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A SURVEY OF EARLIER STUDIES ON IE

3.1. Introduction

There has been in recent years a growing realization that IE supplies rich data for language contact study in a cross-cultural and multilingual context. Accordingly, attempts have been made at various times in the past 2 or 3 decades to analyze the different aspects of IE as a non-native variety of English.

The existing body of research on IE shows that there have been more studies of the phonetics and phonology of IE than of any other area. This preoccupation with phonology was natural for the structural linguists of the time. Secondly, the censorious attitude prevalent - that all non-native forms of English were substandard and therefore needed to be remedied - was responsible for their interest in IE from a pedagogical point of view. And as pedagogically this level has been treated as the primary level, the phonology of IE naturally attracted more attention.

In more recent years a growing interest in IE as a transplanted variety has led to a number of studies, mainly by Kachru, of the lexical innovations that have taken place in the English language as a result of its adaptation to Indian
cultural contexts. These studies are significant in that they attempt to establish a basis for regarding IE as a distinct, autonomous variety of English.

The syntax of IE, however, has not been discussed in any great detail. Earlier descriptions of IE treated all syntactic deviations as outside the 'code' of English and therefore as 'substandard'. These deviations were ascribed to mother tongue interference rather than to syntactic innovations produced by the Indian community using a foreign tongue in a new geographical and socio-cultural setting, and therefore perhaps forming as much a part of the 'Indianness' of IE as do the lexical innovations mentioned by Kachru.

A brief discussion of the major studies done on IE with regard to each of these levels follows:

3.2. Phonology

There are regional sub-varieties and ethnic sub-varieties of IE. One of the first studies of an ethnic variety of IE was Spencer's study of 'The Anglo-Indians and their speech' (1956). For the most part, however, the various studies done on the phonology of IE (Barron, Lahiri, Pandit, Rao, Kelkar, Varma, etc.) have been concerned with the regional varieties, or in some cases with the accents in larger areas such as Dravidian
English, North Indian English, and so on. Features of these regional varieties of IE have been viewed as the product of the interaction between standard native English and the speakers' mother tongue.

It has been customary to describe the characteristic features of IE as 'deviations' from British R.P., which is taken as a kind of norm or reference point. These phonetic/phonological deviations are essentially determined by the phonetic/phonological structures of the L1 and are of two types: (a) those of segmental phonemes, and (b) those of non-segmental phonemes. In most analyses of IE it is mainly the segmental differences which have been worked out. The study of the non-segmental areas is either very sketchy or has been completely ignored. Moreover, little has been contributed by way of important insights into the dynamics of linguistic change in these areas because most linguistic research has attempted to fit IE phonology into a straightjacket instead of treating it/a system in its own right.

Two main factors have been considered responsible for the development of the phonology of IE as it exists today:

(i) Except for a minority all Indians learn English as a second language. Therefore they tend to substitute features from their mother tongues for the sounds of English. The
substitution of $L_1$ elements for $L_2$ elements may be of two
types: First, it may be a substitution of one or more
phonetic elements in a full series of sounds, e.g. the fricative
series, which is not absent in the Indian languages, but shows
gaps when compared with the same series in English. Second,
there may be a complete transfer of series, e.g. the whole
alveolar series is replaced by a retroflex series in most
varieties of IE. The systematic differences may also occur
in terms of distribution. What happens is that the most
approximate sound is substituted from the phonological
inventory of $L_1$ whenever there is a 'gap' in the system. It
is this substitution and 'overhauling' of the phonological
systems which results in the deviations and ultimately, in
the phonological characteristics termed "Indianness" (Kachru
1966).

(ii) Owing to the total lack of contact with native
speakers Indian learners of English have virtually no exposure
to the phonology of native English. Since practically all
Indians learn their English from other Indians their English
has considerable phonological approximation to the Indian
languages. Apart from being very different from English,
these languages are varied, some belong to the Indo-Aryan
family, others to the Dravidian and so on. It is not
surprising then that there is a great range of variation in
the English that is spoken.
Thus we have certain marked features that distinguish a Bengali from a Tamil speaker of English or an Assamese speaker from a Marathi speaker. For example, if his mother tongue is Bengali, chances are that the speaker will have difficulties in maintaining a distinction between /s/ as in same and /ʃ/ as in shame. Speakers with Hindi or Urdu as their mother tongue tend to pronounce English words like station, school and speech as /Isteʃan/, /Iskul/ and /Ispitʃ/, respectively because in Hindi/Urdu the clusters st, sk, sp do not occur word-initially. Again, while the main consonantal problem for Hindi speakers (and other Indo-Aryan speakers such as Gujarati or Bengali) is the distinction between fricatives and stops, Tamil and Malayalam speakers have trouble with the voiced-voiceless distinction in certain positions (Masica et al. 1963). Thus words like simple and uncle are pronounced /simbøl/ and /ʌŋɡəl/ by Malayalam speakers because in Malayalam voiced nasal sounds are normally followed only by voiced homorganic plosives. Thus within IE phonology certain features mark the speakers of one area from another.

However, it has been observed that although there are speakers of clearly identifiable 'Hindi' or 'Bengali' or 'Malayalam' accents, in every region there are also people who have shaken off the 'gross' features of these accents and speak a more neutral form of Indian English. This type
of speech which is free from substratum influence has been called a 'non-regional' or 'supra-regional' accent: "... in every region there are good speakers of English and bad speakers of English, the term 'good' and 'bad' referring both to the degrees of approximation to native English or to the best types of Indian English and also to qualities of clear, effective and intelligible speech" (Bansal 1966:97). Thus attempts have been made to identify a pan-Indian accent which has prestige within the country in addition to being intelligible to native speakers of the language.

One of the earliest systematic studies of this accent is Bansal's "The Intelligibility of Indian English" (1966), which attempts to characterize IE at the phonological and phonetic levels with a view to ascertaining the major causes that hamper its intelligibility both to native and non-native speakers of English. The study concludes that it is perfectly possible to speak with an Indian accent and yet be as intelligible to educated British listeners as a British R.P. speaker. On the other hand, Indians with heavy regional accents are not as readily intelligible to others as they may be to those from the same linguistic region. Among the divergencies from native English that characterise quite a few varieties of IE and which are most likely to cause unintelligibility are:
(i) Wrong word stress: (a) stress on the wrong syllable of a word, (b) word requiring stress in connected speech left unstressed.

(ii) Wrong sentence stress, rhythm and intonation.

(iii) Wrong location of the intonation nucleus.

(iv) Pause at the wrong place.

(v) Lack of clear articulation.

(vi) Elision of syllables.

(vii) Use of the strong form of a word in place of the weak form.

(viii) Tendency to speak too fast.

(ix) Use of unaspirated /p/, /t/, /k/ in stressed initial positions.

(x) Absence of /θ/, /ð/, /w/ and /v/.

(xi) Incorrect vowel length, e.g. the use of short

- /a/ for /a:/
- /ɔ/ for /ɔ:/
- /ɪ/ for /i:/

(xii) Incorrect distribution of vowels and consonants, e.g. substitution of

- /ɔ/ for /ɔ:/
- /ɔː/ for /ɔː/
- /ɪ/ for /i:/
The study shows that the difference between the more intelligible and the less intelligible Indian speakers of English does not lie in any marked differences in their phonemic systems. It is rather in the frequency of mistakes Indian speakers make in the distribution of vowels and consonants and in patterns of word stress, sentence stress, rhythm and intonation. It is obvious that the intelligibility between an L₁ speaker of English and an IE speaker suffers much because of the second type of deviation.

Bansal's work is important in that it served to show that "Indian English, in spite of all the variety that we notice from one linguistic group to another, from one region to another,
and even from one speaker to another, retains a fairly uniform pattern" (Bansal 1966:293).

The accent described in the above study had been discussed earlier by scholars like Gokak, who pointed out that "There is an educated Indian pronunciation" and that "the best speakers of English in each of our states use it" (Gokak 1964:80). He also stressed the need to document and describe it.

A description of the characteristics of this kind of supra-regional accent was later attempted in "The Sound System of Indian English" (Masica 1972). The basis for isolating this accent is its "non-regionalism" as opposed to the specifically traceable regional or local accent found in other "sub-standard," "mother tongue" pronunciations. This also happens to correlate with less vs. greater deviation from either R.P. in particular or what might be called the "overall standard English norm". A comparison of this supra-regional accent of IE with R.P. shows the following differences:

(i) The absence of /ʒ/ and the use of /ʃ/, /ʃ/ or /z/ in its place.

(ii) The absence of /θ/ and /ð/ and the use of /t/ and /d/ in their place.

(iii) The lack of distinction between /v/ and /w/. 
(iv) The lack of distinction between /ɔ/ and /ɔː/ as in cot and caught.

(v) An addition of several contrasts which R.P. does not have at all, as between father and farther, or has only marginally as between paw, pour and poor.

(vi) A monophthongal pronunciation of the sounds corresponding to R.P. /eɪ/ and /æʊ/.

(vii) The existence of only one short central vowel, as against the phonetically distinct stressed and unstressed varieties (/ʌ/ and /əː/) in R.P.

(viii) The pronunciation of /r/ after a vowel.

(ix) The difference in prominence between stressed and unstressed syllables is less marked than in R.P. and the relationship of prominence to pitch is different, but both word stress and sentence stress are present.

(x) This variety does not have a stress-timed rhythm, but appears to have a syllable-weight-based timing.*

*The results of another study done around the same time (Prabhakar Babu, 1970-71) seem to indicate, however, that IE is neither syllable-timed nor stress-timed.
(xi) Its intonation patterns seem to be different from those of R.P.

(xii) This variety is further marked by the tendency towards 'spelling pronunciation' and the absence of weakened vowels in unstressed syllables.

According to Masica, this supra-regional variety "appears to be the de facto norm to which the majority of the 5,000,000 odd speakers of English in India aspire" (1972:2). He suggests that this de facto norm could with certain modifications become the de jure norm for teaching purposes.

Although the claim made above may not have been backed by adequate empirical evidence, the fact that such an accent exists and carries prestige is quite obvious. An interesting study done recently (Ramunny, 1976) to investigate the subjective reactions of various representative occupational groups of a cross-section of Indian society to the different accents commonly found in India - both 'regional' and 'non-regional' or 'supra-regional' - showed that the supra-regional accent was regarded as the more acceptable by most informants. The study is revealing in that this accent is by and large, the accent that Bansal refers to as the 'neutral' accent of IE, and that Masica suggests can be made to function as the de jure norm in educational instruction.
3.3. Lexis

In cross-cultural situations it is the lexicon which is likely to be affected the most as a result of years of interaction with a different people and their culture. The process of acculturation can lead to new formations and to changes in the semantic structure of lexical items. The outcome of this process in the Indian context has been a large number of innovations in the vocabulary, which by their distinct Indian 'flavour' have contributed to the 'Indianness' of this variety and can often be used to identify it.

Two characteristics of the vocabulary specific to IE can be distinguished. A large portion of the IE vocabulary is used essentially in the Indian contexts and is restricted in use to IE. The second part comprises those items which do not have such a 'variety constraint' and have thus become part of the borrowed lexicons of other 'Englishes' too. One might term such items 'assimilated items', that is, assimilated in the lexicon of the English language.

It was mainly the first aspect of IE vocabulary that captured the attention of earlier scholars. Their concentration on this aspect was probably induced by pragmatic considerations
such as the need to communicate with the natives. A number of fragmentary lexical lists were thus compiled by early travellers to India to facilitate the work of administrators involved with Indian affairs. These are represented by those IE lexical items which were used, for example, in registers of administration, agriculture, law, etc. Such studies, however, are not considered serious contributions to lexicography.

Of greater academic interest is the second type of IE vocabulary, and one of the earliest works to deal with this aspect was Yule and Burnell's "Hobson-Jobson" (1886). "Hobson-Jobson", which from the methodological point of view was a healthy break from the tradition of earlier lexical research on this variety of English, was intended to deal with "all that class of words which, not in general pertaining to the technicalities of administration recur constantly in the daily intercourse of English in India, either as expressing ideas really not provided for by our mother tongue, or supposed by the speakers (often quite erroneously) to express something not capable of just denotation by any English term ... in so much that a considerable number of expressions in question have not only become familiar in sound to English ears, but have become naturalized in the English language and meeting with ample recognition ..." (Yule and Burnell, 1903, XV-XVI).
Based on earlier works like Wilson's "Glossary of Judicial Revenue Terms" (1955) and Whitworth's "An Anglo-Indian Dictionary" (1885) this monumental compilation soon became a classic for its wealth of information and style.

The type of Indian lexical innovations discussed in "Hobson-Jobson" may be categorized as:

(a) Hybridization: e.g. jail khana, brandy pani, etc.

(b) Phonetic change owing to the influence of the substratum; e.g. gilas 'glass', rasid 'receipt', etc.

(c) Semantic shift: involving extension of semantic features, e.g. bearer, boy, etc.

As Kachru points out (1973:360), the traditional lexical work on IE had several limitations: first, the goals were essentially pragmatic, namely to provide lexical manuals for Westerners in India; second, the source material and data presented were often register-restricted; third, the attitude which the compilers reveal about the then developing Indian English was often censorious; fourth, the native language sources listed for various lexical items were not always reliable.
In a series of interesting papers, Kachru (1965, 1966, 1973, 1975, 1977) illustrates how a large number of lexical innovations that have developed in IE are contextually determined and can be better understood if one takes into consideration the linguistic and cultural setting in India. In several native varieties of English (Australian, American, Canadian English, etc.) the distinctiveness of a variety has been claimed on the ground of contextual differences which eventually manifest themselves in independent linguistic innovations. These innovations have been used as a justification for distinct lexicons for American, Australian, Canadian English. Using the same argument Kachru makes a case for a lexicon of IE. Such a lexicon is basically a lexicon of English with an added dimension of area-bound, context-bound and language-bound features which separate the Indian variety of English from other varieties (Kachru, 1973:355). These features which he terms "Indianisms" reflect the assimilation of English to the cultural mores of the country and are described by him in terms of transfer, collocation-extension, collocation innovation, register range extension and hybrid formations. Kachru gives many examples from the Indian setting.

According to Kachru, the linguistic factors which generally determine the Indianness of IE are not different from those in any other language contact situation. Such a situation mainly
involves transfer or interference at the linguistic level. In tracing the sources of Indiannisms Kachru extends the meaning of 'transfer' to include under it non-linguistic elements as well. For in a contact situation at least two languages ($L_1$ and $L_2$), and in certain cases two cultures ($C_1$ and $C_2$) are involved. Thus there are transfers of two types: transfer of linguistic items from $L_1$'s and transfer of certain non-linguistic features of $C_2$.

Indianisms then may be the result of the following processes:

I. **Transfer of context**: involves transfer of certain cultural patterns (contextual units) which are absent in or different from those of native English varieties, e.g. the castesystem of India ('upper caste', 'inter-marriage', 'Brahminhood'), social attitudes and customs ('brother-annointing ceremony', 'purdha system', 'fall at your feet'), social and religious taboos ('cow-eater', 'separate eating', 'untouchable'), superstitions, (rain-bringing ceremony, invitation-rice), etc.

II. **Transfer of form/context components**: While writing in English about such contexts as those mentioned above the specific formal items for these in Indian languages are
transferred to IE, thus involving transfer at two levels: form as well as context. Formally these may result in collocational deviations.

III. **Transfer of formal items**: (a) transfer of formal items from L₁ to L₂, e.g. 'spoiler of my salt', 'salt giver', 'turmeric ceremony', etc. (b) transfer of L₁ meanings to L₂ items, e.g. the term 'brother-in-law' has acquired three distinct meanings in the Indian context: as a term of (i) abuse, (ii) affection or intimacy, and (iii) kinship.

IV. **Lexico-grammatical transfer**: (a) borrowing of single lexical items from Indian languages, e.g. 'ashram', 'beedi', 'chutney', 'guru', 'pooja', 'pundit', 'curry', etc. (b) loan translations, e.g. 'caste-mark', 'cow-worship', 'hair-cutting ceremony', 'sacred cross-thread', etc. (c) shifts, i.e. adaptation of an underlying formal item of an Indian language, which provides its source and which are therefore better explained in terms of Indian cultural contexts, e.g. 'May the vessel of your life never float in the sea of existence', 'May the fire of ovens consume you', etc.

**IE Collocations**

Kachru maintains that collocational deviation is one crucial feature that marks what may be termed the Indianness of IE. The use of English in India for over two hundred years
has nativized the company which English words traditionally keep in their non-Indian settings. The Indian linguistic and cultural context has either extended the membership of the set of items with which lexical items can co-occur, or new, typically Indian collocations have been formed in the sense that in native English culture these would not function in the same contextual unit which is assigned to them in India, or there may be no contextual unit at all for them in British culture. Some examples of Indian collocations are 'dining leaf', 'separate eating', 'ankle bells', 'banged widow', etc.

Hybrid Formations

Hybrid formations are another interesting lexical feature of IE. The following are examples of IE hybrids from Kachru (1975). While these have been taken from written material they have currency in everyday speech also:

Hybrid collocations: swatantra party, satyagraha movement.

Hybrid reduplications: lathi stick, cotton kapas.

'Area bound' formations: South India: jutka driver, coconut payasam

Punjab: religious diwan.

Bengal: dadan money.
Indian language item as 'Head'

**NN type:** marriage pendal, doctor sahib.

**AN type:** British Sarkar, double roti, holy mantra.

**-ing H:** burning ghat, burning ghee.

Indian language item as 'Modifier'

**Derivative N:** Babu mentality, bazaar musician.

**-ing as Head:** durri-weaving, beedi-smoking.

**Agentive:** tiffin carrier, tonga driver.

**Verb as Head:** sari-clad, khadi-wound.

**N + N:** choli piece, toddy shop.

Hybridization and derivative suffixes

**Non-English Head and English derivational suffix:** goondaism, sadhuhood.

**English Head and non-English derivational suffix:** factory wallah, police wallah.

**Non-English Head and English prefix of Negation:** non-Brahmin, non-advasi.

With regard to some aspects of Kachru's work on IE (1965, 1966) it has been pointed out that although he claimed to "make statements of meaning so that we see how we use language to live" (1966:255), these were largely based on creative writing, which "far from being the standard form of IE"...
is"... not IE at all" (Mehrotra 1971). The danger in using material from creative writing as a basis for such a study is that many of these innovations might turn out to be 'motivated' deviations (Verma, 1972) in that they are often instances of deliberate manipulation of the language by the writer for certain effects. Translations from L₁ and collocations may be consciously contrived literary devices intended to evoke aspects of life and culture typically Indian (as Mulk Raj Anand has confessed with regard to his own practice, 1969:280). There exist also certain idiosyncratic and identifiable features of an author's style which may not be truly representative of IE. And this is true not only of Indian creative writers but of creative writers everywhere who mould the language to make it the vehicle of their thoughts. Here we encounter the problem of how and where to draw the line between English used in India as an instrument of social intercourse by the IE speech community and IE resulting from an individual creativity, for a general study of IE must focus attention on the first aspect rather than the second.

The important point here is that the language of the creative writer is only partly the English that Indians speak. Raja Rao's 'that house people', 'gold-bangle samanna', 'corner-
house Murthy', are very obviously not IE, but perhaps the outcome of an attempt to create in English the ring and throb of Kannada idiom. They are creations of an imaginative mind for a specific literary purpose.

Kachru is not unaware of these processes. He recognizes in principle, that conscious and 'unconscious' translations are distinct (1965:402), but in practice does not stick to this distinction. Indeed he feels that the process of unconscious translation applies more commonly at the lower end of the cline of bilingualism, where the bilingual is unaware that he is using a transferred item from an Indian language. Admittedly, it is the English of the semi-literate that most frequently reveals such plain Indianisms, but they are not entirely absent from what we call educated Indian English.

The constraints imposed by the choice of his data and the restricted nature of his research (which leaves out registral, stylistic and semantic aspects of IE), however, should not detract from Kachru's contribution to the study of IE, which he has placed within a sound framework of theoretical and descriptive linguistics - an important preliminary step toward a little studied variety of English - and as such deserves to be recognized as a pioneering effort.
3.4. Syntax

While it is possible to make certain predictions about the phonological patterns and lexical innovations that will be employed by members of the IE speech community, the syntax of IE, owing to a number of reasons, does not lend itself so readily to such predictions. The indeterminacy in the area of syntax has been partly responsible for the disparaging undertone present in all earlier treatment of IE. The wide range of variation that exists from individual to individual and the co-existence of semi-literate and educated forms often led earlier scholars to confuse IE with the varieties referred to as Babu English, Butler English, Kitchen English, etc. It is no wonder, then, that when in 1932 IE came under serious consideration at the hands of Whitworth, it was treated as a 'substandard' variety.

Whitworth's work, 'Indian English' is a systematic enumeration of Indianisms which, he suggests, could be explicable by referring to the idiom of one or the other of the Indian languages. In later studies, Goffin (1934) and Kindersly (1938) were to stress the same point. Goffin attempted to suggest psychological explanations for the Indian divergences from Standard English. However, although Goffin claimed to provide "notes on the characteristics of the English used today
by the educated Indian" (1934:20), his illustrations of IE usage show his failure to discriminate between the usages current only among the semi-literate and those of the educated. Hence Goffin has been criticized for passing off 'ignorant' usages "for those that are universal and flourishing enough to be worth special quotation" (Dustoor, 1968:99-100), when actually they are confined to semi-literates and are not universal even among them.

As Dustoor points out, Goffin's essay illustrates the need for the student of IE to make up his mind at the outset as to what variety of IE he is setting out to describe. "He may well confine himself to the level of schoolboy or Babu English or he may study the English of the press and platform, of the law courts and the council chambers ... though the main purpose is to examine the English of educated Indians. But that the two levels are as distinct as the English of the barrack room and the Queen's English must never be lost sight of" (Dustoor, 1968:99).

In this respect Kindersly's application of the term IE seems more specific. His investigations were concerned "... not with the broken sort of English spoken by servants or other Indians of little or no 'English' education, but with the English of those who have learnt the language in schools. They apply, generally speaking, to the English of clerks and
of the well educated among the professional Indians who use English daily, such as pleaders and magistrates: That is, they apply to a form of speech intermediate between the almost completely normal English of many Indian writers on the one hand, and the dog English of the schoolboy on the other" (Kindersly 1938:25).

It may be noted that this level seems to coincide with the central point on the cline of bilingualism mentioned by Kachru.

Whereas Goffin blurred the picture by not drawing a very clear line between levels of usage, and Whitworth claimed to confine himself to the level of 'educated' usage only, Dustoor (1968:100) endeavours "to deal with Indian usage at both levels with a view to exhibiting not only what are the more or less common Indian usages today, but also what may enter the language of tomorrow".

Dustoor recognizes that even what may be considered features of educated IE are not all prevalent in the same degree. Whereas some of these are common enough, others are universal or almost so. Determining the category to which a given usage belongs is therefore arbitrary, depending entirely on the intuition of the analyst of IE. But, he maintains, if the analyst is to indicate trends as well as firmly
established usages, he must consider them all, for he is not examining something final and finished but a continuing process. This being so, he must allow that there will be, at any given period, not only educated and semi-literate users in co-existence, but also, among educated users themselves, some who exhibit hardly any traces of Indianisms in their use of English.

Dustoor considers two important factors which have led to 'a somewhat exotic brand of English': First, an Indian learns his English in the classroom. The natural consequence of this is that his English still bears some traces of the educational process to which he has been subjected. Not only does his English reveal features, resulting from overgeneralization, 'transfer', imperfect learning, etc., processes usual in second language learning, but also the consequences of bad teaching. Numerous infelicities have arisen from a failure to picture clearly or understand exactly, the things spoken of; e.g. 'a thin end of the wedge' betrays ignorance that a wedge has only one thin end; similarly, 'outlook of life' exhibits a failure to realize that 'outlook' suggests 'looking out' and so may be followed by 'of' only when referring to the person looking out; the thing before him is looked out 'on'. Other such instances are 'an inkling into', 'to dabble with', 'to pick up a quarrel', 'to be in one's elements', 'make short shrift of', etc.
Secondly, because the teaching of the English language in India is so closely linked with the teaching of English literature, it is not the idiom of living speech, but the stately and elegant forms sanctified by literary tradition which pupils learn to respect and imitate: "Thanks to this bias given early to our English, it is somewhat more literary than is the English of native Englishmen or those who acquire it in the process of living rather than in the process of being educated" (Dustoor 1963:102).

It was generally taken for granted that the mere fact of exposure to the literary masterpieces would ensure mastery of the language. Hence, teachers and pupils concerned themselves with the content of the literary texts under study rather than with the subtleties of the English idiom. Any special attention devoted to the language as language was mostly in the form of a mechanical drill in grammar - and a misguided introduction to the use of idioms. Dustoor gives examples of how IE speakers may be heard to express themselves 'idiomatically' as follows: 'I am in very good health and hope you are in the same boat', 'Life is not a bed of roses, but a hard nut to crack,' etc.

According to Dustoor (1968:104), this approach to the teaching of English has in large measure been responsible for the birth of what is called Babu English, "... strange verbal
memories haunt their minds and get in the way of their expressions", giving rise to such metaphorical monstrosities as "wedded to the path of violence", "threshed out all possible avenues", "knocked about like a weather cock from pillar to post", etc.

Given below are examples of some of the common divergencies from accepted English usage as noted by Dustoor (1968):

**Articles:**

_missing articles_
1. All principal delegates were present.
2. There exists considerable body of opinion.

_intrusive articles_
3. (He) received a harsh treatment.
4. (I) am in the favour of ...

_use of wrong articles_
5. Hide one's light under the bushel.
6. Give a gist of

**Possessive Pronouns**

_missing possessives_
1. take him into confidence
2. was in teens
intrusive possessives
3. had our interests at his heart
4. see things in their perspective

Reflexive Pronouns
missing reflexive pronoun objects
1. availed of every opportunity
2. I enjoyed in the club.
intrusive reflexive pronouns
3. He qualified himself for the post.
4. We must withdraw ourselves from the party.

Adjectives
nouns as adjectives
1. a commonsense fellow
2. a nonsense talk

adjective as noun
3. not a single of them

wrong adjectives
4. will arrive next morning
5. their numbers are few

Adverbs

adjective as adverb
1. He behaved miserly.
preposition for adverb
2. all round the year

wrong adverbs
3. His death was mourned all over.
4. much encouraging

Conjunctions
wrong conjunctions
1. I doubt that he will pass.
2. The first time when I saw him...

intrusive conjunctions
3. consider it as an insult.
4. called me as a coward.

Prepositions
missing prepositions
1. They must provide our needs.
2. There was nothing to complain.

intrusive prepositions
3. discussed about/on the case
4. He ordered for some books.

wrong prepositions
5. congratulated me for my success
6. got angry on me
Nouns

nouns without plural forms used in the plural
1. accommodations for three
2. the costly furnitures of the house

unnecessary plurals
3. the wretched conditions of the poor
4. went abroad for higher studies

caste-iron idioms
5. pulled my legs
6. These were forbidden fruits.

Verbs

transitives as intransitives
1. He topped in the examination.
2. He has donated freely to the school.

intransitives as transitives
3. I replied her at once.
4. Posed himself as a patriot.

Phrasal Verbs
1. I left off school last year.
2. We could not pull on together.
3. Cope up with the work
Tenses

continuous tense for the simple present
1. I am going to school regularly.

perfect for preterite
2. He had gone to Calcutta last week.

preterite for pluperfect
3. The deceased was ailing for months.

preterite for perfect
4. He went to Bombay and is not expected back till next Thursday.

perfect for preterite
5. He has written to him only yesterday.

The above mentioned usages are further classified by Dustoor as very common (VC) and rare (R). He even includes semi-literacies (S) in his illustrations on the ground that at the level at which they occur, they sometimes occur frequently enough to be able, unless checked, to influence usage at higher levels. His classification of IE usage into VC, R and S is, of course, based on intuition rather than on any statistical information and is to be interpreted as indicating trends. Thus Dustoor attempts to impose some kind of systematicity on his data, although he does not mention the
specific sources of his data and gives no clue as to the level of the competence of his informants.

The tendency earlier was to dismiss these patterns as nothing more than an accumulation of errors or foreignisms, but the plain fact is that many of these persist and get passed on from one generation to the next, acquiring a certain amount of stability and continuity. They occur quite frequently in the everyday usage of educated speakers of IE, and what is more, often pass unnoticed. This aspect of IE has been taken into account in more recent studies by present day scholars (Fox 1968, Kachru 1966, 1975, Verma 1972), who recognize the fact that on account of the currency such features have acquired in the Indian context, they appear more like dialectal innovations than transient foreignisms.

This view is in keeping with the point often made by variationists, that in non-native varieties of English, the main systems are to a large extent the same as those of English English; it is the subsystems which yield deviant patterns peculiar to each variety. Fox's study, 'A Transformational Treatment of Indian English Syntax,' (1968) attempts to make just this point. He maintains that language learners who have passed the beginning stages of language learning diverge only at the transformational level of grammar. Like any dialectal
variety, therefore, IE has a vast body of syntactic principles which are common to all varieties of English, while the features which are peculiar to it are those which differ from these other varieties only in certain low level transformational rules.

IE may thus be characterized as having a core which it shares with native British English plus its unique features which it uses with some consistency.

The following features are listed by Verma (1972) as characteristic of IE:

1. **Inter-clause sequence of tense**
   When I met him yesterday he said he is coming.

2. **Conditional sentences**
   If it will rain this evening, we will not go out.

3. **Reported questions**
   Do you know where does he live?
   I wonder why did I do it?

4. **Tag-questions**
   Your friend went home yesterday, isn't it?
   You would do this work, isn't it?

5. **Tense and aspect**
   I have visited that place only last year.
   I am here since this morning.
6. **Wh-questions**
   Where you are working now?
   Why your friend has not come today?

7. **'Want' type of Verb + sentence**
   I want that he goes there.
   I consider that he is a fool.

8. **Response type sentences**
   Aren't you coming this evening?
   Yes, I am not or no, I am.

9. **'Know' type of verb in its progressive form**
   I am not knowing him.
   We are not having these items today.

10. **Word order**
    Your both hands are dirty.
    My all friends are here.

11. **Relative clause followed by correlative pronouns**
    The three young men who visited you yesterday,
    they have come again to see you.

Although these have been listed as characteristic of IE, it should be noted that features such as conditional sentences, reported questions, 'want' type of verb + sentence, etc. are not peculiar to IE alone. They occur in other varieties of
English as well. As Verma points out, not only are these forms part of the grammar of a great many educated Indians, but they are to be found also in other non-native varieties of English. Thus in French, German and Czech English one often comes across sentences such as, "I have gone to the cinema yesterday". In Ceylonese, Burmese, Indonesian and Japanese English, 'wh--' questions are marked by non-inversion and most of the non-native varieties of English make use of "isn't it" as a sort of multi-purpose tag.

One explanation for these common divergences may be that by its very nature, the structure of the English language tends to lend itself to modifications along certain predictable lines, whatever the linguistic background of the learner. Indeed, if this is true, it substantiates the point made earlier by French (1956), that the cause of most deviations in second language varieties is not so much interlingual as intra-lingual; "Explanation does not lie in cross-association and instinctive translation of the mother-tongue, but in the usages of English itself; for these usages provide the only factor which is common to all regions, all students and all methods" (French 1956: 7-8).

It appears then, that in a description of IE, a socio-linguistic or functional model alone will not suffice, though such a model serves to account for much of its lexico-semantic
aspect. While Kachru's studies emphasize the latter, preoccupation with it and with the influence of interlingual interference is likely to draw attention away from intra-lingual interference which is of equal importance. To understand and account for the syntactic deviations in IE, therefore, it will perhaps be useful to use the second language learning model or framework as well.