bilingualism in Nagaland; Ahmad, A. (1979) examined and reported on the trend of language and dialect studies between 1969-72; Istiaque, M. (1980) on language continuity and change among Austirc speakers; Apte, M. L. (1981) discussed the nature and implication of linguistic diversity in India; Shapiro and Schifforan (1981) analysed the magnitude of ethnolinguistic diversity in India. Another recent work on dialectology in Manipur is that done by Lhungdim, H-Thang (1986). This study identifies tribal territories based on the intrinsic ethnolinguical parameters taking dialects and
other innate traits. The study area covered about 770 villages from 3 prominent tribal districts.

II.4. TERRITORIALITY OF DIALECTS AND ITS COMMUNITIES

Territoriality of dialect as such is not studied in depth by linguists and geographers. The term itself is mostly not used by them. It is rather common among political scientists and psychologists, later used by psycholinguists. Therefore, most of the materials come from other fields. However, quite a few work on territoriality, distribution, and patterning of speech communities are available from the work of linguists, anthropologists, geographers, etc.

Most of the work cited below deal with the concepts of region or place, nature and theories of territoriality, ethnic boundaries or caste regions, maintenance of ‘space’ by speech groups, etc. Vance, R. B. (1929) discussed the concepts of region; Miller, E. J. (1954) described the existence of caste and territory in Malabar, Carpenter, C.R. (1958) reviewed the concept and problems of territoriality; Lyman, S.M. and Scott, M.B. (1967) on territoriality; Saberwal, S. (1971) on regions and their structures; Altman, I. (1970) on human territorial behaviour; Martin, R.D. (1972) and Tringnam, R. (1972) examined different aspects of human territoriality; other studies relating to human territoriality and behaviour are that of Edney, J.J. (1974); Dyson-Hudson, R. and Alden-Smith, E. (1975); Schefflen, A.E (1976) dealt elaborately on human territories; Gold, J. R. (1981); Ford, L. (1986); etc. As pointed out earlier these studies are those that concerned themselves with the theoretical aspects of territoriality, human territories and behaviour, region’s structures, etc.

Those studies which are concerned with specific cases of territoriality as encountered in different parts of the world are mentioned below. The cited works are also those that highlighted incidents of cultural or ethnic boundary maintenance, patterning of socio-cultural elements in a region, etc. They are very helpful in the present study. The referred work are given below:

Richards, F.J (1929) described the cultural regions of India; Miller, E.J. (1954)
highlighted the existence of caste and its territory as seen in Malabar, India; Bose, N. K (1956) described the cultural region of India; Schwartberg, J. E. (1968) studied the nature of caste regions in the plains of north India; Barth, E. (1969) on ethnic groups and their boundaries; Other important studies on these interests emerged mainly in the late Seventies and in the Eighties. Some of the pertinent works are Jochnowitz, G. (1973); Campisi, J. (1975) on ethnic boundary maintenance; Ross, J. K. (1975) viewed social borders as defining diversity; Buck, R. C. (1978) on boundary maintenance in an old order Amish community; Wallman, S. (1978) described the boundary of race as process of ethnicity in England; Driedger, L. (1978; 1979) has studied cases of ethnic boundary maintenance in urban neighbourhoods; Lauwagie, B. N. (1979) analysed the problems of ethnic boundaries in modern states; Khleif, B. B. (1979) stressed the importance of language as ethnic boundary in Welsh and English relation; Hannan, M. (1979) on the dynamics of ethnic boundaries in modern states; Paulston, C. B. (1980) highlighted the importance of language in ethnic boundaries; Benneth, C.J. (1980) described the morphology of language boundaries of the Indo-Aryans and Dravidians; Sopher, D. E. (1980) explicitly illustrated the patterning of cultures in India; Sack, R.D. (1981) on the territorial base of power; Eyles, J. (1984) examined social relationship in space; Warnes, A. M (1984) on the place and people, a reflection on their study in social geography; etc. Most of them discussed the nature and mechanisms of territoriality and implication of ethnic boundaries as encountered in different parts of the world, and some relating to India.

II.5. ETHNICITY AND SPEECH COMMUNITIES

It is also intended in this study to examine the nature and degree of ethnicity or 'sense of peoplehood' among and within the cognates and unrelated speech groups. Maintenance of distinct speech and territory appears to culminate in the emergence of "in-group" and "out-group" attitudes, thereby segregating individuals and communities based on their ethnolinguical differences.


II.6. PATTERNS OF INTER-ETHNIC COMMUNICATION

Materials on this theme are mainly derived from related studies and works by linguists, sociologists, anthropologists, geographers, and media experts. The main thrust of this theme is to analyse emerging communication pattern among
unrelated speech groups and compute 'index of communicatvity' of a particular language/dialect in an area, after understanding the intensity of linguistic diversity.

some of the important studies referred to in this analysis.

Greenberg's method A is also used in this analysis, and the index of communicativity measured in the latter part. Method A gives the index of linguistic diversity. His method H (index of communication) is not applied which is more complicated and requires data not available at the micro-level. Besides, this formula could only determine communication within a population. It says nothing about communication between two spatially separated groups, the main concern in this section. Since the concern of this part of research is rather on communication among spatially delimitable groups, Kuo's (1979) formula is applied. Kuo's method could measure 'index of communicativity' among multispeech groups. Greenberg's method H was later modified and extended by Lieberson (1964) to study intercommunity communication.

An attempt is made in this section to explain the 'index of communicativity' among different ethnolinguistic groups. For this purpose, the work of Kuo (1979) and his formula is used. As Fasold puts it "...this index represents the probability of drawing two speakers from the general population who know a given language". Kuo's study was confined to multispeech areas of Singapore and West Malaysia. But the formula can be applied in any multilingual areas, as reflected by the results. The analysis illustrates the state of dominant speeches and the potential of a particular 'tongue' or language to serve as link language or koine dialekte in that area. Accordingly, a language will require a high index value of communicativity for its functioning as 'medium' for wider communication and mutual intelligibility among medley speech communities.

Fasold (1984) computed index of communicativity for some Indian states (regions), using 1961 census data as adopted by Khubchandani (1978). The formula was used to attempt a comparative potential of Hindi-Urdu and English communicativity in India. Hindi-Urdu appeared to far better than English in most

states other than Tamil Nadu and Kerala. In these two Dravidian language states neither language has a high index! As Fasold observed, "It is also possible to compute indexes of communicativity among the four linguistic regions which Khubchandani divides India into. This will give some idea how well English and Hindi serve as link languages between one region and another". 4

Besides Kuo, Fasold, and Khubchandani, another work that used Greenberg's method and also calculated diversity and communication is Itagi, N.H. et.al.(1986). They have computed and analysed the communication potential in tribal areas of Assam and Madya Pradesh. However, they failed to compute index of communicativity, and compute only index of communication as suggested by Greenberg and as modified by Stanley Lieberson(1964). 5

II.7. LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

Though substantial literature are available on linguistic diversity and different aspects of development, not many work are concerned with the relationship between them. The pioneering studies on this topic were published only in the mid-Sixties. Later, other related works gradually emerged.

Some of the important studies referred to in this study are the following works. Most of them are by the linguists or anthropologists Greenberg, J.H. (1956) devised methods of computing linguistic diversity; Ferguson, C.A. & J.J.Gumperz (1960) described linguistic diversity in South Asia; Friedrich, P.W. (1961) later reviewed the ideas of Ferguson and Gumperz; Ferguson, C.A. (1962) highlighted the role of language in national development; Gumperz,J .J. (1962) also related language problems encountered in the rural development of north India; Fishman, J.A. (1966/1968) examined various aspects of language problems, contrast between linguistically homogeneous and diverse nations, etc.; Das Gupta, J. (1968) on language diversity and national development; Pool, J. (1969/1972) examined relationship national development and linguistic diversity;

4. ibid., p. 138.
Lieberson, S. et al. (1975) on the course of mother-tongue diversity in nations; Lieberson, S. & Hansen, L.K. (1974) illustrated the significant relationship between mother-tongue diversity and national development, citing examples from many countries; Dua, H.R. & Shakuntala Sharma (1977) on linguistic diversity, bilingualism, and communication in India; Itagi, N.H. et al. (1986) also examined communication potential in a linguistically diverse tribal areas and population, with reference to Assam and Madhya Pradesh; etc. Almost all the mentioned works or case studies believed or suggested the presence of certain kind of relationship between linguistic diversity and regional development, and also highlighted the intensity of communication gap in such diverse areas.

Besides the above mentioned researches, the analytical part on inter-ethnic communication patterns in Manipur depends entirely on Greenberg’s (1956) method A. This formula, also known as ‘monolingual non-weighted method’, is an approach to quantify diversity and it “operationalizes diversity by giving the probability that randomly paired members of a nation will have different mother tongues. Thus, A ranges from 0 (complete homogeneity) to 1.0 (the level approached when each person in a nation has a unique mother tongue)”. By this method the degree of mother tongue/linguistic diversity in different areas have been computed.

On the measurement of interrelationship between regional development and linguistic diversity, the parent works referred to are, Banks,A.S. & Textor,R.B.(1963/1965) who had examined and compiled cross polity survey; Fishman,J.A.(1966) on contrast between linguistically homogeneous and heterogeneous polities; Pool,J.(1969/1972) extensively examined the possible relationship between national development and linguistic diversity; and Lieberson,S. and Hansen,L.K.(1974) re-examined the basic correlations between development and language diversity. Pool applied regression method in his

attempt to establish or illustrate casual relationship between the two variables. On the other hand, Lieberson and Hansen used the correlation technique (person’s product-moment correlation) to prove their findings. Both the studies appeared to draw similar conclusions. As Pool remarked, “a country that is linguistically highly heterogeneous is always under-developed or semi-developed, and a country that is highly developed always has considerable language uniformity.”

Other similarly important studies that dealt with other aspects of languages (in society) are mentioned. They also greatly help in the understanding of the role and impact of diversity in a nation. Most of the works cited reflected the various impacts of linguistic diversity on socio-cultural and political spheres of a nation and populations. Fishman, J.A. (1966) and Sutherlin, R.E. (1962) claimed that linguistic diversity aggravates political sectionalism; hinders inter-group cooperation (Kloss, H: 1966), and national unity (Haugen, E.: 1966; Emerson, R.: 1962; Hertzler, J.O.: 1966); impedes political enculturation (Fishman, J.A.: 1968, Verba, S.: 1965) and also political participation (Steward, W.A.: 1962, Valdman, A.: 1968); holds down governmental effectiveness (Sutherlin, R.E.: 1962); and political stability (Sutherlin, R.E.: 1962, Kloss, H: 1968, Rustow, D.A.: 1968).

On the economic sphere too, many scholars are of the opinion that linguistic diversity affects different aspects of economic development. Das Gupta, J. and Gumperz, J.J. (1968) observed that linguistic diversity slowed the pace of economic development by braking occupational mobility; Valdman, A. (1968) believed it reduces the number of people available for mobilization into the modern sector of the economy; Fishman, J.A. (1968) and Sadler, V. (1962) stated that “linguistic diversity appears to decrease efficiency; besides, it also seem to prevent the diffusion of innovative techniques as highlighted by Gumperz (1962) and Kelman, H.C. (1969).

Apart from those works cited above, there are few studies exclusively

concerned with the nature, implications, problems, etc., of socio-economic indicators. These studies greatly assisted the present study tremendously. McGranaham, D.(1972); Baster, N.(1972); Seers, D.(1972); Drewnowski, J.(1972); Andrews, F.M.(1973); Hellwig, Z.(1974), etc., all highlighted the theoretical implications, nature, problems and application of various development indicators adopted in different studies. Mention may also be made of some research papers published by Unesco (1976) entitled 'the use of socio-economic indicators in development planning'. The book contained many vital articles pertaining to different aspects of socio-economic indicators. Those referred to are studies by Baster, Mukherjee, Yeh, Rao, Martin, and Cant. Zapf, W.(1975) and many others also described the approaches, problems, systems, etc., of socio-economic indicators.

Literature and research publications on the various methods and techniques, usages, formations, etc., involved in the application of selected indicators are also referred to in this study. Prominent among them are Mitra, A. (1961) analysed levels of regional development in India; Pal, M.N. (1963; 1971; 1975) on a method of regional analysis of economic development, quantitative techniques for regional planning, and also measured regional disparities in the levels of development in India; Das Gupta, B. (1971) attempted a statistical approach to socio-economic classification of districts; De, B. (1973) on historical perspective on theories of regionalization in India; Kundu, A. (1975; 1980) described in detail about construction of indices for regionalisation, and measurement of urban processes as methods of regionalisation; Chattopadhyaya, B. & Raza, M (1976) on the analytical framework and indicators of regional development. These are some of the works helpful in the analysis of linguistic diversity and regional development.

Literature and other publications mentioned above under various themes of this research are only those found to be more pertinent. Other similar or related works are therefore not cited here, but listed in the bibliography.