CHAPTER 1

INDIAN ENGLISH
1. INDIAN ENGLISH

1.1 English as a Global Language

The pressure of globalization has led to a worldwide upheaval in almost all spheres of human interaction. One of the most notable changes during the past few decades relates to the way English has become increasingly global. It has assumed an unprecedented global presence due to its wide demographic and geographical spread. Quirk et al. (1985) speak of English as ‘the language on which the sun does not set’ (p. 1).

The English language developed out of Germanic dialects that were brought to Britain during the fifth and sixth centuries. It is remarkable that English, which was once a language of a single country, is now being used as an official language in about fifty-four countries. The spread of English to different parts of the world is one of the striking examples of ‘language expansion’ of the twentieth century.

Several linguists have pointed out that in the linguistic history so far no language other than English has touched the lives of so many people, in so many functional roles and with so much prestige. Nunberg (1996) expresses the view that the English language should be renamed
as ‘Globalese’. English is now represented in every continent and in the islands of three major oceans-Atlantic, Indian and Pacific. Krishnaswamy and Krishnaswamy (2006) refer to this phenomenal spread of English as ‘The English Tsunami’ and comment, ‘The English tsunami is lashing every country in the world’ (p.154).

According to Svartvik and Leech (2006), the expansion and influence of British colonial power and the status of the United States of America as the leading economic, military and scientific power of the twentieth century have contributed significantly to the development of English as a global language. Crystal (2004) considers the evolution of English as a global language to be a unique event and points out that around 1,400 million people use English in the world for international and intranational purposes. In the global context in countries like UK, USA, New Zealand and Australia, English is used as a first language, in countries like Singapore, Nigeria, Pakistan and India it is used as a second language and in countries like China, Sweden, Germany, Belgium and Denmark it is used as a foreign language. There has been a massive increase in the number of people learning English as it is considered to be a passport to success in today’s world. It has been observed by various linguists that the age at which children start learning
English has been decreasing across the world. It is interesting that China has adopted a national policy to make every student literate in English by the year 2008. Graddol (2006) expresses the view that Asia in general and India and China in particular now hold the key to the long-term future of English as a global language.

The globalization of the English language has been viewed in a variety of perspectives. On the one hand, English is considered to be an indispensable medium for international economy, diplomacy, science and the media. Today English is equated with the growth of education, trade, commerce and information technology and it seems to dominate almost all walks of human life. It is estimated that nearly 80 per cent of all websites use English. On the other hand, some people consider English to be a ‘killer language’ as they feel that the spread of English is responsible for the extinction of innumerable indigenous languages around the globe and that it also endangers local cultures. It is felt that in today’s world we must develop ‘linguistic tolerance’. It is necessary to nourish our own languages and at the same time respect other languages. Fishman (1996) rightly points out, ‘Whether we consider English as a killer language or not, whether we regard its spread as benign
globalization or linguistic imperialism. Its expansive reach is undeniable and for the time being unstoppable’ (p. 97).

1.2 Varieties of English

The widespread use of English has resulted into several varieties of English in different parts of the world. Crystal (1990) believes that language change and language varieties are the two aspects of English which are at the centre of its identity. No natural language is a homogeneous undifferentiated entity. Languages are dynamic and it can be said that variation is one of the special characteristics of every language. Martinet (1962) observes, ‘Language varies because it suits the varying needs of man’ (p. 23). A large number of varieties of English exist within the British Isles. For example, Welsh English, Irish English and Scottish English. Even within the English used in UK we find a plethora of dialects.

Languages vary along different dimensions. They show variation along the dimensions of social class, sex, education and register. It is also possible to study variation across time. Regional variation is one of the main factors responsible for language variation. Richards, Platt and Weber (1985) define it as ‘variation in speech according to the particular
area where a speaker comes from’ (p. 242). Quirk (1990a) draws a distinction between use-related varieties and user-related varieties. The diagram given below explains Quirk’s taxonomy of varieties of English.

The use-related varieties are those that an individual assumes along with a relevant role and one individual may have a mastery of several such varieties. For example, a lawyer expresses himself in legal English while drafting an agreement, and he may use literary English.
while writing an article for a book. Thus, the use-related varieties seem to be based on an individual’s occupation and interest. As far as the user-related varieties are concerned, generally an individual is tied to only one variety. For example, an American expresses himself only in American English and an Indian expresses himself only in Indian English (henceforth abbreviated to IE). The user-related varieties can be further identified on ethnopolitical grounds and on linguistic grounds. On the basis of linguistic grounds it is possible to distinguish between non-native varieties and institutionalised/non-institutionalised native varieties. Kachru (1983a) convincingly argues, ‘In the international context, it is more realistic to consider a spectrum of Englishes which vary widely, ranging from standard native varieties to standard non-native varieties’ (p. 36).

The journey of English outside the English isles has led to the emergence of innumerable varieties of English as far as the regional variation is concerned. Strevens (1978) draws a family tree of the native and non-native varieties of English to illustrate in a graphic form the existence of different varieties of English as branching off from two principal native varieties – British English (henceforth abbreviated to BrE) and American English.
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This diagram reveals that the linguistic centre of English has moved away from England and its hegemony is spread in different parts of the world. In this sense Kachru (1983b) rightly speaks of ‘World Englishes’. Today there is a growing recognition of plurality of Englishes and it has become increasingly common to speak of ‘Englishes’ rather than ‘English’ while discussing the roles of English in the world. Kachru (1987) has made comments on the sociolinguistic implications of the spread of English and prefers the term ‘Englishes’. On the other hand, Quirk (1987) has argued for preserving the notion of ‘English’ as opposed to ‘Englishes’ for maintaining the ‘standard’. However, both of them seem to welcome the fact that English is a lingua franca of the world and it has different varieties.

The varieties of English are often categorized in two groups - ‘the centre’ and ‘the periphery’. The centre refers to countries like Britain, Australia and America where English is used as a first language. Quirk (1990a) divides the peripheral varieties of English into two groups. According to him in the periphery there are countries like India, Singapore and Pakistan where English is used as a second language and it also includes countries like China, Japan, Korea and Germany where English is used as a foreign language. The English used in the periphery
is often referred to as ‘New Englishes’. Thus, it is possible to study
native varieties like British English and American English and non-
native varieties like IE, Chinese English and Singapore English.

The rapid expansion of English to different parts of the world and
the development of varieties of English have raised the issue of the
ownership of the English language. Though prominence is generally
given to native varieties, there has been a growing recognition of non-
native varieties and they are considered to be worthy of study in their
own right. From a contemporary point of view it can be said that English
belongs to every person who uses it and it has become the property of
the citizens of the world. Strevens (1985) echoes this point of view when
he asserts, ‘Whose language is it? It is ours and everyone’s - the English
language is truly a world possession’ (p. 427).

1.3 Kachru’s Model of the Three Concentric Circles of English

According to Kachru (1985), the spread of English around the
world can be visualized in the form of three concentric circles
representing different ways in which the English language has been
acquired and is currently used, viz. ‘the inner circle’, ‘the outer circle’
and ‘the expanding circle’. The diagram given below gives an idea of the
wide dispersal of English and the demographic demarcation presented in this diagram has been taken from Crystal (2004).

These three circles display the different roles of English in the world. The inner circle represents countries where English is used as a primary native language. It includes countries like UK, USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. People belonging to the inner circle enjoy a certain privilege as they acquire the language from the environment and use it as their first language. The outer circle encompasses a large
number of countries where most of the inhabitants use English as a second language. It includes countries like India, Singapore, Malaysia and Pakistan. In these countries English plays a prominent role in different domains of life like education, administration, business and technology. Beyond the inner and the outer circle, English is also learnt and used as a foreign language in the expanding circle which includes countries like Japan, Greece, Poland, China and Germany. They recognize the significance of English as an international language and in these countries English becomes indispensable for international contacts in areas such as industry, tourism, politics, education and technology. However, countries in the expanding circle do not give English any special administrative status. Recently the countries of the expanding circle have realized the inevitability of learning English and active steps are being taken to master English.

Kachru (1985) rejects the idea that any special prominence or superior status should be assigned to the varieties of the inner circle, and he lays a greater emphasis on the outer and expanding circles. He argues that the most vigorous expansions and developments of the language can be observed in the outer and the expanding circles.
According to Crystal (1995), ‘It is possible to interpret the three-circle model of World English in terms of the way norms of usage manifest themselves’ (p. 359). According to him, the inner circle can be thought of as ‘norm-producing’, as BrE and American English are the two leading normative models of Standard English. The outer circle is ‘norm-developing’ as the special role of English in these communities is fostering an internal standard of educated usage which has a status and dynamics of its own. The expanding circle by contrast is ‘norm-dependent’ in the sense that speakers of English as a foreign language need to look elsewhere for criteria to judge their usage.

Kachru’s model of the three circles of English (1985) reveals that there are more non-native speakers of English in the world than the native speakers. Svartvik and Leech (2006) argue that native speakers of English could soon form a rather small proportion of the speakers of English worldwide and comment, ‘Non-native speakers in fact outnumber native speakers- probably a unique situation in language history’ (p. 1)
1.4 The Phenomenon of Non-native Englishes in the Twentieth Century

Fishman (2000) estimates that about one and a half billion people speak English in the world, out of which one third are native speakers of English and the others are non-native speakers of English. The book written by Paikeday (1985) entitled ‘The Native Speaker is Dead’ highlights the point that the native speaker alone is not the owner of the language.


The term ‘non-native’ implies the presence of some other language. It has been observed that English used by the non-native
speakers is influenced by their respective native languages to some extent. The contact of English with other languages and cultures has resulted in the processes of ‘nativization’ and ‘Englishization’.

The manifestations of nativization and the development of non-native varieties have evoked two types of reactions. Some scholars have been sceptical about the growth of non-native varieties and consider the phenomenon of acculturation as a kind of aberration. Powell (1995) remarks, ‘Others may speak or read English more or less – but it is our language, not theirs. It was made in England by the English and it remains our distinctive property, however widely it is learnt or used’ (quoted in Kujore, 1995, p. 36). Some linguists consider the emergence of non-native varieties as an undesirable phenomenon, as they feel that these varieties hamper intelligibility. Prator (1968) claims that the process of nativization should be curtailed as it reduces intelligibility with the native speakers of English. He dismisses IE as a local ‘unintelligible’ variety. Thus, he reflects the typical purist attitude of the native speakers of English towards the non-native varieties. Svartvik (1985) questions whether it is ‘really worth having a variety of norms even for institutionalised outer circle fellowships’ (p. 34). However, the institutionalised non-native varieties of English have changed our
perspective on standard language. Taking into consideration the wide spectrum of non-native varieties of English, some linguists stress the importance of multiple and variable standards of English.

On the other hand, there are many scholars who take a more pragmatic and linguistically tolerant attitude towards the emerging non-native varieties of English. Strevens (1983), Trudgill and Hannah (1985), Lee (1978), Kachru (1981) and Abbott (1981) have positive attitudes to non-native varieties of English. Smith (1981) asserts, ‘English no longer belongs to the originators, it has become the property of the world’ (p. 108). Lowenberg (1982) points out that in each non-native context of use, new forms and functions of English develop which are systematic and productive in that locale. According to Quirk et al. (1972), the non-native varieties of English like IE and African English may be thought to be stable and adequate enough to be institutionalized and regarded as varieties of English in their own right rather than stages on the way to a more native-like English’ (p. 26). Schneider (2004) points out that nativization is crucial for the emergence and further development of New Englishes. According to him, nativization takes place ‘when varieties of English develop and adopt distinctive linguistic features of their own on all levels of language organization’ (p. 227).
Traditionally the distinction between native and non-native is based on the crucial criteria of when and how English is learnt. Tay (1982) asserts that a native speaker is ‘one who learns English in childhood and continues to use it as his dominant language’ (p. 107). A non-native speaker does not pick up the language from his surroundings, but learns it in a formal context.

In the past few years the definition of the term ‘native’ has also undergone a change. Paikeday (1985) points out some of the problems involved with the use of the term ‘native speaker’. He defines a native speaker as ‘a proficient user of a specified language’ (p. 87). Singh (1998) points out some of the difficulties involved in considering ‘native language’ to be a synonym of ‘mother tongue’. Graddol, Leith and Swan (1996) comment, ‘In practice it is difficult to draw hard and fast boundaries between … the native/non-native distinction as in contexts like India and Singapore some (notionally) non-native speakers become familiar with English from an early age and use the language routinely’ (p. 13). Some scholars have argued that those Indian speakers who grow up using English and use it predominantly in all domains of life can be classified as ‘native speakers’ although they do not qualify as native speakers in the strict sense of the term. It is felt that in the Indian context
English can be considered to be a native language of a very small section of the population and a considerably large number of people use English as a second language in India. Hence the present study treats IE as a non-native variety. However, it is felt that a systematic study needs to be carried out on children who are exposed to the English language right from their birth in countries like India and Singapore and its implications should be studied in detail.

As there is a tremendous growth in the number of people who use English as a non-native variety, linguists like Crystal (2004) and Svartvik and Leech (2006) have argued that the future of English is inextricably tied up with the future of non-native varieties of English. Hence rather than regarding these varieties as corrupt, distorted and debased versions of the standard native forms, it is necessary to develop a positive attitude towards non-native varieties. It is felt that extensive research should be carried out at different levels of linguistic organization for the growth and development of the non-native varieties of English.
1.5 The Status of English in India in the Pre-Independence Era

The beginnings of English in India are generally identified with the date 31 December, 1600 when Queen Elizabeth I signed a charter authorising the East India Company to open trade with India and other countries of the east. Initially the main domains of its use were trade and military and missionary work. The earliest attempts to introduce English in India were made by the missionaries who came primarily for the purpose of religious and moral preaching rather than for spreading English. A large number of Christian schools imparting an English education were set up by the early 1800’s. The colonizers introduced English in the Indian education system with the sole intention of producing cheap clerks who would help them in their administration. Thus, the British rulers used English as an instrument to expand their power in India.

Macaulay and Roy played a pivotal role in spreading English in India. The process of producing English-knowing bilinguals in India began with the Minutes of 1835, which decreed that English be the medium of education in India. This ordinance officially endorsed Macaulay’s goal of forming ‘a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern – a class of persons, Indians in blood
and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect’ (quoted in Kachru, 1983, p. 22). The decision of making English the medium of education proved to be a blessing in disguise for the Indian masses. Macaulay’s recommendations had both immediate and long term consequences. English became a symbol of imperial rule and also the language of education and advancement.

Raja Rammohan Roy also played a crucial role in spreading English in India. Roy led a group of Indians in demanding English education for Indians as this group was convinced that English would be more useful for Indians than Indian languages for academic, socio-economic, scientific and international purposes. In 1839 English became the language of administration in India. In 1857 the Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras were established and the importance of English increased considerably. English was generally taught by adopting the grammar-translation method in the colonial times. At the beginning of the 20th century English became a language of political discourse, law and international administration in India and it was given the status of an official language. Even before India achieved independence, writers like Tagore and Nehru produced some great writings in English.
During the freedom struggle a large number of Indian scholars felt that English would never become a ‘living language’ in the Indian milieu. They thought that it would fade out from India after the British left, as was the case with the Persian language after the Mughal rule.

During the colonial rule IE was considered to be a ‘sub-standard’ variety of BrE and certain pejorative labels like ‘Babu English’, ‘Kitchen English’, ‘Bazaar English’, ‘CheeChee English’, ‘Pidgin English’ and ‘Desi English’ were used to denigrate IE. Thus, in general in the colonial days the term ‘Indian English’ was used with an implied undertone of disparagement.

1.6 The Significance of English in the Post-Independence Period

It is remarkable that India made a foreign language her own in the post-colonial period. In the post-independence period English became strongly entrenched in India.

Article 343(2) of the Indian constitution specified that English was to be used for all official purposes of the Union till 26th January, 1965 and according to article 343(1), after that date Hindi was to be given the status of the official language of the Republic. However, this recommendation could not be implemented as the language controversy
took a violent turn. For instance, TamilNadu witnessed language riots in the 1960’s in which seventy people were killed and Hindi and English were both temporarily banished from the state (see Kachru, 1983, p. 90). Since states like West Bengal and TamilNadu expressed their resentment towards the imposition of Hindi, the Indian parliament passed an Official Language Act in the year 1967, according to which Hindi became the Official Language of India and English was given the status of an associate official language. The three language formula proposed by the Kothari Commission (1966) suggested that both Hindi and English should be used as link languages in India.

Thus, although Hindi is now the official language of the Union of India, English is an important ESL (English as a second language) variety and it enjoys a special privilege in India. Four states, viz. Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Tripura and eight union territories recognize it as the official language. According to some estimates when the British rule ended in 1947, about 8 million people knew English in India. Bhatt (2000) points out that 60 million people use English as a second language in India. In terms of the number of speakers of English, the Indian subcontinent ranks the third in the world, after the USA and the UK (see, Crystal, 1997) and this indicates that it is one of the most
prestigious languages spoken in India. Thus, contrary to the popular pre-independence view that Hindi would dethrone English after independence, English has not only continued to flourish in the educational and official network of India, but it is also looked upon as ‘the language of opportunity’ and ‘the language of upward social mobility’. Thus, in the post-colonial context English is looked upon as a linguistic asset rather than a colonial liability. According to Kachru (1966) it is widely used for ‘maintaining appropriate Indian patterns of life, culture and education’ (p. 32).

In the past few decades there has been a profound change in Indian and Western scholars’ attitudes towards IE. They recognize IE as a fairly stable, autonomous and efficient variety existing in its own right. Today a great deal of literature is available on IE as a variety of English and several scholars have been arguing for the identity of IE. According to Verma (1978), it is ‘a highly structured system, which is systematically deviant from the standard British English’ (p. 217). Mohan (1978) asserts, ‘Indian English is not just British English with a few Indian spices added to it. It has its own distinct identity’ (p. 2).

It is felt that though historically English has been an ‘alien’ language in India, from a contemporary point of view it is our own
language. Anand (1969) makes a strong plea for the recognition of English as one of the Indian languages. He suggests, “Let us genuinely accept it as one of the languages of India recognized by our constitution” (p. 285). Das also emphatically brings out the idea that English is our language in her poem ‘An Introduction’.

...The language I speak

Becomes mine, its distortions, its queerness

All mine, mine alone. It is half English, half

Indian, funny perhaps, but it is honest.

1.7 The Emerging New Roles of English in the Early Twenty-First Century in India

In the early twenty-first century the domains of English have been restructured and English has acquired a new power base. It is estimated that about 5% people speak English in India. Today India is the third largest English book-producing country in the world after the USA and the UK. In the past English used to symbolize a better class and a better education, but now we can see a glaring proliferation of English from the upper crust of the society to the grass root levels.
Today a great number of interactions in the domains of education, commerce, technology, administration, mass media, tourism and aviation are carried out in English. Because of the pervasiveness of English it is equated with success and power. It is no more looked upon as a language of westernization, but an indispensable instrument of modernization. John (2007) rightly argues that today Indians look upon IE as ‘a stepping stone to bigger things’ (p. 66).

In recent times English education has been fast becoming a large-scale industry. The spoken English courses are in tremendous demand with their crash courses and ‘English made easy’ programmes. Indians have become providers of ELT services to different parts of the world. Highly competent Indians are invited to teach English in the Middle East, Africa, China, Singapore and even the USA and the UK. Today a lot of online jobs are available where Indians are expected to correct scripts written by native speakers of English.

One of the most notable features of globalization has been the outsourcing of services to other countries. The use of English has given India a competitive edge in the BPO (Business Process Outsourcing) and LPO (Legal Process Outsourcing) industries. Call centres are appointing English trainers and conducting accent-sensitizing and accent-
neutralizing programmes. The multinational companies have started employing English knowing trained Indians to reduce costs and maximize their profits.

The demand for English medium schools is growing day by day as today English occupies a prominent place in almost every sphere of life. Some states in India have made English a compulsory language right from standard one in the regional medium schools. Now one of the main objectives of different schools is to develop students’ generic skills, and communication in English is an important component of generic skills. Today a lot of people are eager to appear for examinations like GRE, IELTS and TOEFL and there is a great demand for courses like Business English, Technical writing, English for Information Technology and Communication Skills in English.

Thus, it can be said that English is a glocal language in India as it satisfies both the global and local needs. Today Indians achieve a lot by knowing English and the world achieves a lot through Indians knowing English. Kachru (2005) makes a distinction between ‘genetic nativeness’ and ‘functional nativeness’. According to him in determining functional nativeness one must take into consideration the sociolinguistic status of a variety in its transplanted context, the functional domains in which the
language is used, the linguistic exponents of acculturation and nativization and the attitudes exemplifying labels used for the variety. It can be said that English in India has acquired ‘functional nativeness’ as a medium of communication across distinct linguistic and cultural groups.

1.8 Characteristic Features of Indian English

IE has been categorized as a variety of language according to interference. Quirk et al. (1972) among other non-native varieties of English label IE as an ‘interference variety’. This is because the speaker’s first language (L1) interferes with the process of learning English in the Indian context. Kachru (1986) labels it as ‘transplanted variety’ as it functions in new surroundings, new roles and new contexts in India. Kachru (1983b) has identified IE as a ‘transference variety’ as he observes the following four types of transfer in IE.

i) Transfer of context

ii) Transfer of speech functions

iii) Transfer of formal items

iv) Transfer of meaning from L1 to L2.

India represents a socio-linguistic area with one of the most diverse linguistic and cultural patterns of the world. Kachru (1983b)
extends the concept of linguistic ‘transfer’ to include certain non-
linguistic elements and observes that in the Indian context apart from
interference that takes place at least between two languages, interference
also takes place between two cultures (C1 and C2). The interaction
between English and Indian languages has resulted in the process of the
Indianization of English languages. The ‘substratum influence’ of
various Indian languages is evident in IE.

IE is sometimes described by native speakers of English as ‘a
bookish variety’. Native speakers get the impression that Indians are
efficient at using English in formal contexts, but they are not so
proficient in using it in informal situation. One of the reasons for this
observation can be that most Indians learn English from books.
Generally, the focus of teaching in schools and colleges is on the
development of reading and writing skills, and the listening and speaking
skills seem to be ignored. However, in the current scenario a need to be
proficient even in the informal style is felt and active steps are being
taken in this direction.

IE tends to be a little archaic. It has been observed that what is out
of use in modern BrE may still continue to be used in IE.
IE is a heterogeneous variety. Indian users of English show a wide variation in their proficiency in English depending on their competence in the language. It has, therefore, been suggested that English-knowing bilinguals should be ranked on a scale or a cline so that one can separate them on the basis of their level of competence. Different linguists have spoken about the concept of cline with different labels. Halliday (1961) comments, 'A cline resembles a hierarchy in that it involves relation along a single dimension, but instead of being made up of a number of discrete terms a cline is a continuum carrying potentially infinite gradation' (p. 249). The next section discusses the different labels posited by various scholars on the cline.

1.9 The Concept of Cline

Verma (1978) argues that English in India represents a cline extending from non-educated varieties of English at one end to an internationally accepted standard form at the other.

The cline of bilingualism that Kachru (1965) refers to is an arbitrary scale which consists of three ‘measuring points’, viz. the zero point, the central point and the ambilingual point. This scale runs from
absolute monolingualism at one end, through varying degrees of bilingualism, to absolute ambilingualism at the other end.

According to Kachru (1965) the speakers that can be placed at the zero point do not have proficiency in English. Since a ‘minimal bilingual’ ranks just above the zero point, he lacks competence in English. Bilinguals are placed in the vicinity of the central point and they have adequate competence in one or more registers of IE. People who have native like proficiency can be placed at the ambilingual point. Naturally this point enjoys a certain degree of prestige, but he feels that it is a rare phenomenon in India. Kachru (1983b) defines a standard IE bilingual as one ‘who ranks somewhere between the central and ambilingual points on the scale of bilingualism’ (p.99) and comments that such a person ‘is intelligible not only to other Indians in different parts of the sub-continent, but ideally speaking to the educated native speakers of English’ (Kachru, 1965, p. 394).

Das (1982) argues that it is possible to divide IE into three broad categories – lower, intermediate and higher. The lower end of the cline includes semi-literate or illiterate people who are engaged in various professions but do not have proficiency in English. According to him, people who have received university education belong to the
intermediate level and this kind of English ‘is spoken and written by millions of Indians and on this variety depends the future of English in India’ (p. 142). The last category, i.e. the higher level, is represented by creative writers who have near-native like proficiency.

Shastri (1988) posits a cline from the heavily Indian to hardly Indian with the educated variety as its midpoint. Daswani (1978) classifies the Indian speakers of English as adequate, inadequate and minimal bilinguals. The minimal bilingual is at the lower end, the adequate one at the upper end and the inadequate one between these two points. He identifies IE speech community as consisting of inadequate bilinguals whose English is ‘deviant by definition’.

Hosali’s Cline of competence (1984) represents three focal points, viz. basilect and acrolect as two extreme points with mesolect in the middle. She seems to locate IE midway between the acrolect and the mesolect.

All the points discussed by various scholars on the cline deserve serious academic attention. But since educated Indians constitute the most significant and influential section of the Indian society, the present study focuses only on the educated variety of IE. It does not take into consideration ‘the zero point’ or ‘the lower’ category or the ‘basilect’. It
is hoped that in further large scale surveys of IE, an attempt would be made to describe English as it is used at ‘the zero point’ on the cline of bilingualism.

1.10. A Survey of the Definitions of ‘Indian English’

Due to linguistic and cultural heterogeneity in India, there is some problem in defining what exactly IE is. Since IE has several regional sub-varieties like Marathi English, Tamil English and Bengali English, some scholars think that the concept of IE is a myth and no one really uses IE. They refuse to accept IE as a legitimate and systematic non-native variety.

Daswani (1975) seems to be critical about the spread of English in India and sees no possibility of assigning to IE the position of a variety. He claims that the so called IE is only ‘a poor approximation of the standard variety’ (p. 38). Mander (1963) considers IE to be an impossible proposition and asserts, ‘English in India has become essentially a dead language’ (p. 45).

Some linguists label IE as ‘a pidginised variety’. For example, Le Page (1964) expresses the view that the language variety spoken in India may deteriorate into a number of quite unintelligible dialects or even
pidgins. However, a pidgin is used in a very restricted context and it comes into existence only for business purposes. Since IE is used in several domains and has a lot of functional value, it is felt that it should not be labelled as a ‘pidginised variety’.

Several scholars have been arguing for the identity of IE and they all have defined IE in their own way and Nihalani et al. (1979) find the term ‘Indian English’ disputable and prefer to call it ‘the Indian variant (s) of English’ (IVE). Verma (1969) regards IE as ‘an offspring’ yielded by English and he defines it as ‘a second language with a distinct Indian flavour’ (p. 22). Hosali (1984) considers IE as a language which is composed of different varieties. Bansal and Harrison (1972) use the term GIE (General Indian English) to refer to the common core of IE.

Shastri (1984) postulates a terminological distinction between ‘English in India’ and ‘Indian English’. He defines IE as a broad variety of English which displays those distinctive features traced to the interference of native languages and cultures of India and the tendency of a language to change in course of time. On the other hand, Agnihotri and Khanna (1997) and Yadurajan (2001) prefer the phrase ‘English in India’ rather than ‘Indian English’.
Pattanayak (1998) defines IE as ‘English with a specific social-regional-dialectal tag attached to it’ (p. 184). Gokak (1978) discusses the concept of IE with reference to Indian writing in English. Kachru (1983b) uses the term ‘South Asian English’ (SAE) as a cover term for the educated variety of English used in the Indian subcontinent.

Krishnaswamy and Burde (1998) prefer the term ‘Indians’ English’. They point out that the ‘modulect’ of English in India has two sub-modules and they operate at two levels of use— one at the international level and the other at the intranational level, which is strongly influenced by Indian languages. They label the former as ‘Indians’ English’ and the latter as ‘Inglish’.

Parasher (1979) uses the term ‘Educated Standard Variety of IE’ and defines it as ‘that variety of English which is learnt and used by a large number of educated Indians as a second language’ (Parasher, 1999, p. 21). Thus, according to him, the term IE refers to the kind of English which is used by educated Indians whose process of formal education is complete.

The above discussion reveals that a good deal of effort has been devoted to define IE. The complexity in defining IE is brought out well by Subrahmaniam (1977) when he asserts, ‘Indian English is like unto
God. You know what it is not, but know not what it is. What you do not
know is the only thing you know about Indian English’ (p. 18).

The present study endorses Parasher’s definition of Indian
English and ‘Educated Indian English’ is the focal point for this study.
The term ‘Indian English’ has been used in this study to refer to
‘Educated Indian English’.

John (2007) compares IE to a chameleon that changes colours in
different locales, and talks of varieties like Hinglish and Tamglish. It is
felt that though Indian English has several regional sub-varieties, the
term IE is not restricted to a particular region of India. It is a cover-term
used to refer to a large number of closely related varieties of English
used by Indians. In spite of different first languages, the ‘common core’
present in all these regional sub-varieties can be labelled ‘Indian
English’. Hockett (1958) defines the common core as ‘the total set of
shared features’ (p. 332). The diagram given below explains the concept
of ‘common core’.
Thus, English in India has a pan Indian character in which most of the regional features are neutralized. It is essential to make a distinction between ‘regionally restricted features’ and ‘pan-Indian features’. Platt et al. (1984) rightly comment that ‘although there is an undoubted influence from the native language of the speakers, we feel that there are, for example, common features shared by Punjabi English, Bengali English and Dravidian English which make them all recognizable as belonging to Indian English’ (p. 5). It is felt that it is possible to conceptualize IE as that variety of English which is shared by most educated speakers of English in India.
Around the early modern period (15\textsuperscript{th} and 16\textsuperscript{th} centuries), there were a large number of regional differences among English speakers and they had problems in understanding each other. Unlike the French, English did not establish a language academy for the standardization of the language, and so the solution to this problem was a political one. Since politically, culturally and economically, London and the region around it was considered to be the most important region, the language used in and around London came to be regarded as prestigious English and gradually the language variety used in these areas was labelled as ‘Standard English’.

Johnson and Johnson (1998) bring out the importance of Standard English. According to them, ‘Standard English is a dialect with the most prestige and/or influence within the English-speaking community… Due to its association with the upper and middle classes, it is considered to be the ‘correct’ version of English’ (pp. 303-04). Thus, Standard English carries a higher social status than other varieties.

Plurality of Englishes has led to the plurality of standards and this has resulted in claims and counter-claims regarding the ownership of English and the question of standards. Kachru (1985) remarks, ‘The
global diffusion of English has taken an interesting turn: the native speakers of the language seem to have lost the exclusive prerogative control to its standardization' (p. 30). Thus, the concept of ‘Standard English’ has also undergone a change in the last few decades.

The Indian socio-linguistic scene is highly complex with various cultural and linguistic groups interacting with each other. In such a situation, the process of standardization becomes very complex. There are many controversies among linguists as to whether standard IE exists as a concrete reality. According to Greenbaum (1988), an established and acknowledged standard IE does not exist and (1985) he questions, ‘If the educated varieties of the ‘outer circle’ assume the status of national standards without reference to the international norms of the ‘inner circle’ will they diverge too far to remain part of the international Standard English?’ (p. 32).

However, it is felt that the abstraction of Standard IE is imperative from pedagogical, literary, administrative and communicative points of view. Since in spite of some differences, IE and BrE share a lot in common, it is felt that the existence of Standard IE will not cause problems for international intelligibility. Several grammarians identify standard IE with the educated variety of IE. Parasher (1991) defines
Standard IE as ‘that variety of English which is used by highly educated Indians, which is intelligible to speakers of other educated varieties of English and which conforms to the major syntactic rules of contemporary English’ (p. 201). It may be noted that only if English spoken by educated Indians is free from regionally restricted features, it can be recognized as ‘Standard IE’. In this study the term ‘Standard IE’ is used to refer to the educated pan-Indian variety of English.

What contributes to the process of standardization of a language is the availability of dictionaries, lexicons, grammar books and teaching materials. Unfortunately adequate descriptions of IE are not available in a systematic form. Greenbaum (1988) rightly complains, ‘Educated speakers in India... cannot consult grammars of their standard dialect or usage guides to find out what is correct for their national variety’ (p. 37).

Thus, it must be remembered that in the absence of a lexicon and a comprehensive grammar of IE, Standard IE is not a concrete reality. Greenbaum (1988) suggests that grammarians should play ‘their part in describing and shaping standard varieties of English for their countries’ (p. 37).

Kachru (1982) discusses four stages in the development of non-native models. In the first stage, the non-native speakers fail to recognize
the variety of English that they use as a legitimate variety and consciously try to identify themselves with the native speakers. The second stage is characterised by the extensive diffusion of bilingualism in English and the users do not accept the non-native variety as a model for communication. This stage reveals that though the local model is used in various contexts, it is still low on the attitudinal scale. In the third stage, the non-native speakers gradually accept the non-native variety as a norm and the dividing gap between the linguistic norm and behaviour is reduced. The final stage is characterised by linguistic realism and attitudinal identification with the variety. The non-native speakers develop a positive attitude towards the variety that they use and in this stage the teaching materials are also contextualized in the native socio-cultural milieu.

At present, IE is gradually being accepted as a norm. Therefore, it may be tentatively said that IE has passed through the first two stages, at present it is passing through the third stage and preparing itself for the final stage. This also highlights the point that standard IE is more of a concept now as it is still in the process of evolution.

Greenbaum (1986) comments, ‘No established and acknowledged Standard dialect of say Indian or Nigerian English yet exists on which
grammarians can draw for the data to be described in their grammars of the standard language' (quoted in D’Souza 1997, p. 95). Nelson (1985) suggests that the confidence of the users of the variety and the internal consistency of the variety itself are significant factors in the process of standardization. But it seems that Indian speakers of English do not possess enough self-confidence and pride for the variety of English they speak. According to a survey conducted by Kachru (1982), 66.66 per cent of the Indian teachers preferred BrE as a model, whereas only 26.66 per cent preferred IE as their model. Rajagopalan et al. (2001) remark, ‘... To native speakers our Indian English sounds a bit quaint or odd. It is essential that we should speak to the west in their ‘dialect’ if we want our ideas to be recognized, accepted and appreciated’ (Editorial Page). Kachru (1982) labels this point of view as a clear case of ‘linguistic schizophrenia’ (p. 60).

Since IE is passing through a stage of transition, it is necessary that Indians develop a positive attitude towards IE. It is felt that confidence and pride of the Indian speakers of English would play a very significant role in the process of standardization.
1.12 Indian English as a Medium of Indian Literature in English

Indian writing in English has gained worldwide recognition and has aroused considerable interest among the scholars within and outside India. The creative writers in India who use English as a medium of expression have produced a substantial body of literature. The Sahitya Academy recognizes Indian writing in English as one of our own literatures. Choudhari (1966) represents the views of most of the Indian creative writers when he remarks, ‘English is not a mere instrument for us but a force shaping and moulding personality, making us a wholly different kind of character from what we should have been if we did not know the English language’ (p. 9).

Parthasarathy, a well-known Indian poet, on the one hand repents his ‘Whoring after English Gods’ but on the other hand, is infatuated with the English language and possesses a strong urge to write in English. In the opening lines of his poem ‘Homecoming’ he says,

My tongue in English chains,
I return, after a generation, to you

Daruwalla in his poem ‘The Mistress’ refers to English as his mistress and takes pride in asserting the fact that he uses Indian English. He comments,
She is not Goan, nor Syrian Christian,
She is Indian English, the language that I use.

Creative writers like Khushwant Singh, Anita Desai, Kamala Das, Raja Rao, Mulk Raj Anand, Arundhati Roy, Vikram Seth and Kiran Desai have experimented a lot with English as a medium of literary communication and used IE to capture the vitality and ethos of Indian culture. Generally in their writings Indianisms are reflected in the use of lexical items and literal translations from Indian languages. Rao has described the position of a south Asian writer in the following words, ‘We shall have the English language with us and amongst us, and not as a guest or friend, but as one of our own, of our caste, our creed, our sect and of our tradition’ (quoted in Kachru, 1983, p. vi).

Though most writers welcome the potentiality of using IE as a vehicle of literary expression, it has been observed that most of the Indian writers present only a partial or exaggerated view of IE. According to Gokhale (2003) one of the possible reasons for this can be that most of the canonical writers in India have not stayed in India, but in the Indian diaspora. They seem to be very close to the point of absolute ambilingualism as they spend a lot of their time among the native users of English. Most of these writers seem to approximate native speakers.
For example, we do not find any trace of Indianism in Ezekiel’s serious poems like ‘Poet, Lover, Birdwatcher’, and ‘Philosophy’. However, in his parodies he makes an exaggerated use of certain linguistic features associated with IE and they do not faithfully mirror IE.

Verma (1972) argues that literary writing should not be taken as a basis for linguistic studies as in literature we often find ‘motivated’ deviations and instances of deliberate manipulation of the language by the author for certain effects. Thus, since literature seems to provide only a distorted image of IE as a variety of English, it is felt that conceptualizing IE entirely on the basis of literary texts would not be reliable and appropriate. However, along with the relevant data collected from different sources, examples in literary texts can be used as supporting evidence to make generalizations of IE.

1.13 An Overview of the Earlier Studies on Indian English

The past few decades have witnessed a considerable amount of research in IE as a variety of English. Several researchers have contributed remarkably in establishing IE as a viable variety through investigations into its major distinctive aspects. Sridhar (1992) comments, ‘The study of Indian English has made major strides in the
last quarter of a century, moving away from the prescriptivist paradigm, ('Indianisms’ or ‘common errors in IE’ approach) to what Kandian (1991) has referred to as the ‘Kachruvian paradigm’ in which the distinctive characteristics of IE are viewed as natural, and necessary developments as a transplanted language is used to express a unique socio-cultural context’ (p. 141).

A lot of studies have been devoted to the phonology of IE. Studies of Babu (1971), Bansal (1978) and Pandey (1980) attempt to describe the segmental and suprasegmental aspects of Standard IE. Some researchers have carried out pedagogically oriented contrastive studies between R.P. and a regional variety of IE, for example, Rajasthani English (Dhamija, 1976), Marathi English (Gokhale, 1978; Rubdy 1975) and Tamil English (Vijayakrishnan, 1978). Bansal’s work (1967) attempts to measure the intelligibility of IE and the result of his study indicates that in spite of numerous variations found within spoken IE, it is possible to determine a Standard pronunciation of English. Sahgal (1983) and Agnihotri and Sahgal (1985) have analyzed the phonological structure of IE in terms of the social and psychological background of its speakers. Nihalani et al. (1979) recommend educated IE as a model that must be adopted in schools and colleges.
The Indian socio-cultural and linguistic scene has an impact on the lexical features of the English language in India. Kachru (1994b) discusses several types of lexical innovations in IE.

Kachru (1965) illustrates how a large number of lexical innovations that have developed in IE are contextually determined and can be understood in a better way if one takes into consideration the linguistic and cultural settings in India. Sridhar (1996) lists words, phrases, idioms and collocations that distinguish IE. Verma (1969) cites words which have ‘an additional dimension of meaning’ in IE. Parasher (1979 and 1983) discusses several examples of lexical innovations, lexical deviations and semantic extensions. Nihalani et al. (1979) list a selection of about one thousand items of the English language which are used in a distinctive manner by a large number of educated speakers of IE.

Recently, a lot of interest has been shown in the discoursal features of IE. For example, Pandharipande (1987) briefly compares the paradigm structure of English with that of Marathi and other Indian languages including IE. Leitner (1990) who has empirically investigated certain features of IE strongly argues that differences between different varieties of English or within the same national variety are tied not only
to regional or social differences, but also to text types within each variety.

IE is marked by certain syntactic peculiarities. In the area of syntax emphasis has been laid on pointing out deviations from accepted English usage. A few attempts have been made to compare IE with standard BrE in areas like articles, prepositions, negatives and questions. [(See, for example, Kachru (1965), Selinker (1972), Parasher (1991) and Aitchison and Agnihotri (1985)]. Jacob (1998) claims about IE that it is important to distinguish between, on the one hand, the errors in Indian English that violate the norms of grammaticality and on the other hand, deviations that are within the grammaticality and the comprehensibility range of the language’ (p. 15). Fox (1968) offers a transformational treatment of IE syntax.

Researchers like Trudgill and Hannah (1985) and Agnihotri et al. (1988) have carried out work on the syntax of articles, tenses and prepositions and it has largely been pedagogical in nature. Verma (1972) describes IE syntax on the basis of written work handed in by CIEFL participants. Daswani (1974) points out that Indians make an erratic use of articles and prepositions and denies IE the position of a variety. Parasher (1983) concludes that syntactically educated IE does not differ
much from BrE. Rubdy (1981) maintains that IE does not differ markedly from native varieties of written English with respect to the central grammatical system. Hosali (1984) reports certain syntactic features of Butler English. Sridhar (1992) points out that studies which have taken regional or ethnic variation into account have discussed features that may be characteristic of only a particular region ‘as though they represent all of Indian English’ (p. 146).

Though substantial research has been carried out on various syntactic aspects of IE, much of this research remains largely unempirical. Several scholars have expressed the view that in the syntax of IE we lack exhaustive data and a lot of descriptive work needs to be carried out in that direction. Kachru (1983b) comments, ‘The description of Indian English grammar is yet far from satisfactory and improvement of it is a crucial undertaking both from lexicological and pedagogical points of view’ (p. 178). It is felt that a lot of systematic work needs to be carried out on the syntax of IE as comprehensive description of IE is not yet available. It is hoped that this study will help in the better characterization of IE.
1.14 Earlier Research on the Verb Phrase in Indian English

The earlier section has revealed that studies on syntax of IE have been very limited in scope. Though a substantial amount of work has not been carried out on the verb phrase in IE, some brief comments have been made on it in some books and articles. This chapter takes a brief overview of the observations made on the verb phrase in IE.

Kachru (1983b) in his analysis of the similarities and differences between BrE and IE remarks, ‘In the case of passive, preterite, continuous and perfect, the differences are not significant’ (p. 33). The present study aims at verifying this observation.

Nihalani et al. (1978), Trudgill and Hannah (1985), Arya (1979) and Verma (1980) note the tendency in IE to use the present perfect with the past adverbials. All of them only give examples of this pattern without commenting on them. According to Das (1982), if educated users of IE use the present perfect with the past adverbials it is ‘the result of intellectual blindness rather than adherence to particular laws of IE’ (p. 147). The present study recognizes IE as a self-contained system and tries to arrive at more satisfactory generalizations.

According to Trudgill and Hannah (1985) Indians make ‘use of the present tense with durational phrases (indicating a period from past
to present) where EngEng would require the present perfect (unusual in more educated IndEng)’ (p. 108). Nihalani et al. (1978) note that Indians frequently use the past perfect instead of the British simple past and Agnihotri, Khanna and Mukherjee (1994) note the tendency to use the future continuous in place of the future perfect continuous. All of them only give some examples of these patterns without commenting on them. Gokhale (2003) points out that the various patterns regarding the use of the perfective in IE are related to and extend from the patterns in BrE.

Shinde (1991) in his study of the behaviour of verbs in IE based on the analysis of data of the Kolhapur corpus discovers the tendency in IE to use two part verbs instead of one-part verbs. Shingate (1986) comments on the verb-particle constructions with ‘up’ and ‘down’ in IE. He has discovered that fifty per cent of the verb-particle constructions do not conform to the Standard English usage. Vayangankar (1985) investigates the similarities and differences in the use of phrasal verbs between BrE and IE and points out the problems of teaching phrasal verbs in the Indian context. Katikar (1984) comments on certain syntactic irregularities in the use of modals in IE. Patil (1986) points out that present and future forms of verbs tend to be used somewhat interchangeably in certain texts in IE. Gokhale (1988) distinguishes
between the BrE stative verbs which are used non-statively in IE and those which are not.

Some researchers have carried out contrastive studies between BrE and a regional variety of IE. For example, Mary (1986) compares the verb phrase in English and Malyalam. Yadava (1980) comments on the similarities and differences between time, tense and aspect in English and Maithili. Jayaraman (1978) brings out some of the semantic differences of some aspects of tense and time in Tamil and English.

Some studies have been devoted to analysing the errors made by students in using the verb phrase. For example, Bakshi (1978) analyses the errors made in the verbal group in English by Punjabi speaking students. Parasher (1977) points out some errors in the verb phrase made by a group of Hindi speaking first year students of Madhya Pradesh.

Parasher (1979) concentrates only on the written data for the purpose of data collection. Letters and reports of two nationally important organizations are studied by him. Rubdy (1981) selects only samples of written texts of a non-fictional, semi-journalistic nature produced by educated users of IE.

There are hardly any studies on the use of the verb phrase in both literary and non-literary texts. It seems that studies carried out on the
sub-systems of a verb phrase have mainly been based on the written texts. This study attempts to study the use of the verb phrase in some literary and non-literary texts and it also takes into consideration utterances used in real contexts by speakers of IE. Though some researchers have selected examples from the Kolhapur corpus of English, it seems that none of the studies have selected examples from the International corpus of English. In this study examples have been selected from both the Kolhapur corpus and the International corpus of English.

Thus, though some work has been carried out on the verb phrase in IE, a lot remains to be done. Though these studies offer some significant insights, they do not discuss the phenomenon of the verb phrase in IE in detail. There are hardly any studies that point out the approach that a teacher of English must have in relation to the distinct patterns of IE within the framework of the currently emerging endonormative approach. The present study aims at considering the patterns relating to the verb phrase in IE from a pedagogical perspective.

The above discussion reveals that the uses of the verb phrase in IE need to be stated more precisely. The present study is a modest attempt
in that direction. It is felt that this is probably the first full-scale study of the verb phrase in Indian English.