CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Speech events

According to Austin, when someone says something to someone else in the "full normal sense" (Furberg, 1963: 56), he performs a speech act. Spoken language consists of a variety of speech acts or linguistic events such as making a speech, giving a lecture, gossiping with friends, saying a prayer, reading a news bulletin on the radio, reciting poetry, acting a play, taking part in a panel discussion or having an argument etc. The above mentioned acts can be broadly categorized under the heads -- reading aloud, monologue and conversation.

Reading aloud and monologue are speech acts in which, the hearers are not supposed to join in. Reading aloud includes radio speech, recitation of something learnt by heart. Speeches (extempore), radio commentaries on sports, many spontaneous lectures are bracketed along with monologue. These two categories of speech acts are very specialized and organized and all people do not, and also need not engage in them. They can be termed as spoken prose as it is not real spoken language. Most of the radio bulletins, commentaries etc. are read from a prepared text and even the so called extempore or spontaneous lectures now and then fall back on the notes already made.
The third speech act — conversation or free speech — is the most natural act and all humans participate in it. To quote Riley, "Communication is a process whereby we create, negotiate and interpret personal meanings" (Riley, 1985: 1). Abercrombie, in his book, "Studies in Phonetics and Linguistics" lists out the differences between spoken prose and real conversation (Abercrombie, 1965: 1-9).

1.1 **Features given by Abercrombie**

1. Spoken prose has marked intonation patterns when compared with conversation.

2. The tempo of spoken prose is more regular as compared to constant changes in the tempo of conversation.

3. The pauses in spoken prose are connected to grammatical meaning but in conversation these pauses are quite arbitrary.

4. In conversation silence is very important (filled in by grimaces, gestures etc.); however in spoken prose silence cannot have any meaning.

5. Stammers and errors are quite natural in conversation but rare and unnatural in spoken prose.

6. The number of phonetically different speech sounds is more in conversation than in spoken prose.
7. Conversation has this unique characteristic of being understood from the context and so a part of it can be left unsaid, whereas in spoken prose things might have to be clarified.

8. Repetition is another important characteristic of conversation.

9. Conversation is full of 'intimacy signals' or apparently meaningless words like - sort of, kind of, you see, I mean, well you know, etc. which perform the function of gap filling, allowing us to think of what to say next, while we are still talking.

1.2 Discourse discussed in perspective

The researcher in this thesis has used the words discourse and conversation synonymously.

1.2.1 What is discourse?

Discourse is viewed in a broad sense by linguists like Widdowson (1979), Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), when they try to analyse the communicative functions of language. Discourse is defined as the entity consisting of the text (verbal and non-verbal messages) and the circumstances in which the text is produced, and interpreted (who is the speaker, whom is he addressing, what is his communicative
aim, etc.). The term discourse is used to designate the verbal and non-verbal text used by an actor to address his interlocutor for communicative purposes. In other words, it is "the collaborative construct of two or more participants mutually engaged in other directed communicative behaviour" (Riley, 1985: 50). When people participate in conversation, they do not just talk i.e., it is not a string of non-sensical sounds that they produce, but a stretch of language that is connected and coherent.

1.2.2 **Typology of discourse**

Discourses are classified into different types such as spoken and written, interactive and non-interactive, planned and unplanned.

**Spoken and written:**

Though the spoken medium is the most extensive representation of language, it does not reduce the importance of the written medium. However, the organization procedures for both are different. In written discourse, the writer has to build up the context. Further, there has to be a logical development of thought, depending on the kind of writing. The general impression is one of premeditation and conscious organisation. To the argument that there is no interaction in written discourse, Widdowson points out that the writer always anticipates his readers' moves
by writing them into the discourse. Written discourse is a linear organisation of sentences and hierarchical organisation of functions. In spoken discourse, the speaker falls back more on the physical actions like gestures, pointing to the other speaker, etc.

Interactive and non-interactive:

In interactive discourse, oral discourse is realised in a face-to-face communication situation and it involves the participation of all present. But oral discourse can also be non-interactive. Teachers' lecture on a subject interspersed with some advice to the students is an example of this sort of discourse.

Planned vs unplanned:

Planned discourse involves some preparation and is thought out before expression. It is more organised. Unplanned discourse is spontaneous and is not pre-planned, nor is it organised. In this type of speech, the possibility of producing regular and tightly controlled discourse becomes remote. This might sometimes result in nonsensical and haphazard sentences.

It can be seen that the two are extremes. In reality, in our day-to-day conversation, discourse is not so well-defined to either extreme. We usually listen to and produce language which is a mixture of both planned and unplanned discourse.
1.2.3 The different approaches to discourse analysis

There are different attitudes adopted towards discourse analysis by different people. For some, the object of investigation is the end-product and then it can be called product oriented analysis. Some give more importance to the process of discourse and it is procedure oriented. Given below briefly, are the views of some scholars from various schools of thought.

The mode of discourse analysis proposed by Harris (1952) is perhaps the first one to deal with discourse, but it ignores performance functions and as such it becomes almost a text analysis and not discourse analysis. Halliday's register analysis and grammatical cohesion also is on the same lines as Harris' text analysis. Registers are types of texts and not types of discourse, as they are not defined in terms of what communication they represent.

Katz and Fodor are the transformationalists as they study discourse in the transformational generative framework. They argue that discourse can be dealt with in terms of sentence grammar and they think that sentences in discourse have only additive kind of relationship with each other and that there is no restriction on the use of 'and' in connected discourse. But, words like however, yet etc. which show opposition, disproves their claim. In this
analysis only the formal aspects of language are taken into account whereas, inter-relation between sentences into sequence involves more than formal relationships.

The tagmemic approach to the analysis of discourse is propounded by Pike, Longacre and Grimes. This is connected with narrative discourse, as their informants were asked to tell a particular story. This procedure appears to focus not the structure of discourse but the changing construction types.

Some linguists realised the need to consider the 'presupposition' or the 'understood' element in the sentences and the sociolinguistics follows this line of study. Sociolinguists like Labov maintain that language cannot exist independent of its use in socio-cultural context. Widdowson (1979: 92) gives the difference between Harris and Labov when he says "that whereas Harris conceives of discourse in purely formal terms as a series of connected sentences, Labov is thinking of the way language terms are used to perform social actions." Hymes' notion is that the concept of communicative competence involves the knowledge of appropriateness of utterances in a socio-cultural situation. He says: "There are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless" (Hymes, 1972: 278).

Sinclair and Coulthard are concerned not with the formal properties of an item in their discourse analysis
but with its functional properties, i.e., what it is used for etc. They realise that conversation is the right field to study the nature of working of a language as it is multidirectional, but they limit their research to one-man controlled and unidirectional data - the teacher-pupil interaction. This again has its limitations.

Michael Stubbs wants the sociolinguists to broaden their field so as to accommodate analysis of how conversation works, i.e., in which way a talk between people is organized, what makes it coherent and understandable, how people introduce and change topics, how they interrupt, ask questions and give or evade answers, and in general how the conversational flow is maintained or disrupted (Stubbs, 1983: 7). Another avenue arises from the work of conversation analysts as articulated in Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1974). The study proposed here is on the same lines as the above linguists. Therefore this study tries to give an elaborate picture of their analysis. Their analysis according to Sandra A. Thompson (1990:114) "seeks to clarify the principles governing the sequential organisation of conversation as a type of situated social action."

Conversations do not just begin and end. The openings and closings are well organised for conversations to be opened - an adjacency pair such as greeting-greeting,
request-grant, question-answer, or statement-response is employed. This helps in the immediate participation of the conversationalists and will lead to a conversation. Closings also do not just happen but some signals indicating that the conversation is ending are used. Closings are preceded by pre-closings like OK..., Sooo (with downward intonation).

Conversation is governed by interactional tactics, i.e., by the turn taking norms, rules which determine who talks and for how long. Participants evaluate each others' utterances to judge the proper place or time when he hands over the floor. In order to ensure that the intended messages have been successfully conveyed, the participants monitor the conversation and this involves correction of sentences where necessary. Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977: 362) use the term 'repair' to refer to the attempts by the listener or speaker to correct the mistakes in conversation. Repairs by the speaker himself are self-initiated ones. Sometimes, the speaker repeats a word not understood properly and the other participant explains it. This technique is called 'Echoing'. The concept of repair is extended to include communication strategies. These are self-initiated repairs and they include:

a. Approximation - Not getting the word in the target language, the speaker may use an approximate word, may be a synonym. e.g. Shop for departmental store.
b. Word coinage - To fill out a gap in the target language, a word may be coined, e.g., ice crushing ship for ice breaker.

c. Circumlocution - The speaker may sometimes describe or paraphrase a word when he lacks that word in his vocabulary.

d. Borrowing - Unable to remember a particular word in the target language the speaker may borrow it from the mother tongue, e.g., I felt very...malu...you know (shy).

e. Mime - The speaker may act out a word. e.g., The plane... (mimes a plane taking off).

f. Topic shift and topic avoidance - if the speaker lacks the confidence to discuss a particular topic, he changes the topic or avoids it. (Richards, C. and Schmidt, 1983: 148-149).

Manfred Bierwisch (1982: 585-597) analyses some errors found in spontaneous speech. Numerous grammatically incorrect sentences are produced in naturally occurring conversation. False starts, and rule violations are usual categories found in linguistic literature. Apart from grammatical errors, there are others like ordering errors, selection errors etc. Some examples are given below along with the intended sentences.
1. Firstly not every hour lasts four rehearsals.
   Firstly not every rehearsal lasts four hours.

2. He works three weeks a days in Berlin.
   He works three days a week in Berlin.

These examples illustrate a phenomenon called word exchange. It is not arbitrary as words of the same syntactic category are exchanged. It has no connection with any syntactic permutation rule and so cannot be accounted for as rule violation. It affects the sequential organisation of sentences.

Selection errors arise due to the use of a wrong lexical item. The item intended is not substituted by an arbitrary one but by one which is phonemically or semantically connected to it. As in the case of word exchange when the speaker usually notices the error, in selection errors, the speaker is unaware that he has not conveyed the intended message. Sometimes an antonym of a word is used in place of the word itself.

e.g. You must forget the following.
     You must remember the following.

Blends:

In some cases there is the contamination or blending of two word structures. Blends can be regarded as a fault in the selection mechanism, only that in this case, it is not the selection of a wrong item but two right ones combined.
Fromkin also gives some examples to show that phonologically similar word is substituted for the target utterance (Fromkin, 1980: 3).

Target (T) - a verbal output
Actual (A) - a verbal outfit

In some cases, there is an exchange of phonemes of two words which is labelled as spoonerism, after the famous De Spooner.

e.g. T - He went by the down train.
A - He went by the town drain.

Paul Drew (1990: 27-28) in his paper on 'Conversational Analysis: Who needs it', shows that the technique of pausing is used to disagree with something the co-participant has said. He says: "Pauses are thus part of the design of doing disagreements. Furthermore, they are available as such to participants that is, when a speaker asserts something and then the recipient pauses before responding that speaker can anticipate that the other is going to disagree."

This analysis of discourse is to see how communication is achieved i.e., it is process oriented. A spontaneous talk is not a well planned speech and as such there are bound to be many errors made on the part of the speaker. These might be substitution of one word for another, or
interchange of some phonemes thereby producing a new word, or it might be a blend of two words etc. These are on the lexical level. On the phonetic level too many divergences from standard English are seen. So also on the grammatical level, we come across all these features in ordinary conversation, in addition to features like repetition of a word or sentences, paraphrasing, i.e., to stop a sentence midway, explain something in that and then continue the sentence etc. (sometimes may not continue it).

Conversation includes pauses which may be filled by gap fillers like ahah, mmm or by lexical items like - you know, sort of, like that or even by silence. Sometimes there is duplication of a word e.g."Standing standing I came in the bus." Code-mixing and code-switching are other frequently occurring features of discourse.

These features of discourse will be given in greater detail in the chapter dealing with the analysis of discourse.

1.3 **Status of English in India**

In India, English co-exists with many other Indian languages. There has been an increase in the users of English, owing to its worldwide popularity and importance. In spite of the three-language formula with regional language or mother tongue as the first language, Hindi as the second
and English as the third language, teaching of English continues both privately and in educational institutions. English is considered to be the language of the elite and fluency in English is a sign of status in life. The very fact that English medium schools are cropping up like mushrooms is a sure indication of the consensus of opinion of the people in India, in favour of English. The position of English is in fact secured by the Constitution. In 1967 the Official Language Act of 1963 was amended and English acquired a special status in the Constitution as an 'Associate Official Language' next to Hindi. In practice however the situation is exactly the reverse, with English as the virtual official language and Hindi as a "poor associate" (Khanna, 1986, cited by Krishna, 1991: 58). Of late, there has been a move in some states to remove English and replace it with Hindi. But for a couple of states all other states are for the stay of English. As a developing country India needs English as we have to depend on the scientific technology. To quote Gokak, "A knowledge of English is imperative for getting access to modern scientific and technological knowledge" (Gokak, 1964: 57). It is such a widespread language that in the words of Randolf Quirk it is "the language - on which the sun does not set, whose users never sleep." (Quirk and Widdowson, 1985: 1).
1.3.1 **Indian English**

A language which is used as the mother tongue by people of a particular area is called the native language in that area. As such a language is non-native when (i) it is not the mother tongue of its speakers and (ii) when it differs linguistically and sociolinguistically from the variety spoken by a native speaker. To quote Kachru, "The non-native Englishes are the legacy of the colonial period and have mainly developed in the un-English cultural and linguistic contexts in various parts of the world wherever the arm of the western colonizers reached" (Kachru, 1983: 96). The foregoing definitions make Indian English fall under the category of non-native variety of English. Indian English is the English spoken by educated Indians. There is a uniqueness about the English in India to be labelled 'Indian'. It is different from the native varieties of English like British English, American English, Canadian English, Australian English, etc. Grammar and vocabulary are not the major areas of deviation as is pronunciation. This is due to the contribution and interference of the phonetic features of the mother tongue. The deviations are also due to the cultural differences and the interlanguage analogical processes (Verma 1982).

But do these deviations ensure the emergence of Indian English (IE) as a distinct variety of English is the contro-
versy among the scholars and their studies on IE are divided over the issue. There are two groups of scholars - those who say it is a viable variety and others who say it is not, but only a deviation from RP. The views of some of the scholars are given below. Having studied the various aspects of IE - Kachru on stylistics, Bansal and Masica on pronunciation, Verma on grammar, they conclude that IE is a distinct variety. C.J. Daswani and N. Krishnaswamy differ in their opinion.

Kachru in his book "The Indianization of English" has a chapter on "The Pragmatics of non-native varieties of English", where he compares Latin and Sanskrit to the new English saying that, just as the former languages underwent a historical development, so also nativized and local models of English must be recognized as part of the total variety of the international English. "The range of verbal repertoire, which forms an essential part of communicative competence is determined by culture-bound parameters and the concept of acceptability, appropriateness and intelligibility cannot be used independent of the context" (Kachru, 1983: 215). He opines that there is a distinct variety called IE and in answer to the question as to how it is distinctive, he focuses attention on some typically IE formations and calls these Indianisms. He takes the examples from Indo-Anglian literature. Following is the list of the type of formations (Kachru, 1983: 130-150).
a. Those which are transferred from Indian languages into IE. e.g. the confusion of casts - 'Varna Sankara', dung-wash - 'lepan'.

b. Some are not transferred but are only collocationally unusual to an $L_1$ user of English, e.g., Salt-giver, rape-sister.

c. Some terms are formed on the analogy of native English. e.g. black money on the analogy of black market.

d. The formations may be formally non-deviant but culture-bound. There is an extension of the register range of an item of $L_1$.

  e.g. 'flower-bed' is used in IE in the sense of nuptial bed by B. Bhattacharya (e.g. on this her flower-bed her seven children were born).

He also gives some examples of lexical innovations which go into making IE a distinct variety.

  e.g. Lathi-charge, Police-wala, Kumkum mark where one of the two components is from English and the other from a regional language.

Bansal took intelligibility as the basic criterion for the efficiency of a dialect. "English as spoken by educated people in India does not differ radically from native English in grammar and vocabulary, but in pronuncia-
tion it is different from both British and American English. Even within India there are a large number of regional varieties, each different from the others in certain ways and retaining to some extent the phonetic patterns of the Indian language spoken in that particular region" (Bansal, 1972: 3). In spite of the different sub-varieties, he arrives at a neutral form of IE. Given below is the phonological description of IE. There are eleven vowels in IE. In addition to these, there are six vowel glides viz.

/ai/ /ɔɛ/ /au/ /ɨə/ /eə/ /uə/
bile boil house cheer air poor

These findings show that in place of RP phonemes /æ/, /ɒ:/ and /ə/, IE has only one phoneme [ə]. In place of RP /ɒ/ and /ɔ:/ IE has [ɔ]. Monophthongs [ɛː] and [oː] replace the diphthongs /ei/ and /əu/ of RP in IE. In IE weak vowel is not always used in unaccented syllables nor are weak forms always in unaccented positions. Then he gives a list of consonants with examples that are substituted for the RP consonants.
IE | RP | RP | IE
---|---|---|---
/[d]/ for /t/ laughed /lɑːft/ [lɑːfd]
/[f]/ for /v/ of /əv/ [əf]
/[w]/ for /v/ advance /ədvaːns/ [ədwaːns]
/[v]/ for /v/ arrive /əraɪv/ [əraɪv]
/[t]/ for /ð/ north /nɔːθ/ [nɔrθ]
/[θ]/ for /ð/ that /ðæt/ [ðæt]
/[z]/ for /s/ loose /luːs/ [luːz]
/[s]/ for /z/ dogs /dɒgz/ [dɒgs]

[ən] and [əl] for syllabic /n/ and /l/
e.g. button, little

[ŋə] for /ŋ/ - singer /sɪŋ/ [sɪŋə] medially

Omission of /j/ - students /stjuːdnts/ ['stjuːdnts]

[ŋ] for /w/ - way /weɪ/ ['weɪ]

In stress, rhythm and intonation too there is difference between RP and IE.
e.g. 'Come and 'dine with us
(ordinarily it is on dine)

'I know what you mean
(usually on mean)

To make IE more intelligible he gives some suggestions.
Colin Masica is of the view that there is a definite variety called IE. He lists the difference between IE and RP (Masica, 1972: 4-7).

a. Phonemic:

General Indian English lacks the category /3/. It is replaced by /ʃ/ /ʃ/ or /צ/. There is no distinction between /v/ and /w/. They are replaced by /ɣ/. IE turns fricatives /θ, ɵ/ into stops.

b. Phonetic:

IE speakers use only unaspirated stops. Only one allophone (unvelarized) of /l/ is found in IE. /c, sʃ/ corresponding to /tf, df/ are used in IE. Sometimes /tʃ/ and /ʁʃ/ are used in place of /t, d/.

Distributional:

In IE /n/ is retained in the final position but medially /ʁʃ/ is added - *singer, ringer.*

Syllabic /l,m,n/ are replaced by /əʃ/, /əm/ and /ɛn/.

Vowels - Summary of differences:
1. IE has all vowel contrasts of RP except that between cot and caught.
2. Where there are no contrasts in RP, IE has.
   e.g. father/farther, paw/pour/poor, made/maid

Phonetic:
1. /ei/ and /əu/ are replaced by /æʃ/ and /ɔːʃ/
2. /ɛːʃ/ is used in place of /eː/
3. Instead of /ʌ/ and /ɔ/ there is one phoneme /ʊ/.

4. Some diphthongs may be said as disyllabic sequences with a transitional [ɛː] or [ɛ̃-w-].
   e.g. India

5. Long vowels used in place of diphthongs.
   e.g. RP IE
   /siəriəs/ [siːriəs]

He says that IE has stress but it is different and it might be due to analogical regularising sometimes. - e.g., 'photographer. IE is not stress-timed. It appears to be more or less syllable weight based. Intonation too is different from RP.

Indian English according to Verma is a "non-native, second language variety and has a complex network of features contributed by the mother tongues of its speakers, by their cultures and also intra language analogical processes" (Verma, 1982: 174-175). He quotes Quirk - "The most important development of all is seen in the emergence of varieties of English that are identified with and specific to particular countries from among the former British colonies", - to emphasize the fact that when a language interacts with other languages, the lexical items, phonological features and syntactic patterns of one language influence the other/s. As English is used in India by a large majority
of people, it is definite to create a local model. Verma takes some examples from grammar and says that "Indian English is a self-contained system and follows its own set of rules. This system is closely related to the core grammar of English English" (Verma, 1982: 180).

e.g. When you will move into your new house?
Mohan wants that you should go there.

So Indian English has a system of rules to generate sentences like those mentioned above. "These non-stylistic deviant (deviant when compared with the patterns of English English) syntactic patterns are typical not only of Indian English but of many non-native second and foreign language varieties of English.... It is a highly structured system" (Verma, 1982: 183-184).

C.J. Daswani tries to show that "the claim that there exists a viable variety of English called Indian English is false." He bases his arguments on examples from grammar. "In rejecting the claim we will show that the semantic structure of the so-called Indian English does not fulfil our conditions for it to qualify either as a regional dialect of English or a social non-standard variety of standard English" (Daswani, 1975: 37). In order to demonstrate this, he examines the inflectional features found in the major unit N. In standard English the presence or absence of
surface structure items like the definite and indefinite articles and plural marker has various semantic units underlying it.

e.g. a. The tiger is big. 
     + definite, refers to a particular tiger

     b. The tigers are big. 
     + definite, refers to a particular tiger

     c. A tiger is big. 
     - definite, refers to the sub-set of the class of tigers.

     d. Tigers are big.

     e. The tiger is big - refers to the total class of tigers

(a) and (e) are phonetically identical but are different in meaning.

Indian English violates several configuration rules of N and these deviations cannot be explained by positing of rules.

e.g. * Made their lives failure.
* Pay visit to
* gave us an advice
* He has a great trouble with...
* loud applause broke out
* wordings of the document
* take initiative
* go to dogs
* love at the first sight
The behaviour of nouns in IE is erratic as the above examples show.

* I replied her at once.

* They appealed the high court.

Since the semantic structure is so different from standard English, the claim of IE being a variety of English is untenable. Daswani criticizes the view that there is a standard Indian English. He says that if the list of ten suggestions (made by Bansal) by which IE could be made more intelligible are followed, then IE will cease to be IE and it will be SE. So "the English of the majority of L2 speakers of English in India may, at best be called pidginized English which may, in future develop into a pidgin in its own right" (Daswani, 1975: 58).

N. Krishnaswamy's paper on Indian English is a counter argument to those people who argue that there should be a 'Standard Indian English' and they justify this stand basing on the presence of 'American English'. He says that American and Indian English cannot be equated, as for most of the Americans, English is the first language and the difference between British and American English is only in words and word meanings. He says, "So long as the total system of a language remains unaltered the differences can be ignored. But in the case of Indian English the total
system of English is altered. This is because most Indians carry the system of the native language to the foreign language, without even being aware of the fact... the Indian carries his own native intonation and stress to the foreign language" (Krishnaswamy, 1971: 8). Krishnaswamy lists a few well-known Indianisms.

e.g. weightment, he is absconding, why you went, signboard on a bakery—A first class loafer, there are four adults and three adultresses in my house.

Then in India there are many substandard forms like Tamilian English, Bengali English etc. due to the 'gravitational pull of the mother tongue'. He lists some examples:

**Bengal** – Bery bery good. I hab one more phiis.

**Kerala** – It is very simble. I go to temble daily.

**Madras** – Sir, you are going to a pictureaa?

**Gujarat** – Babu, I want to enjoy you upto the pawn shop.

He poses a question as to which of these is IE. He advocates for English to be only a library language and not the medium of instruction. As such, he opines, that there is no need for a new brand called 'Indian English'. He compares English to the tower of Babel and suggests not adding some more Englishes to it to make it worse.

Prabhakar Babu attempts to strike a balance between the above mentioned two groups of scholars (Prabhakar Babu,
1990). He agrees with the first set of people who argue for the existence of IE. He justifies it by saying that "outside India, it is easy to identify a speaker from the sub-continent since his accent is clearly different from the accent of other speakers of different geographical origin." Indians, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis are clubbed together and are referred to as speaking IE. But, he realises the problems that arise if a general term like 'Indian English' is used to cover a wide range of sub-varieties like Telugu English, Oriya English etc. He feels it is not possible to expect Indians to speak English with a near native fluency and that some allowance must be made for IE. But the question is where to draw the line.

To the question - is IE acceptable, there are three attitudes. The first attitude is that it is acceptable. The second is that, it is not, as with so many deviations, it is likely to become pidginized. The third is that with some alterations IE will be acceptable in spite of its Indianness. Prabhakar Babu advocates for the implementation of the third approach and suggests some modifications. They are - the right syllables should be accented and the contrast between the weak and strong syllables must be brought out. Voiceless plosives in the initial positions of stressed syllables must be aspirated. The speech should be slow and clear. The Indian flavour is seen in the intonation patterns, pronouncing /r/ wherever it is written (the rhotic
variety), the substitution of /e:/ and /o:/ and a few other features.

The above arguments concerning IE have been put forward with the idea of projecting the different attitudes, scholars in India and abroad have towards IE. IE to a foreigner is the English spoken by the people in the subcontinent Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Sri Lankans etc. For the average Indian, to attain the RP standard is practically impossible. The convent educated and elite class (who are in small percentage) may be able to, but not all Indians and it is also not fair to expect them to speak with an RP accent. J.C. Catford discussing the status of English in India very rightly says - "In that country it would be foolish, it seems to me, to insist on making students try to learn RP or an American accent. There is a perfectly good model in IE, which has many features, that can be transferred by Indian children through positive transfer from Indian languages (Catford, 1983: 5). As such, to meet the problem midway, one can retain some of the IE characteristics which do not come in the way of intelligibility and strive to rid oneself of the blatant divergences from RP which, when spoken will be heard by a native speaker as being some other tongue, alien to him.

Even within India there are a large number of regional varieties as a result of the influence of mother tongues
of peoples of different regions. As a consequence, intelligibility has begun to suffer even in our inter-provincial contacts. To deal with this problem, a regionwise analysis viz. south, north east, north west, central etc. has to be made to find the features peculiar to that region. This is pedagogically important because, once the intelligibility hindering features are spotted, some remedial measures can be taken at the school level to eradicate those errors.

In this thesis, an attempt is made to find the phonetic features that bind together the English of the four states of south India viz. Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala and Tamil Nadu, to be termed as South Indian English (SIE). It is the English spoken by the people in south India which is inhabited mainly by the descendents of the Dravidian race. But there is a problem here as not all Dravidians are south Indians. There are descendents of Dravidians in some parts of north India also but they are only a small percentage. When people refer to Dravidians, they ascribe that term to south Indians, generally.

The focus in this thesis is on the segmental and supra-segmental features of SIE. Then a brief analysis of how it differs from the English of other regions of India will be given.
1.4. **Dravidianism**

1.4.1 **Meaning of the word Dravida**

The word 'Dravida' in linguistic context, is used in both a restricted meaning implying Tamil, as well as an extended meaning which includes all the South Indian languages. In the earlier literature, the restricted meaning is found. Dhammapala, in his commentary on Tripithakas in the 5th century A.D., mentions that Magadhu, Andhaka (Andhra) and Damila (Tamil) were the three main languages in India. Kumarila Bhatta in his Tantravartika (7th century A.D.) used the expression 'Dravidandhrabhasa' meaning Tamil and Telugu languages. In all the above mentioned works, Dravida very clearly means Tamil.

However the word 'Dravida', as studies show (Leela Thilakam, Pancha Dravida etc.) is found to be used even to this day, in both its restricted an extended meaning. One Malayalam grammar of the 14th century A.D., has used the word 'Dravida' to mean Tamil, Malayalam, Kannada and Telugu. The most important example of Dravida being used in an extended meaning is the Indian National Anthem 'Jana gana mana' wherein, in the series of names of different parts of India, the word 'Dravida' appears, to refer to all the four south Indian states (Andronov, 1970: 16-26; Subrahmanyam, 1983: 1-12).
1.4.2 Previous work on Dravidian languages

The study of individual Dravidian languages was going on for over three centuries. Tamil was the first language that the western scholars started analysing. In 1810 A.D., William Carey, a Baptist missionary linguist, found that the languages of south India formed a separate group. In 1820 Francis Ellis recognized the dialects of south India as forming a distinct family. It was in 1856 that Bishop Caldwell published his epoch-making book *A Comparative Grammar of Dravidian or South Indian Languages*. He laid firm foundation for further studies on comparative linguistics and he is rightly called the father of Dravidian linguistics. He divides languages as cultivated - Tamil, Malayalam, Telugu, Canarese, Tulu, Coorg and uncultivated - Tuda, Kóta, Gõnd, Khond, Oraon, Rājmahāl. After Caldwell, during the past 125 years some more languages have been traced. Jules Bloch’s name also appears very high in the field of Dravidian linguistics. The English translation of his work in French titled *Grammatical Structure of Dravidian Linguistics* deals with the non-literary Dravidian languages which did not surface in Caldwell's work. There are many other scholars who made notable contributions like T. Burrow M.B. Emeneau etc. Many Indian linguists - L.V. Ramaswamy Iyer, S.K. Chatterji, Bh. Krishnamurti etc. made valuable contributions to Dravidian linguistics.
1.4.3 Early Dravidian Grammars

The grammatical tradition of Tamil is the first to have been started of all the four major Dravidian languages. It is said to have been written in the 3rd century B.C. Kannada comes next as its grammatical tradition starts from the 9th century A.D. This is followed by Telugu whose first grammar was written in 11th century A.D. Malayalam comes as late as the 14th century.

S. Agesthiaisingom and N. Kumaraswami Raja (1978:ii-iv) in their book on Studies in Early Dravidian Grammars list out the various grammars. They are given below:

Tolkappiyam by Tolka:ppiya:r is the earliest Tamil grammar. Akattiyam preceded this, but is not famous. Tolka:ppiyam consists of three parts - Elutt - atika:ram (dealing with Tamil phonology, the morphophonemic system etc.) Coll-atika:ram (dealing with grammar) and Porul-atika:ram (chapter on poetics and rhetorics). Vi:raco:liyam, belonged to the 11th century A.D. as was supposed to be written by the Chola king, Veera Rajendra Chola. Then followed Ne:minatam by Guna Veera Pandita belonging to the 12th-13th centuries. After this came Nannu:l written by Pavananti belonging to the same age. Some works of the 17th century are Pirayo:ka Vive:kam written by Subrahmanya Dikshitar, Ilakkana Vilakkam by Vaidyanatha Desikar and Ilakkanakkottu...
by Swaminatha Desikar. In the 18th century an Italian Priest, Father Beschi, also referred to Vi:rama:munivar's Tonnu:1 Vilakkam. In the 19th century came the work Muttu Vi:riyam by Muttuvi:riya upa:ttiya:yar.

The important works in Kannada grammatical tradition are - Kavira:jama:rga of the 9th century A.D., Ka:vya:valo:-kana by Nagavarma II belonging to the 12th century. He also wrote Bha:sa:bhu:sana but it was written in Sanskrit. Ke:si-ra:jas Sabdamanidarpana written in 1275 A.D. is held in high esteem by scholars, and is considered to be the best work among the Kannada grammars. In the 17th century Bhatta:kala-rika wrote the treatise Karna:taka Sabda:nusa:sana. In 1838 a book called Hosagannada - nudigannadi was brought out.

century is *Ba:la Vya:karanamu* by Chinnaya Suri. The rules given in this grammar are clear and concise. *Praudha Vya:karanamu* written by Chinnaya Suri's disciple, Sitaramacharyulu, is supposed to be a complementary to *Ba:lavya:karanamu*.


1.4.4 The state of the art of Dravidian English

Though quite a few dissertations and studies have been done on the different sub-varieties of English corresponding to the four regions of south India viz. Telugu English, Kannada English, Tamil English and Malayalam English, not much work has been done on South Indian English (SIE) as a whole. This can also be called Dravidian English that is the English spoken in Dravida region which is south India. G.S. Gopalakrishna has attempted to describe the phonological features of SIE. The findings of G.S. Gopalakrishna are given below (Gopalakrishna, 1960: 62-67).
1. A general unawareness of the pattern of primary as well as secondary stress \( \text{makbe} / \) for /mek'be/.

2. Ignorance of differentiating stressing of nouns and adjectives versus verbs.

/ˈkontraːst/ /kontraːst /

3. Unawareness of shift in stress found in different parts of speech derived from Latin or Greek roots.

/ˈsain/ /əsɪgˈneɪʃən / /əsɪˈni /

Two vowels of different syllables sometimes coalesce into a diphthong and sometimes vice versa.

/′woːˈraɪti / for /woːˈraɪti / - coalesce

/praːʃər / for /praː / - divide

Consonants:

/ʃ/ is replaced by /ʃ/ (medially)

/θ/ and /ð/ by the slack dentals - Sanskrit

/ʒ/ and /tʃ/ by Sanskrit

/s/ becomes /z/ and vice versa - indiscriminate voicing or unvoicing of /s/.

Gemination when a double consonant appears

/ʋ/ and /w/ pronounced alike

/ð/ /t/ /l/ /n/ pronounced with a reverted tongue.
/mp/ and /nt/ pronounced as /mb/ and /nd/ - Characteristic of Malayalees - /simbl/ /twendi/

Telugu add a final vowel - /seddu/

Insertion of vowels between certain consonants - /filim/

Vowels:
Vowels are affected by wrong stressing

/ˈmədʒən/ for /mədʒin/

/ə/ sometimes replaced by /ja/ /fjan/ for /fən/

/aː/ not long enough /stated/ for /staːtid/

/ɑː/ pronounced /ə/ /glass/ etc.

/e/ replaced by /a/ or /ə/ altogether, second

/i/ substituted by /e/ - /pri/ for /priti/

/ʊ/ replaced by /a/ or /ɑː/ or /o/ (Malayalees) e.g. Ball

/ɔo/ pronounced as /wa/ or /wɔː/- /swan/- swan

/a/ or /ʌ/ pronounced almost like /ə/

/kət/ for /kət/

/u/ replaced by /uː/- /kruːk/ for /kruːk/

Diphthongs are uttered hurriedly and lack the characteristic glide.

/ei/ pronounced as /eː/ sometimes. /keːm/ for /keim/

/ou/ is like /oː/

/ju/ replaced by /uː/- /suː/ for /sju/

/əə/ pronounced as /ə/ /eː/ /ei/ - /stər/ for /stəə/
/iə/ replaced by /iː/, /e/ - /kweri/ for /kwiəri/

/ɔː/ or /ɔ/ replaced by /aː/ and /oː/ (Malayalees do this).

/uə/ replaced by /uːr/ or /uwər/

/aː/ replaced by /ar/ - /darə/ for /dəːr/

/ai/ often pronounced as /aji/ or /oi/

/auə/ replaced by /aur/ /awər/ - /sawər/ for /saur/

The South Indian begins some of his vowel sounds with a palatal semi-vowel /j/:

/jarə/ for /əːr/

From a discussion of South Indian English in the context of Indian English, we shift our focus to a detailed consideration of the features and characteristics of SIE in the following chapters.