CHAPTER VI
THE PHONOLOGICAL RELEVANCE

1. Speaking as One Major Aim of Learning an L2

One of the main aims of teaching a living language is to enable the learner to speak that language. And speaking the language means speaking it in an intelligible manner—a manner intelligible to those for whom it is the native or the first language, or as L2, at least the language of communication. Even in case of an international language such as English (with several varieties in the international context) inter-comprehensibility has to be maintained. Every language, no matter, howsoever many the varieties it might have, has one core variety which is widely recognised as the model or the standard variety of that language. This variety is a model not only grammatically and lexically but also phonologically. As far as a language is a spoken medium of thought and communication, the major element that makes it intelligible or otherwise is the pronunciation and accent of the speaker. It is, therefore, important that the L2 learner of a living language should be initiated into its correct pronunciation. If one does not acquire its correct pronunciation in the sense of inter-comprehensibility one's learning of that language will become wellnigh meaningless as a spoken channel of thought.

1. This standard may not be realized 100% in actual speech. It may be only a conceptual reality or only a hypothetical core, but still it has a reality which is phonetically realizable. The realization may be approximate, still the standard/core remains the reference point and the ideal.
2. The Meaning of Inter-comprehensibility for us

Inter-comprehensibility in India will mean intelligibility of the language among the Indians mostly and with the Englishmen or Americans or other foreign speakers selectively. Therefore, the intelligibility of English pronunciation should have priority reference to the Indians. The 'affected' pronunciation of English for a supposedly specialized class gives rise to what has been described as the snobbish effect. "Language snobs are legion", it has been said, "but naturally very few will admit this." Nevertheless, the intelligibility of English in India is first Indian and later something beyond, though a valuable something and having still a lot common with the Indian variety.

3. State of English Pronunciation in India

The pronunciation of English of an average student or an adult who receives education at ordinary schools and colleges in India leaves, to face the facts, much to be desired and in certain cases specially of some words and sounds, quite faulty. Among the factors responsible are:

i. Unenviable quality of teachers whom the students imitate.

ii. Non-availability of correct pronunciation in an intelligible and standard phonetic notation.

As for the quality of teachers available in India, much

has already been said in the chapter entitled 'The Teaching Context'. As for the second factor, it is true that the pronunciation of English words is available in dictionaries in the notations based on Roman script. Mostly all dictionaries such as Websters, Oxford (Concise), Hornby's ALD and Chambers indicate the pronunciation of words in notations based on Roman script, but each different from others. Very few English-knowing people in India know how to decode a phonetic notation based on Roman script. D.P.L. Dry, realizing this difficulty being faced by the Indian users of these dictionaries, says:

Moreover, these dictionaries are mainly compiled with an eye to their use by native English speakers or by European and Japanese learners, and are often not as helpful as they should be for native speakers of language like Hindi.³

Now, therefore, efforts are being made in the direction of giving near-standard pronunciation in the script of the learner's MT and things are becoming easier. A very serious attempt for the benefit of the learners of English whose MT is Hindi has been made by Bulke in his well-known English-Hindi Dictionary.⁴

4. The Problem of Standard

But then arises a very vital question: What standard of pronunciation should be sought to be inculcated in the learner?

---


Many would favour the perfect pronunciation of the ideal native speaker of the standard variety. But practical experience shows that that is too high an ideal to be achieved, particularly so in the context in which we in India are faced with the problem of teaching English. The kind of English an average student in an average Indian school learns at present shows that this English is hardly intelligible at the all India level, much less at the international level. If the standard variety of English is the desirable target, much improvement is needed. The standard as the reference point and the ideal, if not the goal, in such a case will be the speech of the average educated British Speaker.

Besides, the learner in this case is too grown up to acquire new sounds 'with felicity'. Small children "possess a remarkable facility for acquiring strange sounds, and under favourable circumstances there is little difficulty in teaching a near-perfect pronunciation to them in class. But there comes a time --perhaps at puberty --when the faculty for easy imitation is lost. If language learning starts after this time, systematic (and painful) instruction in pronunciation is necessary."\(^5\) Even long back, a great lover of the language, Dr. Johnson thought that a change takes place in the 'pliability of the organs'\(^6\) and they 'become stiff'\(^7\) after 'the dividing line

---

7. Ibid., p. 38.
It has already been pointed out in an earlier chapter that the learner whose case is being taken up here studies English in conditions far from favourable and ideal. Besides, he is also of an age 'when the faculty for an easy imitation is lost' and his organs have become stiff because 'the dividing line has passed'. It is for this reason that in the present case a limited practical goal rather than a high ideal in respect of pronunciation is possible and desirable. David Abercrombie, for this reason, suggests that "pronunciation teaching should have, not a goal which must of necessity be normally an unrealized ideal, but a limited purpose which will be completely fulfilled."10

The limited goal that Abercrombie sets for achieving is, "the attainment of intelligibility."11 He says that "the learner, instead of being taken systematically through each English vowel and each consonant, and later, if there is time, through the complexities of intonation and rhythm, would have presented to him certain carefully chosen features on which to concentrate, the rest of his pronunciation being left to no more than a general supervision."12

9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
In the same vein D.A. Wilkins says that the "learner's task in acquiring a second language is not so much to reach a native speaker's standard of pronunciation. It is not very realistic to expect this. He needs to acquire a pronunciation that is accurate enough for the significant sounds to be distinctive from one another".  

Robert Lado also suggests a choice if possible in a non-native/foreign situation:

In India, the Philippines, Nigeria, and other countries where English is taught as a second language for national communication, arguments are strong for accepting the type of mutation English which exists in each of these countries and which has been influenced by the local languages. The argument can become purely rhetorical if no other English can be taught, but if there is a choice, then a more widely acceptable pronunciation might be preferable since the language will also be used in international communication.  

According to Lado the operative area of the widely acceptable pronunciation may transcend the local boundaries but it does not necessarily exclude the local speech conditions and the local core. By implication, with reference to India, if there is a choice between the strictly Indian (local) pronunciation and the Indian-cum-International pronunciation, the choice would be for the latter and wider variety, but the wider variety, in order to be international or British, cannot

afford to be non-Indian in our situation.

So the second language scientists seem to agree that ultimately the goal in respect of pronunciation need not be the attainment of perfect accuracy of the ideal variety. It is, practically speaking, intelligibility over a wider and wider area which has to be achieved. How best it can be achieved in the usual Indian context is the concern here.

5. The Perspective at a Glance

Before proceeding further in the discussion it will be worthwhile for a proper perspective, to put in brief what has so far been sought to be said:

i. English has many varieties but we accept a standard variety which is widely acceptable.

ii. That standard variety for us is the English of the Educated British speaker.

iii. The British ideal for us is not the practical goal; more than that it is a reference standard. We or our pupils cannot speak like the educated British speaker because our circumstances are different. But we develop our own pronunciation with reference to that standard. Our purpose may be described as a balanced integration of simplices: locality, practicality and ideality, the integration leading to intelligibility and intercomprehensibility.

iv. While we try to attain this limited purpose (rather than the perfect ideal) we ought to maintain the intra-systemic distinctions of sounds for the sake of intelligibility.
Besides these the following points are also worth noting in this connection:

i. As pointed out under the heading 'The Teaching Context' we have grown up pupils. Their speech habits have already been formed if not fixed. Their speech organs are rigid rather than flexible and pliable.

ii. As we accept MT interference as a fact of nature and the relevance of it as a matter of pedagogic strategy, we ought to make use of the approximation of sounds in the two languages towards the target language.

iii. As we have accepted the comparative-contrastive method of teaching language items, the same strategy can be adopted in respect of teaching pronunciation. "A comparative study of the sound systems of the pupil's mother tongue and of English will bring out the difficulties Indian children have in producing certain English sounds...". 15

iv. Since the notations available in the Roman or the international form are different from one another, it is better to evolve our own system which may be easily comprehensible to us.

v. If we have to evolve our own system why not make use of Devanagari symbols and give them English values? An attempt in this direction has already been made by Father Bulke. Nagri Lipi Parishad (Gandhi Smarak Nidhi, 19, Rajghat, New Delhi) is doing a commendable job in popularising Nagari script as one which can be adapted for the orthography of not only English but

other Indian and foreign languages as well. It has adapted this script for transcribing more than a dozen Indian and foreign languages such as Kannada, Telugu, Persian, Arabic, Japanese, Sinhalese, Russian, Italian, etc. This remarkable achievement fills us with confidence that our plea for transcribing English words in Devanagari is well-placed. Dr. Malik Mohammad, the chairman of Nagari Lipi Parishad says:

The scholars in and out of India generally accept that Devanagari is the most scientific script not only among the Indian scripts but also among those used in the whole world and it is capable of transcribing all the Indian languages, and all the world languages with slight modifications.\(^{16}\)

6. Learner's First Script (S1) and L2

Whenever a person at the earliest stage of L2 learning hears a word from a language other than his MT, his first reaction is to transcribe it, at least mentally, in the script (if he has learnt it) of his L1. Even if he does not actually transcribe it on paper he creates an image of it in the mind. David Amercrombie says that "introspection reveals, moreover, that sound images are present in the mind."\(^{17}\) He also says that "It is difficult to remember sounds without written equivalents."\(^{18}\) The images of the sounds, then, are defined in the characters (letters) of the learner's S1, i.e., the script in which his MT (L1) is written. Naturally therefore, during the times to come later on (but before a connection is


\(^{17}\) Problems and Principles in Language Study, p. 19.

\(^{18}\) Ibid.
established between the orthography and the pronunciation of a word of TL), it is these images which will guide him to pronounce the new words. In consequence, every word of English stands transcribed in Devanagari script before the mental eye of an initiate into the learning of English if his MT is Hindi or if Devanagari is his SI.

This, however, is the case more specially in respect of the words of English since it is not written as phonetically and consistently as Hindi, Sanskrit, Marathi or any other of the Indian languages. In the case of the words of the TL's which are written phonetically the sound image is transcribed in the script of the very same language. For example, a Hindi speaking learner of English on confronting the word 'picture' will mentally transcribe it as पिक्चर at least at the early stage of learning. On the other hand, while learning Panjabi as L2, on confronting the word ਪੈਟ਼ੀ the very same learner need not create its image in Devanagari script because Panjabi itself has a phonetic alphabet. But in the case of English the creation of the L1 scriptoral image of a word in phonetic transcription helps the learner in retaining its correct and corresponding pronunciation. It is for this reason that the learner (with Hindi as his L1) tends to transcribe English words in Devanagari script.

7. Inconsistent Orthography of English

English spelling as well as pronunciation is characterised by irregularities and inconsistencies of orthography. English spelling, J.R.Firth aptly points out, is "preposterously
No student of English can fail to notice that English spelling is not always a reliable guide to pronunciation. No examples need to be cited to bring out the validity of these remarks. For the sake of an interesting illustration, however, we may cite the case of an Indian child, born and being educated in Canada: In the fourth year of his schooling he spelt 'daily' as 'dale'. He gave a phonetic reason to justify his performance: d + a \(/e1/\) = /de1/ and 1 + e(\(-/1/-\)) = /l1/. Hence 'Dale' is \(-/de1l1/-\). To be fair to the child, it is difficult to disagree.

There is a great discrepancy between English spelling and pronunciation. The reason for this is the inadequacy of English alphabet: the 26 letters have to serve to represent all sounds which are more than one and a half times as many in number. There are twelve vowels, eight diphthongs and twenty four consonants and thus the total comes to 44. So the English alphabet has to "struggle unsuccessfully, to bear the burden of all the sounds." As Deniel Jones puts it, the "chief difficulty connected with the application of the Roman Alphabet to languages other than Latin is and always has been that most languages contain many more essential speech-sounds than Latin did." Robert Lado too says the same thing, that "when standard


21. Quoted, R.S. Pathak, p. 64.
spoken utterances differ from their graphic representation, it is due to inadequacy of the writing system." Further, English in the written form has suffered the disadvantage of fixed printed spelling while the pronunciation has been changing. This discrepancy between the fixity of the written form and the changeability of the spoken form adds to the difficulty. Even if the sounds were given written phonetic representation, the spelling still refuses to alter. The English are hard core traditionalists in this sense, not only in matters of monarchy (as Shaw put it) and manners, but also in their language. A reference to any history of the English language will bear it out.

The result is that English has had to make up this deficiency of the letters with the help of improvised measures which are neither coherent nor consistent. Hence a lot of duplicacy, incoherence and inconsistency in respect of spelling-pronunciation relationship. However, if we read the history of spelling and pronunciation and the problems of orthography English has faced and tried to solve during the last few centuries, things become understandable but that does not solve the problem of an average L2 learner. His problem is not the history but the language itself at the time when he is learning it. Some of the improvised measures being used in

English are:

a) We use one letter for more sounds than one:
   i. c = /s/ as in 'cigar' /ˈsɪɡər/ and 'cell' /ˈsɛl/
   ii. c = /k/ as in 'can' /ˈkæn/ and 'car' /ˈkær/
   iii. c = /ʃ/ as in 'suspicion' /ˈsəspiʃən/ and 'precious' /ˈprɛʃəs/

b) We combine two letters for representing one sound:
   i. ch = /tʃ/ as in 'chair' /ˈtʃeər/
   ii. sh = /ʃ/ as in 'shelf' /ˈʃelf/
   iii. th = /θ/ as in 'thing' /ˈθɪŋ/
   iv. th = /ð/ as in 'that' /ˈðæt/
   v. gh = /g/ as in 'ghost' /ˈɡəʊst/
   vi. wr = /r/ as in 'write' /ˈraɪt/

c) We sometimes use one letter and sometimes two for representing the very same sound, for example:
   i. 'g' and 'gh' = /g/ as in 'girl' /ˈɡɜːl/ and 'ghost' /ˈɡəʊst/
   ii. 'r' and 'wr' = /r/ as in 'wring' /ˈrɪŋ/ and 'ring' /ˈrɪŋ/
   iii. 's' and 'sh' = /ʃ/ as in 'sugar' /ˈsʌɡər/ and 'shoot' /ʃuːt/
   iv. 'k' and 'ch' = /k/ as in 'school' /ˈskuːl/ and 'book' /bʊk/

d) Some letters in certain situations are silent:
   i. 'p' as in 'psalm' /ˈpsɔːm/
   ii. 'b' as in 'tomb' /ˈtʌm/
   iii. 'c' as in 'indict' /ˈɪndɪkt/
   iv. 't' as in 'often' /ˈɒfən/
Some letters are silent in a word but are pronounced in some of its derivatives:

i) 'b' is silent in 'doubt' /daʊt/ but pronounced in 'dubious' /djuˈbiəs/.

ii) 'c' is silent in 'indict' /ɪnˈdaɪət/ but pronounced in 'dictum' /dɪkˈtəm/.

In view of the irregularities and inconsistencies as shown above, learning of the pronunciation of English from the orthography of words appears to be a difficult exercise. It may, however, be true that there is a method in this madness. We may with effort discover some pattern in the use of consonants for giving or not giving a particular sound. For example:

i) 'wr' found in the initial position will be pronounced as /r/, as in 'write', 'wring', 'wrong', 'wreath', etc.

ii) 'ch' followed by e or oo will sound as /k/ as in 'school', and 'chemistry', 'scheme', etc.

But on the whole there seems to be a complete anarchy as far as the use of vowels is concerned. There is hardly any of the five vowel letters which does not give most of the important vowel sounds. To illustrate, let us take each one of them:

a) Different sounds given by the letter 'a':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i)</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>/ˈsɪdər/</th>
<th>/ə/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>/ɑːsk/</td>
<td>/ɒ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>/ˈvɪli dʒ/</td>
<td>/ɪ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>/keɪs/</td>
<td>/ei/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v)</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>/kæt/</td>
<td>/æ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vi) Watch  /wɒtʃ/  /ɔ/  

vii) Walk  /wɔːk/  /ɔː/  

Here the letter 'a' gives seven different sounds besides being silent in 'vocal' /vɒkəl/.

b) Different sounds given by the letter 'e':

i) Children  /ˈtʃɪldrən/  /ə/  

ii) Women  /ˈwʊmən/  /ɪ/  

iii) Mete  /ˈmiːt/  /ɪː/  

iv) Pen  /pɛn/  /e/  

v) Era  /ˈɛrə/  /æ/  

Here the letter 'e' gives five different sounds besides serving no purpose in 'kite' /kaɪt/.

c) Different sounds given by the letter 'i':

i) Pin  /pɪn/  /ɪ/  

ii) Machine  /məˈʃɪn/  /ɪː/  

iii) Fine  /faɪn/  /aɪ/  

iv) Firm  /fɜːm/  /ɜː/  

Here the letter 'i' gives four different sounds.

d) Different sounds given by the letter 'o':

i) Box  /bɒks/  /ɔ/  

ii) Go  /gəʊ/  /əʊ/  

iii) Woman  /ˈwʊmən/  /ʌ/  

iv) Mosquito  /maʊˈskɪtəʊ/  /əʊ/  

v) Above  /ˈæbəv/  /æ/  

vi) One  /wʌn/  /w/  

Here the vowel 'o' gives six different sounds.
Different sounds given by the letter 'u':-

i) Subdue /səbduː/ /ə/
ii) Used /juːst/ /juː /
iii) But /bʌt/ /ʌ /
iv) Turf /tɔːf/ /ɔː /
v) Rude /ruːd/ /uː /
vi) 'Suicide /sjuːzaɪd/ /juː /

Here the letter 'u' gives six different sounds besides being silent in 'victual' /vɪtʃl/

Besides these, a number of other sounds are produced by each of these five vowel letters when one functions in conjunction with one or more of the other vowels, as for example in:

i) Thousand /θəʊzənd/ /au /
ii) Theatre /θɪˈɛrɛ/ /iə /
iii) Humorous /ˈhjuːmərəs/ /ə /
iv) Beautiful /ˈbjuːtɪfl/ /juː /
v) Great /ɡreɪt/ /eɪ /

It appears that there is no rule of law in the relation between the spelling and the pronunciation of English. It is written arbitrarily and spoken arbitrarily. It appears, at least to one who is not used to the vagaries of orthography, that the rule of the jungle rules the roost here. Some literary luminaries, like Dryden and Johnson, even called it a barbarous language.
G.B.Shaw makes fun of the inadequacy of English alphabet in one of his witty essays. In another, he says that "if the introduction of an English alphabet for the English language costs a civil war I shall not grudge it". In this essay he pleads for the adoption of a new English alphabet carrying 42 characters. Spelling reform, in fact, has been a favourite subject for many conscientious lovers of the language. The Americans have tried it but not to their full advantage. It is, however, not within the reach of the learner of English as L2 to bring about any change in the orthography of English. He will certainly look for some guide not to cross through the wilderness but to give him accurate pronunciation of words just to survive. Of course, the teacher can guide him but in the absence of the teacher only some phonetic notation can come to his rescue. Phonetic notation can come to the rescue of the teacher too.

And if some simple and intelligible phonetic notation is developed it will help the learner to face the problem during and beyond the contact hours in the class room. Such material will prove as a teacher-substitute. Besides, even the teacher needs some effective material such as a phonetic notation being suggested here for his teaching purposes. He needs such material because he too has been taught within limited resources.

Dictionaries of English generally carry the pronunciation of English words in IPA notation or in some other notation based on Roman script. But these notations are of limited use in the Indian context.

8. Unintelligible Phonetic Notation in Use

The Dictionaries of English generally carry the pronunciation of English words in IPA phonetic notation or in some other notation based on the Roman alphabet. But these notations are of limited use in the Indian context. A survey was carried out in respect of the teachers of English both at school and college level involving ten and six teachers respectively for assessing their knowledge of these Roman based (particularly IPA) notations. Whereas none of the school teachers (including those holding M.A. degrees in English) had ever heard of IPA or any other phonetic notation, only two of the college teachers could properly read the IPA system of notation. Others had only a dim idea of it and, only when pressed by necessity, could they make out the pronunciation of a particular word from a dictionary with the help of the Key given on the cover page.

True, these teachers could have been ignorant or lethargic. And ignorance or lethargy is no excuse for incompetence. But there is another factor also responsible for this state of affairs. Pronunciation, as at the moment, is not a prominent or effective part of our syllabi. It is possible for a candidate to pass M.A. (English) without being able to speak or without having spoken a single sentence of English.
Likewise, it is possible to cite instances where lecturers in English were appointed in colleges although they could not speak a single sentence in English before the Selection Committee. Besides, the most important factor is that the system of notation is not in tune with our tradition or language habits. Nor are the systems, whatever they are, uniform or consistent.  

In any case the variations of notation speak volumes of the practical inadequacy of the IPA and other systems of notation. If the teachers of degree and post graduate classes cannot read and understand a system without difficulty, how can it be of any help to a student who is merely a learner and has to remain contented with whatever he can catch from the lips of his teacher. Hence the need and relevance of an easily intelligible and consistent system of transcription.

Here another point is also worth noting. The system of accent notation is still more difficult and inconsistent in English dictionaries. If we compare the popular dictionaries with one another we shall discover that the systems are confusingly different. For example one of the dictionaries, viz., Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 27a marks the accent before the syllable and another, viz., New Webster's Dictionary 27b at the end of the syllable.

26. See Appendix A below for a comparison.
While we in Hindi (Devanagari) regard the vowel (स्वर) as the base of the accent, in English they have the syllable. The reason is basic in respect of the difference between the phonetic systems of the two languages. So the syllable for us is something illusive because while the vowel is still the core of the syllable, the consonants seem to float about between its preceding and succeeding syllables. Our system in Devanagari is to mark the accent on the vowel. And once this is done the syllable takes care of itself, the nucleus of the syllable being the vowel any way. But we blindly follow the English system of notation as well as of marking the accent. D.P.L. Dry Says:

A further problem arises if students are expected to learn a Roman-based phonetic notation at a time when their grasp both of the Roman alphabet and of English spelling is uncertain. The problem of English spelling is bad enough as it is--to add to it another representation of English sounds in the same type of script is likely to cause further confusion with the spelling--a student learns two ways of writing the same word in much the same script, and it is quite possible for him to lose both in trying to catch both. 28

Besides, "It is not good practice to spend a lot of time and energy in teaching an elaborate apparatus of symbols when a more familiar and simpler set will do the job adequately." 29 So this serious additional burden of learning "a whole lot of new Roman-based symbols in the short time available...can only be justified if there is absolutely no alternative." 30

28. Dry, p. 64.
29. Ibid., p. 60.
30. Ibid., p. 64.
9. Devanagari Notation for English

But a very effective alternative, as suggested above, is available in the form of Devanagari notation to one whose SI is Devanagari. And if the pronunciation were to be rendered in Devanagari script instead of the Roman, all teachers and students alike could clearly understand the pronunciation of a word as soon as they looked it up in the dictionary.

10. The Advantages of Devanagari Notation

There are certain distinct advantages of the adoption of Devanagari notation for denoting the pronunciation of English for a learner whose MT/L1 is Hindi:

i. Devanagari script being well known to him, it will be much easier for him to read the pronunciation transcribed in this script. He will not have to refer to any 'key to pronunciation' or guidelines except, in the case of certain sounds not even approximately available in Hindi. The usefulness of something familiar is natural and definite.

ii. Devanagari is a phonetic script. We read it almost as we write it, there being almost complete correspondence between the written letter and the spoken sound. Devanagari literally means from the 'Divine world' and it is the alphabetical script of Sanskrit which is known as Devanani -- language of the gods. That may be a subjective approach with more of sentiment than reason but the fact remains that

Devanagari consisting of 53 letters each representing a definite invariable sound happens to be the most ideally constructed script. Many Indian languages and Hindi in particular have adopted it. Sir Isaac Pitman, the inventor of shorthand was highly impressed by this script and he has paid the greatest tribute to it saying that "if in the world we have any alphabet the most perfect it is those Hindi ones". 32 Monier Williams once commented in the The Times about Devanagari script: "This although deficient in two important symbols (represented in the Roman by /z/ and /f/) is on the whole the most perfect and symmetrical. The Hindus hold that it came directly from gods (whence its name) and truly its wonderful adaptation to the symmetry of sacred sanskrit seems almost to raise it above the level of human invention." 33

iii) If Devanagari be not a perfect alphabet it certainly is a near-perfect one. Hence the need for additional sounds or symbols will involve only marginal extension. In fact certain symbols will involve only marginal modifications. Besides, some symbols are already being used for certain Urdu phonemes which occur in the Urdu loan words in Hindi. The alphabet, either in the present form with certain extensions or in a modified form can be used to cover all the sounds of English as will be seen in the list of phonemic notations.

32. Quoted, Ibid., p. 65.
33. Ibid.
11. Guidelines for Devanagari Notation

a) There should be a distinct symbol for each English phoneme. This principle was upheld by the IPA which enunciated in 1888 certain well formulated guidelines for the transcription of English words in a system of notation based on the Roman alphabet. It was agreed that "there should be a separate letter for each distinctive sound."\(^{34}\) Exactly the same approach will have to be made in respect of Devanagari notation.

b) Consonants should be represented either by consonants with a halanta\(^{35}\) subscribed or with half letters. Those occurring at the end position will, of course, have to be represented with halantas attached to them. For example 'picture' should be transcribed as /\textit{पिक्चर} / or as /\textit{पिक्चर} /. 

c) In England it is the r-less variety of English which is generally regarded as the standard. In the U.S.A., Australia and Canada it is the r-ful variety which is commonly accepted as standard English. India has mostly accepted the British as the model English and hence the r-less variety is regarded here as the standard. All the same, it is the r-ful variety which is spoken in India probably because the 'r' sound in Hindi is a triller and not a glide. D.P.L. Dry has the following to say on this issue:

The distinction between 'r-pronouncing' and 'non-r-pronouncing' accents of English is a fundamental one, and divides the accents neatly into two distinct groups.

\(^{34}\) The Principles of the International Phonetic Association (IPA, 1970), p. 3 of the Cover.

\(^{35}\) Halanta is a diacritical mark (\textbackslash{\textordmasculine}) subscribed to Devanagari Consonants when they are without any vowel sound attached to them.
On the one hand are those like south-western English, Welsh, Scottish, Irish, Midland American, Northern American and General American where 'r' is pronounced wherever it is written. The other group follows the practice of RP and only pronounces 'r' when it occurs before a vowel. Since in fact many accents of Indian English are already r-pronouncing and this is a perfectly respectable and recognized way of pronouncing English, and since it considerably eases the burden of teaching both pronunciation and spelling, it seemed reasonable that Indian English should join the r-pronouncing group.  

So the pronunciation to be represented in Devanagari should be the r-pronouncing one. Interestingly the 'r' which is pronounced in America and levelled in England finds its place in Devanagari transcription (of course when pronounced) in the form of a superscript as in 'cartoon' / कार्टून /. It is easily distinguishable from the 'r' sound followed by a vowel sound which is to be pronounced invariably as in 'carriage' / कैरिज /. Thus there is a clear distinction between the 'r' which is to be pronounced in every case and the one which is to be pronounced optionally depending on the variety one chooses i.e., the silent or the pronounced. So those who wish to use the silent 'r' variety will be keeping the Devanagari superscript (‘) silent (or to be exact, low and levelled), and those who wish to pronounce it can do so. The superscript can serve both the purposes.

36. Dry, p. 65.
d) Where there is no Devanagari letter equivalent of an English phoneme, a letter nearest to the phoneme with a symbol (a diacritical mark) should be chosen to represent it. For example, for representing /z/ sound, ṇ with a sub-script dot i.e., TypeInfo should be used.

The points to be borne in mind for finding these symbols are the following in the order of priority:

i. Already there are some dictionaries (such as those compiled by Bulke,37 and Pathak38) indicating pronunciation in Devanagari. Approximated letters and signs/symbols have been used in them. Some of them, e.g., ṇ for /z/ and ṭ for /ʃ/ and Ṽ for /θ/ have achieved wide acceptability. They may be considered for adoption or adaptation (of course with diacritical marks underneath to remind the users constantly of the distinction) since no better alternatives exist.

ii. Some signs have already been borrowed from other alphabets, e.g., (‘) from Marathi and (.) from Persian. Some of these signs/marks have become a part and parcel of Devanagari script and their sound values accepted as part of Hindi language with the induction of thousands of Persian, Urdu and English words. Some of them which have been assimilated into the Hindi


language system may be retained but only if no other alternative within the Devanagari script exists.

iii. In case some sounds are still left unrepresented or under-represented, e.g., /e/, /ɔ/, etc., new signs could be evolved. But such evolution should be reasonable and comprehensible to the new initiates of Devanagari phonemic notation of English. As shown in point (ii) above, Hindi itself has grown under the impact of other languages. Let it grow further under the impact of English also.

The Devanagari phonemic notation suggested below has all the qualities which can be expected of an ideal notation possible in our circumstances. It is the simplest possible notation for a learner whose MT/L1 is Hindi. It is also typographically convenient since it is easily manageable.

11. Phonemic Notation (Vowels and Diphthongs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No.</th>
<th>IPA Symbol</th>
<th>Devanagari symbol</th>
<th>Examples with IPA Notation</th>
<th>Examples in Devanagari Notation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>i:</td>
<td>ई (i)</td>
<td>see -/si:/</td>
<td>सी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>ɨ</td>
<td>इ (ɨ)</td>
<td>sit -/sɨt/-</td>
<td>सिट</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ए (e)</td>
<td>ten -/ten/-</td>
<td>टेंन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>ऐ (ə)</td>
<td>hat -/hət/-</td>
<td>हेट</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>ʌ:</td>
<td>आ (a)</td>
<td>arm -/aːrm/-</td>
<td>आर्म</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td>ऑ (ʊ)</td>
<td>got -/ɡɒt/-</td>
<td>गौट</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>ɔ:</td>
<td>ओ (ɔ)</td>
<td>saw -/sɔː/ -</td>
<td>सौ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>उ (u)</td>
<td>put -/put/-</td>
<td>पुट</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>u:</td>
<td>ऊ (u)</td>
<td>too -/tu:/ -</td>
<td>तू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr.No.</td>
<td>IPA Symbol</td>
<td>Devanagari Symbol</td>
<td>Examples with IPA Notation</td>
<td>Examples in Devanagari Notation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>अ/ (ऍ)</td>
<td>Cup -/cʌp /</td>
<td>कप्प</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>अ्र (अर)</td>
<td>fur -/f əːr/</td>
<td>फ़र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>अ (अ)</td>
<td>ago -/ə əʊ /</td>
<td>अगो</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>eɪ</td>
<td>ए (ए)</td>
<td>page-/peɪdʒ/</td>
<td>पेज</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>əʊ</td>
<td>ओ (ओ)</td>
<td>home-/həʊm/</td>
<td>होम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>əɪ</td>
<td>आइ (आइ)</td>
<td>five-/faɪv/</td>
<td>फाइव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>əʊ</td>
<td>आउ (आउ)</td>
<td>now-/nəʊ/</td>
<td>नाउ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii.</td>
<td>əɪ</td>
<td>औइ (औइ)</td>
<td>join-/dʒain/</td>
<td>जोइन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii.</td>
<td>əɪ</td>
<td>इअ (इअ)</td>
<td>near-/nər /</td>
<td>निअर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix.</td>
<td>eɪ</td>
<td>ऐई (ऐई)</td>
<td>hair-/hɛər /</td>
<td>हेअर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>əʊ</td>
<td>उओ (उओ)</td>
<td>poor-/pʊər /</td>
<td>पुअर</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes on the Notation of Vowel Sounds

a) A devanagari consonant letter without any apparent matra added to it means that it carries at its end the अ/ə or sound. Wherever a half Devanagari letter (or one with halanta) occurs it indicates that it is to be clustered with the next consonant, if any. Thus consonant clusters occur in Devanagari as in English and English clusters can be properly represented in this script, e.g., 'next' /'next'/, 'helped' /ˈhelp/., booked /ˈbʊk/., etc.

b) There is a difference between Hindi ए (`) and the English /eɪ/ sounds as also between the Hindi ओ (ो) and the English /əʊ / sounds. Both the Hindi sounds, though long are

39. A symbol in Devanagari script, indicating a vowel sound added to a consonant.
relatively shorter than the English ones. For this reason one is tempted to transcribe 'gate' and 'male' as मेंट्ट and मेंल्ल indicating the lengthened sound of the preceding /ei/ (\`\`\`). sound, and 'home' and 'note' as होम्स and नोट्स indicating the lengthened sound of the preceding */\`\`\`* sound. One would have' (or for that matter any other mark indicating length) added after these matras to remind the user of the transcription, of lengthening the preceding vowel sound something like plut\textsuperscript{41} vowels in Hindi and Sanskrit. The symbol is already there in Devanagari (e.g. in ओम्स). But at the same time one would also avoid burdening the Devanagari transcription with yet another symbol. So there is the usual preference for the original Devanagari matras with a general reminder to the users of Devanagari transcription that the two matras in transcription have to be lengthened. The same approach has been adopted here.

c) There is a great difference between the sound value of ऐ(\`\`\`) in Sanskrit where it is a diphthong (ai), and the sound value of it in Hindi and Urdu loan words where it has been levelled. For example the (\`\`\`) in शृंगारी sounds as /ai/,

\textsuperscript{40.} It is worth recalling here that originally ऐ and ओ too were diphthongs, they being combinations of अ and इ, and आ and ओ respectively. In the course of time they got levelled. It is also worth mentioning that in the field of English, too, they are quite often levelled in India and sometimes pronounced as diphthongs by those who know.

\textsuperscript{41.} Plut vowels are those vowels which are pronounced with protracted sound.
much different from ( ' ) in कैसा, जैसा, शैश, पैसा, ऐनकः, हे, पैदल, बेर, etc., where this sound has been levelled as /ə/. In fact ऐ ( ' ) as of now is being used in Hindi for /ə/. In the Hindi heartland (with an exception of a small tract constituted by the Eastern U.P. and a part of Bihar) where it is still pronounced as /ai/, (which diphthong does not exist in the English Language) this symbol is being used for /ə/. So when 'cat' /kæt/ is transcribed as कैत people tend to read it as /kæt/ and not as /kait/; thus giving the correct pronunciation.

It is for this reason that Father Bulke has also used the / ' / symbol for representing /ə /. Even elsewhere this transcription is being freely used to indicate /ə /. Look up any word transcribed in Devanagari and you will find ( ' ) symbol being used for /ə / sound, e.g., in 'Paris' ( पेरिस ), 'Maxmuller' ( मैक्समूलर ) 'he-man' ( ही-मैन ) 'bank' ( बैंक ), etc. So it is only appropriate that ऐ( ' ) should represent /ə / in Devanagari notation.

d) औ symbol ( ' ) like ુ symbol ( ' ) used in Sanskrit words gives a different sound from the one given by it when used in Urdu/Hindi words. For example in देवो, रामो, पितरो, ओषधि the sound represented by ( ' ) symbol is a diphthong, pronounced as /au/ = ओउ . But in the case of Hindi and Urdu words such as कॉन, और, मौजूद, पौज, etc., the same symbol (except of course, in some parts of the Hindi speaking region) gives a levelled sound, which is transcribed as / ə:/ in IPA notation.
Of late even the Sanskrit words (carrying ओ sound) being used in Hindi have changed their pronunciation under the influence of Urdu and Persian. They have started being pronounced as vowels rather than as diphthongs, as in Urdu and Persian words accepted in Hindi. Some of them, for example, are गोरे, थोरेक, तेलिक. They are mostly pronounced as /?u?:r/, /jau:k/, and /lo:k/. as contrasted with their original Sanskrit pronunciation which is /?au:n/, /jaug:k/, and /laug:k/.

In view of this the /?/ sound should legitimately be represented by ओ. 'All', 'tail', 'small' should be transcribed as ओल, टॉल, स्मॉल. But usually this is not being done. Instead, they are written as आल, टाल, स्माल. The pull at the back of the mind is perhaps the original Sanskrit sound notation which prevents a transcriber from using ओ (ो) as a vowel rather than as a diphthong. Even the fully knowledgeable persons do not transcribe the above three words as ओल, टॉल, स्मॉल. They instead prefer to use the Marathi diacritical mark (ं). Resultantly they transcribe them as आङ, टाङ, स्माङ.

But it has been usually noticed that the students belonging to Hindi region neither understand the tilt given by this Marathi diacritical mark nor appreciate its use. Thus they tend to ignore this mark while reading, and completely omit it while writing. This tendency has resulted in the misconception that the pronunciation of words like 'horn', 'fought', 'taught'
is हैरे, फटे, लट respectively. It is, therefore, suggested that instead of using this (ौ ) mark the ओ (ौ ) symbol should be adopted for representing the /ɔ:/ sound.

Another point in favour of ओ instead of ओ for representing /ɔ:/ sound is the immediate and therefore natural availability of this sign for the corresponding sound symbol in case of Hindi-knowing candidates.

Ten intelligent boys and girls of V class who didn't know English were asked to write in Devanagari script the following six words:

- i or ii. horn iii. bought
- iv fought v. taught vi. long

Excepting two boys the remaining 8 students transcribed them as:

- i. और ii. होर्न iii. बोट
- iv. पोट v. टोट vi. लोंग

The two boys excepted (whom I later discovered to be less intelligent than the remaining eight) transcribed some of the words, with य matra as और, होर्न, बोट, पोट etc. None, however, transcribed them as और, होर्न, बोट, etc. In fact they were not conversant with this symbol.

42. This happened because they were not precise in their knowledge of Hindi either. This means that transcription of English through Devanagari would require better discipline of writing in Hindi as well.

43. Marathi boys and girls would prefer (ौ ) diacritical mark for the very same sound. And so if transcription in Devanagari script is intended to be used by Marathi-knowing learner it will not only be better to use the diacritical mark (ौ ) but will also be more desirable.
The conclusion drawn from this survey was that an average student takes the \( \tilde{t} \) symbol to be representing the same sound as is represented by \( \ddot{z} \) in IPA notation. Hence our insistence on the use of \( \ddot{a} \) (\( \dddot{a} \)) for denoting the \( \ddot{z} \) sound.

e) As for \( \ddot{a} \) normally an Indian student fails to distinguish between this sound and \( \ddot{u} \). Of course \( \ddot{u} \) is a lengthened variant of \( \ddot{a} \) sound, which does not exist in Hindi. However, "Indian English has one phoneme \( \ddot{a} \) corresponding to R.P. \( \ddot{a} \) and \( \ddot{u} \)"\(^{44}\) says Dr. R.K. Bansal. But that is only describing Indian English which is deviant. Besides, what Bansal says is doubtful also. Indian English in Hindi region has the short \( \ddot{u} \) as well as the long \( \ddot{u} \) sounds. So a necessity arises for transcribing in Hindi the vowel \( \ddot{u} \) also.

For meeting this requirement a logical suggestion would be to represent this sound with \( \ddot{a} \) (\( \dddot{a} \)), the superscribed (') being a symbol of the shortened vowel.

f) With what Devanagari letter to represent \( /e/ \) sound has been discussed more elaborately than any other point relating to pronunciation, at places where transcription of English words in Devanagari is required. The main controversy has been between representing it with \( \tilde{e} \) (\( \tilde{e} \)) or \( \tilde{e} \) (\( \tilde{e} \)). Some consider it closer to \( \tilde{e} \) and others to \( \tilde{e} \). That is why we find 'red' and 'pen' represented as ' \( \tilde{e} \) ' and ' \( \tilde{e} \) ' respectively in M.P. and

44. Spoken English For India (Bombay: Orient Longman, 1972), p.17.
Maharashtra, and as रेड and फैन, in Haryana and U.P. But this results into a lot of confusion. These three words, 'pen', 'pan' and 'pain' should be transcribed differently. But if we follow either of the practices mentioned above, confusion is bound to result: if 'pen' is फैन then how will 'pain' be transcribed in M.P. and Maharashtra? Similarly if 'pen' is फैन how will 'pan' be transcribed in U.P. and Haryana? So in order to avert confusion we will have to evolve a new symbol for /e/. As in the Hindi context a recourse to length and shortness of vowels can be useful, it has been suggested in the phonemic notation given above that ए (') symbol should be used for representing /e/ sound. This symbol will meet all the requirements without causing any confusion. Besides, the superimposed (') is a symbol of a shortened vowel, as suggested above. Accordingly 'red' and 'pen' will be transcribed as रेड and फैन.

e) The /ə/ is being represented by अ here and thus every full Devanagari consonant in a transliterated word contains in it अ sound at its end, e.g., स in लेसन -/lesən/.

h) /ʌ/ has been represented here by putting  (superscript) on a consonant or अ as in 'cup' (कप) कप, 'but' /bʌt/ बुट, 'under' (आड़र) आड़र, etc. For some, however, this diacritical mark is really not necessary and Indians can do without it. "In R.P. /ʌ/, /ʒ/ and /ɔ/ are separate phonemes, but corresponding to these Indian English has only one
phoneme /ə/, realized as /ə/ and /ʌ/, the two being used indiscriminately. But in order to be as close as possible to R.P. we have to use this symbol (\textsuperscript{\textregistered}) also.

13. Phonemic Notation (Consonants)

R.S. Pathak has prepared a chart of the consonants (with reference to their place and manner of articulation) giving alongside them a Devanagari notation. Since this notation (which itself is based on Daniel Jones' Table of Principal English Sounds)\textsuperscript{46} fully meets all the requirements of the average Hindi speaking learner of English, it is being reproduced here (see page 133) along with the remarks he has made on the Devanagari symbols.

Remarks on the Consonant Symbols

i. Matching the Devanagari symbols against the phonemes of RP, we find that some symbols are immediately applicable. These are:

a) the voiceless plosives \textipa{\textasciitilde p} and \textipa{\textasciitilde k} and their voiced counterparts \textipa{\textasciitilde b} and \textipa{\textasciitilde g};
b) the nasals \textipa{\textasciitilde m}, \textipa{\textasciitilde n} and \textipa{\textasciitilde \textasciitilde}\textipa{\textasciitilde n};
c) the lateral \textipa{\textasciitilde l};
d) the fricatives \textipa{\textasciitilde s}, \textipa{\textasciitilde z} and \textipa{\textasciitilde \textasciitilde s}; and
e) semi-vowel \textipa{\textasciitilde \textasciitilde u} and frictionless continuant \textipa{\textasciitilde r}.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p. 27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plosives</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labiodental</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Postalveolar</th>
<th>Palatoalveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p b</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>f v</td>
<td>e i</td>
<td>s z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frictionless</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuant and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semi vowels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-133-
The modified symbols for the Urdu fricatives ꜙ and ꜚ are in the same category.

ii) Taking into consideration Educated Indian English Pronunciation, as described by R.K. Bansal, we may suggest symbols ꜕, ꜝ and ꜘ for the fricative sounds /v/, /θ/ and /ʃ/ respectively; ꜚ and ꜛ may be accepted for the alveolar plosives /t/ and /d/.

The English sounds /v/, /θ/ and /ʃ/ should be distinguished from the Hindi sounds ꜕, ꜝ and ꜘ by using a subscript dot. The difference between the English alveolar plosives and the Hindi retroflex sounds should also be pointed out.

iii) The palato-alveolar affricates /ʒ/ and /ʃ/ can be represented by the Devanagari symbols ꜞ and ꜟ respectively, though the affrication in the case of the Hindi sounds is much less than in the corresponding English sounds.

iv) The semi-vowel /w/ can be represented by modifying Devanagari ꜝ by a subscript circle---ꞅ

v) Similarly, the voiced palato-alveolar fricative /ʒ/ may be symbolized as ꜙ (by putting two subscript dots under the symbol ꜝ). The symbol ꜙ would be in accordance with the 1888 IPA principle, which states that "the new letters should be suggestive of the sounds they represent, by their resemblance to the old one".
vi) The sounds /p/, /t/ and /k/ should be aspirated when they come at the beginning of a stressed syllable: e.g., pin [phin]; spin [spin]. If these English phonemes are not aspirated by Indian speakers, the native speakers of English will have a lot of difficulty in differentiating between such words as 'pack' and 'back', 'try' and 'dry', etc. The allophonic variants of these sounds, however, need not be indicated in the transcription.

vii) Consonant-clusters should be represented by Devanagari half-letters; e.g.;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>IPA transcription</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>explore</td>
<td>/iks'plɔːr/</td>
<td>ईक्सप्लोर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tests</td>
<td>/tests/</td>
<td>टेस्ट्स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reached</td>
<td>/ritʃ /</td>
<td>रिच्च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clothed</td>
<td>/kloʊəd /</td>
<td>ब्लोड़ूड</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risked</td>
<td>/riskt/</td>
<td>रिस्क्ट</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nasals, however, when they are not followed by a vowel but by a consonant and when they do not occur at the word-end, can be written as anusvāra (.) at the option of the transcriber, e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>IPA transcription</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thinks</td>
<td>/θɪŋks/</td>
<td>थिंक्स  or  थिंक्स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>/ˈnʌmbər/</td>
<td>नंबर  or  नंबर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ink</td>
<td>/ɪŋk /</td>
<td>इंक  or  इंक</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This phonemic notation, consisting of twenty four consonant symbols, is sufficient in itself to be successfully used for teaching English pronunciation to a Hindi-knowing learner of English.

14. Another Way of Looking at the Consonants

Let us now have a list of most of the consonant sounds (the sounds which are immediately or approximately available in both the languages) used in English in the order followed in the enlistment of Devanagari consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ख</th>
<th>ग</th>
<th>घ</th>
<th>च</th>
<th>ज</th>
<th>झ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>छ</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>च</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>झ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प</td>
<td>फ</td>
<td>फ</td>
<td>प</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>य</td>
<td>र</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>य</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. R.S. Pathak, pp. 71-73.

48. Whereas Hindi sound is bilabial, the English sound is labiodental. Hence the equivalence, though usually seen, is rather far-fetched.
Some Useful Notes on the above

a) The table above will give an idea to the learner as to which consonant sounds of Hindi do not exist in English even approximately. Many sounds, particularly the second and the fourth letters of each varga of Hindi consonants do not exist even approximately in English. That is why normally no native speaker of English can produce these sounds. On the basis of this comparative study of sounds a learner has to be warned against a phonetic reading of English in the light of spelling.

Interestingly, the word 'ghost' is likely to be pronounced as गौट by a Hindi-knowing Indian on account of his background of having got used to a phonetic script. But soon he is told that it is not गौट but गौट as an Englishman cannot produce a छ sound because English does not have this sound. In fact an Englishman does not develop a sound box for this and such other sounds in his vocal cords.

This example has been given to highlight the fact that some of the consonant sounds cannot just be uttered by an Englishman. The Hindi alphabet has been constructed systematically. The system is such that one can locate easily

49. The first 25 consonants of Devanagari script have been divided into five groups called vargas, each comprising five consonants having the same place of articulation phonetically, and each varga named after the first consonant such as kavarga, chavarga, etc.
which of the sounds do not exist in English language, e.g., 2nd and 4th letter of every varga, and hence these are to be avoided in pronunciation. Again for example, \( \ddot{a} \) sound does not exist in English. So learners are well advised not to give out this sound while pronouncing such words as 'adhere' 'adhesive' and 'adhesion'. These words should not be pronounced as अधिजर्, अधेसिव and अधीजन् simply because \( \ddot{a} \) sound does not exist in English. Instead, they should be pronounced as अधिजर्, अधेसिव and अधीजन्.

Father Bulke gives the pronunciation of 'Dhoti' (भोटी in Hindi) as ढोटी only because neither छ nor त sound exists in English. So the sounds nearest to छ and त in English, i.e., ढ and त have been used to indicate the pronunciation of these sounds.


51. The problem of pronouncing Indian words accepted in English has also to be tackled. Just as words of Hindi and other Indian languages have been accepted, so words of other foreign languages too have been accepted in English. How should these words (mostly carrying non-English sounds) be pronounced? Should they be pronounced as in the original language or as adopted in English? Should कलकत्ता be pronounced as कैलकटा /kalkata/ by an Indian. And if कलकत्ता is to be pronounced in the original Indian style, what about the words of other foreign origin? Here we may be practical. The English version of an Indian word sounds funny to us but the anglicised European words do not sound funny because we do not know the original. We cannot be dogmatic, though. Whether we stick to the anglicised version or to the Indian or both, the transcription should be clear. On the balance of considerations, though, the Indian version sounds logical. Let us follow something simple. Indian words are to be pronounced as Indian unless they have been anglicised like 'Calcutta' in which case we may accept both कैलकटा and कलकत्ता.
This sort of comparative understanding of the sounds of both the languages helps a learner in determining which word/sound is being sought to be pronounced by a native speaker of English. And therein lies the relevance of the knowledge of the Hindi sound system in understanding some of the words used by Englishmen and other native speakers of this language.

b) There are two shades of ज sound in English, viz.:

i. /dʒ/ which exists in Hindi and is being represented in the Devanagari notation here by ज.

ii. /z/ being represented here by जू. As a matter of fact, this sound does not exist in Devanagari. However, in Persian it does exist and it has come to Hindi via Persian and Urdu. It is usually represented there by the letter Unhandled Error

(c) /ʒ/ is a sound in the English language for which an approximate sound in Hindi is not available. This is a sound occurring in such words as 'measure', 'treasure', 'pleasure', 'occasion', 'division', 'provision', etc. It is being represented here with जू (जू with two subscript dots.) as suggested above by R.S. Pathak also. This is an unusual sound for a learner whose L1 is Hindi and S1 Devanagari. Father Bulke represents it with šज.

But in this connection it is noteworthy that since Devanagari is a phonetic script, it is read as it is written, and written as it is spoken. Moreover, the sound combinations...
(clusters) too correspond in spoken and written forms. So the clustered written forms too are phonetic. Similarly the sandhi too takes place phonetically. In Hindi श is a voiceless sound and ज is voiced. The two cannot be joined for /ʒ/. It is scientifically and practically impossible.

On the other hand, ज is an extension of झ (which itself is an extension of झ). Any addition to an alphabet should be an extension or modification but without affecting the existing letters and diacritics if any. That is why it is more reasonable to represent /ʒ/ with ज ( ज with two subscript dots). However, only a practical demonstration of the pronunciation of this sound can help the learner to attain accuracy. In fact only a practical demonstration of the distinction between these three sounds, viz., /z/, /dʒ/ and /ʒ/ will bring out the distinction of each individual sound from the other two.

d) There is difference between the English /f/ sound and Hindi फ sound. Whereas Hindi फ is a purely bilabial voiceless plosive the English /f/ is a labiodental voiceless fricative. This has to be repeatedly impressed upon the learner. And for this purpose, a constant reminder will be the subscript dot occurring with फ ( फ ) in Devanagari transcription of /f/ sound.

Thus we see that 20 vowel and diphthongal sounds and 24 consonant sounds of English language can be represented in near
exact character with the help of symbols available from the Devanagari script duly modified and extended. They are sufficient for transcribing every word of English and thus for giving students the requisite knowledge of English pronunciation through a familiar script. Though this transcription is not sufficient for specialists in phonetics who will require more symbols and a more elaborate Devanagari notation, teachers of English in schools and colleges with a limited goal of broad intelligibility as agreed upon in the beginning of this chapter will find this set of notations adequate, perhaps ideal. In any case, when correct Devanagari transcription is given to the students while they are being initiated into the learning of English, the standard of English pronunciation is bound to improve.

15. Inexact Transliteration

A lot of inaccurate transliteration of English words in Devanagari and other Indian scripts is being done these days. This is having its adverse effect on the pronunciation of the learner of English, which in turn is having an ill effect on the intelligibility of English within India itself and indeed worse, in the international context also. The state of affairs requires to be rectified if the harm being done by inexact transliteration is to be arrested.
a) Transliteration of English alphabet

Let us first have a look at how some of the English/Roman letters are usually transliterated into Devanagari script:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} &= \text{ए} & \text{f} &= \text{फ} & \text{h} &= \text{ह} & \text{l} &= \text{ल} \\
\text{m} &= \text{म} & \text{n} &= \text{न} & \text{s} &= \text{स} & \text{x} &= \text{ख}
\end{align*}
\]

Here no distinction is being made between the vowel sounds in the nomenclatures of 'a' and 'h' on the one hand, and of the remaining six on the other, though the values of the vowel sounds involved are distinct from one another. This will be clear from their transcription in IPA notation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} &= /\text{ei}/ & \text{f} &= /\text{ef}/ & \text{h} &= /\text{eit}/ & \text{l} &= /\text{el}/ \\
\text{m} &= /\text{em}/ & \text{n} &= /\text{en}/ & \text{s} &= /\text{es}/ & \text{x} &= /\text{eks}/
\end{align*}
\]

Three of the most popular books, viz., 'Speedily English Speaking Course'\(^{52}\), Rapidex English Speaking Course\(^{53}\) and CSR English Speaking Course\(^{54}\) teaching English through Hindi (a kind of crash course) were examined and they too did not distinguish one from the other. Similarly 'z' is also transcribed differently. Somewhere it is transcribed as ज and somewhere as झ। In fact it is because of such quality of transliteration that the

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{52. V.K.Aggarwal, } &\text{Speedily English Speaking Course (Delhi: Dehati Pustak Bhandar, 1978).} \\
\text{53. R.K. Gupta, } &\text{Rapidex English Speaking Course (Delhi: Pustak Mahal, 1992).} \\
\text{54. G.K.Puri, } &\text{CSR English Speaking Course (New Delhi: Competition Review Pvt.Ltd. 1992).}
\end{align*}
\]
impression is given that all these letters have the same vowel sound. If an accurate transliteration in Devanagari of English alphabet as follows is provided to the learners at the very beginning there is no doubt that they will be initiated into the correct pronunciation of English alphabet:

```
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
a & b & c & d & e & f & g & h \\
es & bi & si & di & ei & e & fi & gh \\
i & j & k & l & m & n & o & p \\
\text{आई} & \text{जी} & \text{की} & \text{ली} & \text{मी} & \text{नी} & \text{ओ} & \text{पी} \\
q & r & s & t & u & v & w & x \\
\text{क्यू} & \text{आर} & \text{एस} & \text{टी} & \text{यू} & \text{वी} & \text{डब्ल्यू} & \text{एक्स} \\
y & z \\
\text{वाय} & \text{जी}\\n\end{array}
\]
```

b) Transliteration of words

Coming to the current practice of transliteration of English words in Devanagari script the following deserve a close attention:

i. S.Chand & Co.
   Atma Ram and Sons

ii. Rajendra Ravindra Printers
    Tyres and Tubes Co.
    Rama General Stores

iii. College, football
trolley, common
iv. red and white

v. zero, hero

vi. Tier

Notes on the above

1. These Nagari transcriptions occur on every book published by these prestigious publishing houses. But it is surprising that such a transcription should figure on English-Hindi dictionary compiled by Father C. Bulke who has made a sincere, serious and successful attempt in his dictionary to transcribe in Nagari script the words of English. It would have been only in the fitness of things if the Nagari transliteration had been " ऐसः चन्द्र एण्ड कम्पनि " . Of course S is ऐसः and not एसः, 'and' is एण्ड and not एण्डः, 'company' is कम्पनि and not कम्पनी (following the Nagari notation suggested above.)

But this change would require linguistic commitment to British English. Indeed one's commitment may be to British or American English, the Devanagari notation will work. Even Father Bulke seems to have compromised, otherwise he would not have transcribed 'and' as एण्ड 55 in his preface to the third edition of the very same dictionary in which he transcribes 'and' as एण्डः 56 in the main body of the book. We usually find

55. Bulke, p. vi.
56. Ibid., p. 28.
'and' transcribed as एन्ड even in the most authentic books (which of course is very jarring to the ears of one who is conscious of the distinction existing between ए /e1/ sound and ऐ /a/ sound, howsoever near they might be or seem to be to each other. Even Dr. Bulke could not resist the temptation of following (as brought out above) the course of the layman in practice though he has given different notation in his dictionary for the very same sound.

In his preface referred to above, Dr. Bulke has transcribed 's' as एस57. Had he included 's' as a word or as a letter in the main body of his dictionary, he would have transcribed it as ऐस and not as एस. But he has followed a course dictated more by general practice than the principles enunciated by him with regard to the notation of this sound.

In any case we may for better success and authenticity use phonetic principles in the matter of transliteration rather than the dictates of a long-drawn practice which can be modified to gain in accuracy and authenticity.

ii. From the point of view of correct transcription as suggested, it would be surprising to find such mistransliteration as प्रिन्ट्स instead of प्रिन्ट्स, ट्यूब्स instead of ट्यूब्स, सन्स instead of सन्झ , स्टोर्स instead of स्टोर्ज and the like. One wonders if this deviation is out of any

57. Ibid., p. vi.
linguistic consideration or it is a result of some linguistic fashion. Perhaps it is neither fashion or linguistic consideration. It is so because it is so. The conclusion is: Press Hindi into service and standardise the practice scientifically.

The use of this type of transliteration at present is so wide that in a survey conducted in the business locality of Chandni Chowk (old Delhi) and around, out of the 21 shops which had transcribed into Devanagari script English words carrying /z/ sound at the end of a word, all of them had invariably transcribed the sound as झ . This was surprising in as much as none of the proprietors of these establishments was ready to pronounce the way they had written the words and yet would not agree to amend the mistranscription of the sound. The reason given was none except that everywhere the sound was being represented the same way.

The matter was probed deeper because it appeared to be a linguistic challenge. Therefore, some of the knowledgeable proprietors were questioned on the validity of the transliteration, and all the proprietors except one were convinced that it was certainly a mistransliteration and therefore needed to be rectified. The one cited as an exception above had to say the following on the point:

There is no झ / z / sound in Devanagari script and transcribing the final 's' in the words in question as झ would
be ludicrous and therefore, we choose to transcribe it as स and pronounce it as ज़.

This exceptional proprietor sounded to be justified only in the beginning. But when for this purpose some transliterations in Urdu also were examined on the same lines it was felt that it was for some other reasons than the relative inadequacy of Devanagari script in transcribing the / z / = ज़ sound. Some of the above words had been transliterated in Urdu as [क्षेत्र, जगर, मूर्ति] (वायु, प्राय) न तात्पर्य.

This only establishes that it is linguistically incorrect. But as it stands, the only explanation is that sometimes a practice gets established. Sometimes terms are Indianized. They are written differently and pronounced differently. Generally no question is raised to point out such improprieties. The result is that even wrong practices become acceptable.

This leads us to another conclusion also. The MT, Hindi which is a phonetic language, interferes in the interpretation of English words which are non-phonetic in writing. Hence the tendency to transcribe 'stores' as स्टोर्स (स्टोर्स, स्टोर्स) because 's' is / स / for a Hindi-knowing person. This interference has to be warded off by putting the correct Nagari transcription in contrast.
iii) Why is 'college' transcribed as 'कॉलेज', 'football' as 'फुटबॉल', 'volleyball' as 'तालीबॉल', 'trolley' as 'ट्रॉली', etc? Is it because /ς/ or /θ/ sound does not exist in Hindi? But this sound does exist in Urdu and is represented by (ء) as in خوز, تور, آور, etc. But even then 'college' is mostly written in Urdu as کالج, 'football' as نٹیل, 'volleyball' as والیبال, and 'trolley' as ترلی. That only goes to show that there is some other reason than the inadequacy of Devanagari or Persian scripts in respect of representing /ς/ or /θ/ sound in Nagari/Persian script. In fact Devanagari घ(γ) and Persian ی can well represent this sound. But most of the users of Devanagari letters for English words do not accept घ (€) symbol for representing /ς/ or /θ/ sound, and instead prefer the Marathi diacritical mark (¥) for it, and often the Marathi mark is also dropped. This results into inexact transcription. This point has already been discussed above in the section dealing with the representation of vowel sounds.

In any case, this inexact transliteration only helps distort the pronunciation of some of the English words carrying this sound. In fact, the insistence should be on representing /ς/ sound with घ or ی. The results are bound to be satisfactory. The correct pronunciation of so many words will be clear to the new learner as also to some of the advanced learners who are yet in an uncertain state of mind vis-a-vis the exact pronunciation of these words. If the words in question
are transliterated as कॉलिज, फुटबॉल, टॉपल, mostly they will be read as they are pronounced by the native speakers of English, at least approximately they will be. So instead of going to Marathi for the diacritic १, औ (१) should be used, which would be more natural for a Hindi reader.

iv. 'Red and White' is the brand name of popular cigarette which has usually been seen transcribed in Hindi as रेड एण्ड व्हाइट. It is clear that all the three constituent words here have been transcribed inaccurately. But here we are concerned only with the first word in which occurs the / e / sound. If 'red' is transcribed as रेड, how will 'raid' be written in Devanagari script? In fact, 'raid' is रेड and the vowel sound contained in 'red' cannot be represented in Devanagari script unless some new arrangement is made. Father Bulke has evolved ए (‘) sign for this vowel sound. But usually at non-technical places ए(‘) sign is used to represent this sound resulting into a lot of confusion. However, some people considering this sound to be closer to ए(‘) than to ए (‘), prefer to represent it with the former. They would have it as रेड and not as रेड. According

58. As pointed out earlier also, in Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra mostly 'red' is pronounced as रेड . Perhaps this is the reason why it is transcribed as such. But English pronunciation ought to be standardised at least among Indian speakers. Hence a great justification for a standardised unambiguous transcription of the crucial sound involved here.
to the notation suggested here 'red' should be transcribed as रेड. 59

'White' should correctly be transcribed as वाइट and not as व्हाइट 60, 'h' here being silent. Father Bulke transcribes it as वाइट. Then why should it be transcribed as व्हाइट showing 'h' in action? That will again lead to mispronunciation of other similar words. Perhaps it is because of this very influence that the following words are pronounced with an

---

59. This hits upon an important point: reform, development and standardization of the Devanagari script. Russia did this exercise after the 1917 revolution and took 30 years to complete the job of transcribing all the Russian languages and standardizing the script and language. In fact, they transcribe languages of the Arabic group too in the Russian script. Similarly in India efforts have been made to standardize and develop (reform) the Nagari script through some publications of Nagari Lipi Parishad.

60. Some may insist that this transcription of the word is correct, because /w/ is aspirated here. But if aspirated sounds were to be represented this way then other aspirated sounds should also be indicated on a similar pattern, e.g., in that case 'pen' should be transcribed as पैन. But that is never done. Hence this objection.

One question still arises: Just as American English has its own distinct character, similarly can Indian English, (even though close to British English), have some necessary deviations—where the deviation may be justified by the spelling and general Indian practice?

In this connection it can be said that deviation from the standard in language is a part of their natural growth. But since linguistic scholars are the custodians of the continued intelligibility of a language it devolves upon them to discourage deviation as far as possible and make efforts until things reach a stage of no-return, to reject deviations as pollutants of language. In fact if that were the approach of the scholars there would be fewer varieties of languages and thus mankind would be saved of this tortuous process of learning more and more of languages.
extra-aspirated /w/ even when unstressed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>Transliteration in IPA</th>
<th>Usual Transliteration in Devanagari</th>
<th>Correct Transcription in Devanagari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>why</td>
<td>/wai/</td>
<td>वहाँ</td>
<td>वाँ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td>/weər/</td>
<td>वेहर</td>
<td>वेंर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td>/wen/</td>
<td>वेंन</td>
<td>वेंन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which</td>
<td>/wɪtʃ/</td>
<td>विच</td>
<td>विच</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheel</td>
<td>/wiːl/</td>
<td>वील</td>
<td>वील</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whence</td>
<td>/wens/</td>
<td>वेंनस</td>
<td>वेंनस</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus as a general rule 'wh' in the initial position in a word is pronounced as व and not as वह, 'h' being silent in such cases. But not many in India know this fact. It is because the students are not taught the correct pronunciation through a simple mode of transliteration such as in Nagari script.

v. 'Hero' and 'zero' are usually transcribed as हेरो and जीरो in Hindi which is misleading. All the same these are the usual transliterations of these words. And it is for this reason that these two words are usually pronounced by the student community after this mistransliteration. This state can be rectified with the proper transliteration.

The accurate notations for these words are ज़ेरो and
respectively. Then why should these words not be transliterated in this way? The reason perhaps is that in Hindi never do two vowels occurring one after the other stand apart. They are joined in sandhi. Hence usually the inexact transliteration of these words. Every language has its own system of articulation. Hindi, for example, does not have two vowels occurring together. They join in sandhi whenever they do. But in English the diphthongs are two vowels occurring together but not joined in sandhi, nor levelled. Hence the English system of diphthong (of two vowels occurring in a linear style without sandhi) has to be accepted.

16. Learning Weak Forms Through Devanagari

Very few students, even teachers both in schools and colleges, know that weak forms of certain words exist, and much less do they know that they are an important aspect of spoken

---

61. Some would suggest that some of the English words (including these two ones, i.e., 'hero' and 'zero') have been accepted in Hindi, and they have been Indianized also. But not everyone would accept this position, not to the extent R.K. Bansal describes in his book 'Spoken English for India and Intelligibility of Indian English', but to some extent specially for the reason that English is an Indian language too and has been de-anglised in the world context. In view of this our idea of intelligibility should also be modified to the extent of intercomprehensibility provided certain standards are maintained. One accepting such modification would not like to insist on हीरो or जीरो but accept होर or जोर as a word in the Indian context of English. However, it is true that the modifications that have come about are a result of non-availability of the native pronunciation in an intelligible, standardized notation.
The reasons: first they get to hear very little of spoken English, and in the little they get, no use of weak forms is made. Secondly they have never seen the words having weak forms transcribed in IPA or Devanagari script. IPA notations, as earlier established, are too difficult to be brought into use by non-native users of English. The one realistic and effective alternative left for a Hindi knowing learner of English is to have all weak forms transcribed into Devanagari script.

A Nagari transcription of all the weak forms is easily possible and hence it is imperative that it should be brought to the notice of the learner at the appropriate stage.

Some weak forms have been transcribed below:

### a. Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word to be transcribed</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription of the strong form</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription of the weak form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>अ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>ऐन्त्</td>
<td>अन्त्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>दी</td>
<td>द (before a vowel sound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>दि (before a consonant sound)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. Auxiliary Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>ऐम्</td>
<td>अम् , य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are</td>
<td>आर्</td>
<td>अर् , र</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. Maybe it is worth noting in this connection that in Sanskrit there are five grades of vowels: उक्त (accented), अनुक्त (unaccented), स्वरित (levelled), सनन्तर (weak) and सुन्त (silent).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word to be transcribed</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription of the strong form</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription of the weak form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>can</td>
<td>कैन्</td>
<td>कन्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does</td>
<td>डज्ज</td>
<td>डझु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had</td>
<td>हेज्ज</td>
<td>हज्ज, अझ्ज, ज्ज</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>हेज्ज</td>
<td>हज्ज, अझ्ज, ज्ज</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>हेज्ज</td>
<td>हज्ज, अझ्ज, ज्ज</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>हज्ज</td>
<td>ज्ज, र्ज</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall</td>
<td>जैल्ल</td>
<td>जल्ल, ल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was</td>
<td>जौज्ज</td>
<td>जज्ज</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were</td>
<td>बर्ज</td>
<td>र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>विल्ल</td>
<td>ल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>बुझ</td>
<td>बझ, ब</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c. Conjunctions**

| and                   | ऐन्ड                                | बन्ड, बन्द, न                                     |
| as                    | ऐज्ज                               | अझ्ज                                      |
| than                  | हैन्न                               | हन्न                                      |
| that                  | हैट्ट                             | ट्ट                                     |

**d. Prepositions**

| at                    | ऐट्ट                               | अट्ट                                      |
| for                   | फोर्ट                                 | फर्ट                                      |
| from                  | फॉर्म्ट                                 | फर्म्ट                                      |
| of                    | ओंव्र                                | ओव्र                                      |
| to                    | ट्र                               | ट्र                                      |
e. Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word to be transcribed</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription of the strong form.</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription of the weak form.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>our</td>
<td>आउआई</td>
<td>आई</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>अस्</td>
<td>स्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ours</td>
<td>आउआर्</td>
<td>आर्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>him</td>
<td>हिम्</td>
<td>हम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them</td>
<td>त्म्</td>
<td>तम्</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word to be transcribed</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription of the strong form.</th>
<th>Devanagari transcription of the weak form.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do you</td>
<td>हू यू</td>
<td>हरू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>भूम्</td>
<td>भम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than</td>
<td>इन्</td>
<td>इन्</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we have seen that it is possible to reduce the weak forms of words to Devanagari notation. This notation can take an Indian learner of English closest to the R.P., which is not possible (at least not conveniently possible) through IPA notation in our circumstances.

Thus the relevance of Hindi is very great as far as teaching of phonological aspects of English is concerned.