CHAPTER 1

THE STUDY OF INDIAN, BRITISH AND AMERICAN ENGLISH IN PERSPECTIVE

1.1 Concept of Indian English:

The concept of Indian English (IE) as a variety of English has been discussed and debated from time to time. As a result, the term 'Indian English' has been commonly used to describe English as used by the Indians in general. Besides, there have been several attempts to establish the identity of Indian English through investigations into its major distinctive features. The seminar on IE held at the CIEFL, Hyderabad in 1972 was a collective effort to prove that there is now a distinct identity of IE (Ramesh Mohan, 1978). Accordingly, IE is not just British English with a few Indian spices added to it. It has its own distinct identity. The four of the Seminar papers attempted to describe Indian English dealt with its lexicon, phonology, spelling and pronunciation etc.
1.1.1 Purists:

Not long ago IE was considered to be a 'sub-standard' variety of British English (Whitworth 1932). Yule and Burnell (1856) termed it as Bobu. Butler and Kitchen English and Le (1964) referred to it as arre bhai slop to refer to the English used by the Indians.

Prator (1968: 437) referred to Indian English as a local "'unintelligible' model of English claiming that the doctrine of local models of English was championed more often and more vehemently in India than anywhere else and that Indian English was for the rest of the English speaking world 'the most unintelligible educated variety'". Kachru (1976) rightly refutes Prator's objection suggesting that the pragmatics of the particular local variety of English needs and should be taken into account. He asserts that Indian English is used as a 'link' or an 'official' language and not taught as 'a vehicle to introduce British or American culture'. The Indians accepted English, acculturated it. According to Kachru (1976: 233), this acculturation of English is termed as 'Indian English'. In support of his refutation, Kachru cites a definition of the term 'educated English', similar to the one used by Randolph Quirk for his Survey of English Usage (1960): "A working definition like 'Educated English is English that is recognized as such by educated native speakers' is not as valueless as its circularity would suggest" (Kachru 1976: 226). He states that the over emphasis on the best model of the spoken form is unreasonable. Intelligibility must take into account the 'context of situation' and so much insistence on 'purity' is unwarranted. In support of this Firth (1930, Reprinted 1966: 145-196) is worth quoting: "In the primary speech situation 'meaning' is as much a property of the situational..."
context of people, things and events as of the 'noise' made by the speaker. The noise is important but not nearly so important as purists and other believe". The role of English in India is to 'integrate' culturally and linguistically pluralistic societies within India; 'integration' with the British or American culture is not the primary aim. It also seems that Prator has ignored the basic principle regarding intelligibility as observed by Catford (1950) "Language intelligibility is yet to be related to the concept of appropriateness and effectiveness in a speech situation". With Quirk et al (1985: 33) and Strevens (1987), there emerged a new metaphor of English consisting of a 'core' common to all (standard) manifestations followed by various peripheries that could be organized according to such dimensions as region, socio-economic class, educational level and medium or register. In the light of this, Kachru (1983) puts forward the notion of 'new Englishes' and prefers the term 'South Asian English' to the term 'Indian English' in the context of various features shared with other South Asian countries, namely Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Nepal. (Hence the English language has been South Asianized and has become part of the culture of that vast area. The non-native Englishes are infact 'new Englishes in non-native contexts'. Naturally, Nativization (and deviations) are determined by the new uses of English in new contexts. The result is new Englishes in non-native contexts. "The undeniable family relationship of the 'new Englishes' with the mother-tongue forms is captured in the metaphor of three concentric circles labelled as: the Inner, the Outer or Extended and the Expanding circles.
Kachru (1990: 04) illustrates these circles in terms of the users.

These three circles are represented as follows:

**The "Expanding Circle"**
- China: 1,088,200,000
- Egypt: 50,273,000
- Indonesia: 175,904,000
- Israel: 4,512,000
- Japan: 122,520,000
- Korea: 42,593,000
- Nepal: 18,004,000
- Saudi Arabia: 12,972,000
- Taiwan: 19,813,000
- USSR: 285,796,000
- Zimbabwe: 8,876,000

**The "Outer Circle"**
- Bangladesh: 107,756,000
- Ghana: 13,754,000
- India: 810,806,000
- Kenya: 22,919,000
- Malaysia: 16,965,000
- Nigeria: 112,258,000
- Pakistan: 109,434,000
- Philippines: 58,723,000
- Singapore: 2,541,000
- Sri Lanka: 16,606,000
- Tanzania: 23,996,000
- Zambia: 7,384,000

**The "Inner Circle"**
- USA: 245,800,000
- UK: 57,006,000
- Canada: 25,880,000
- Australia: 16,470,000
- New Zealand: 3,366,000

Fig. 1.
Kachru (1990) rightly explains these circles in terms of the users. As shown in the above Figure 1, the Inner circle refers to the traditional bases of English -- comprising of the regions where English is used as the primary language namely USA, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In the Outer circle there are non-native varieties of English comprising speech communities of the countries like Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Zambia etc. The Outer circle refers to the institutionalized varieties in non-native context. In this circle, English functions has what may be considered traditionally 'un-English' cultural contexts. This circle forms a large speech community with great diversity and distinct characteristics. It has a wide spectrum of domains in which it is used with varying degrees of competence by members of society, both as an intranational and international language. In short, English has an extended functionals range in a variety of social, educational, administrative and literary domains.

The third circle i.e the Expanding circle encompasses vast populations of the countries as shown in it from China to Zimbabwe showing rapid expansion and resulting in numerous varieties of English. The users of this circle use English as an international or universal language.

Mention may be made of the fact that these circles of English have resulted in several English 'languages' with a unique cultural pluralism and a variety of speech fellowships. It may be noted that according to Kachru (1990: 05), the World Englishes are 'the result of these diverse socio-cultural contexts and diverse uses of the language in culturally distinct international contexts'.

Prator is a distinguished and active scholar in the area of Teaching
English as a Foreign Language. His paper 'The British Heresy in TESOL' (Prator, 1968) reflects the attitude of the native speakers of English towards those varieties of English which are not used as Lis. His own Puritanic Urath is summed up in the following words:

The heretical tenet I feel I must take exception to is the idea that it is best, in a country where English is not spoken natively but is widely used as the medium of instruction, to set up the local variety of English as the ultimate model to be imitated by those learning the language.

Besides, the above comment regarding the non-native varieties in general, Prator also makes some claims about Indian English as follows:

1) The doctrine of local models of English is championed more often and more vehemently in India than anywhere else.

2) Indian English is 'for the rest of the Indian English speaking world' the most unintelligible educated variety.

Prator (1968) finds 'no scientific meaning' in the definition of Indian English such as 'Indian English is the English spoken by educated Indians'. To begin with, Prator ignores a basic principle regarding intelligibility. Kachru answers this objection by citing a similar definition of the term 'educated English' by Randolph Quirk for his survey of English Usage. Quirk declares that "a working definition like Educated English is English that is recognized as such by educated native speakers' is not as valueless as its circularity would suggest".

To come back to Prator's objection to the local variety of English as a model, Kachru points out that 'In language learning it is not only appropriate but crucial to relate the model of language to the attitudes and reactions of the actual learners. It would neither be sensible nor
necessary to present a speaker of RP as a model for spoken English to a Junior college class in a village in India. A further important question is whether all the Indian learners of English really need to concentrate on the spoken form. The answer is obviously 'NO'. Hence the over-emphasis on the best model of the spoken form is unreasonable. Intelligibility must take into account the 'context of situation' and so much insistence on 'purity' is unwarranted.

Regarding Prator's two claims about Indian English mentioned earlier, Kachru provides enough evidence to show how they are subjective and without any empirical basis. Prator claims that the doctrine of local model of English is very much championed in India. A survey carried out by Kachru (1975) as a consultant to the Ford Foundation, falsifies this claim. The survey was based on written questionnaires administered to a total of about 1,000 people. These included 700 Indian students from Universities and Colleges, 196 members of teaching faculties involved in the teaching of English and 29 heads of English Department. A fact, relevant here, that emerged out of this survey was that 66.66 per cent of these people preferred the British English as a model for teaching English; Indian English was marked as a second choice. This also shows that opposition to the concept of Indian English came not only from British educators but from highly educated Indians too. It is only recently that the term 'Indian English' has gained currency in India.

Bansal (1969) too, objects to the subjective elements and lack of empirical evidence in Prator's statement and shows the average figure of 73 per cent intelligibility between educated Indian speakers and RP speakers. This study is based on recorded specimens of English of the Indian speech community. Bansal's (1969) study describes those phonetic features of the
Indian English speech which differ from the RP and which in this way establish Indian English as a distinct non-native variety.

1.1.2 Indian English: A Stable Variety:

Bansal's (1972) study aims at 'verifying and modifying his own and Colin's (1972) observations about Indian English speech. He emphatically states and shows how Indian English is being used in varied fields and how it has its own systems which are stable enough to be described. He highlights 'a common core of language patterns' shared by all the members of the speech community' while refuting the objection to the multilingual status of India. The common core of IE that Bansal analyses also describes the distinct phonological features of IE.

Bhatia (1978) establishes IE as a non-native variety on four-fold sound grounds viz: i) In India, English is learnt from the school stage of education, ii) English is seldom used in intimate situations, iii) Being non-native speaker, he has limited facility to use the various registers of the language and iv) A non-native language shows significant phonetic deviations due to the influence of the mother-tongue. Indian English also shows marked lexical differences but does not deviate from the central grammatical system of the language.

Verma (1969) regards IE as an offspring yielded by English, 'a second language with a distinct Indian flavour'; hence, he regards it as 'one of the languages of India' as used effectively by a community of people at different levels of communication'. The basic linguistic systems of IE are the same as those of BE, but IE displays certain distinguishing phonological, lexico-semantic and syntactic features'. Verma regards, IE as a 'non-native second-language variety' on a par with several other such
dialects if not as a variety of native English on a par with the British, American and others.

Daswani (1974), does not grant IE the status of a variety of British English. He refers to Chomsky (1964) arguing, that dialects of the same language are likely to show divergences at the level of surface structure rather than at the level of deep structure. In support of this, Daswani refers to the phrase-structure rules of BE and IE that are the same and the difference is only in the areas of transformational and phonological rules. The use of articles and prepositions in IE and the phonic interference due to negligence of some phonological rules is erratic. He refers even to Bansal (1967) to show IE as not viable and tenable due to the semantic structure of it which is so different from standard English. Hence, he observes that IE is only a poor approximation of the standard variety. He speaks of the need of systematic studies so as to establish IE as a viable variety. IE should rather be studied as a product of language contact situation.

Nihalani et al (1979) claim that English in India has many features which are uniquely characteristic of many Indian users of the language. They record instances of Indian usages in their book using the term 'Indian variant(s) of English' to refer to English with variant forms, characteristics of many Indian users of the language.

1.2 Varieties of Indian English: Cline of Bilingualism:

Iyengar (1977) states that there are possibly more varieties of 'Indian English' than of the English written in UK due to three fold reasons viz: i) India is a far-flung multi-lingual country; ii) English is cultivated in India in "second-language situation and iii) the literary
tradition in Indian writing in English is yet to gain general acceptance". Kachru (1983, 1986) states that the variation in IE may be basically explained on three parameters: region, ethnic group and proficiency, which can be better explained with reference to the "cline of bilingualism" (Kachru's 1965, 1983). The "Cline of bilingualism" has been defined in terms of three arbitrarily determined "measuring points" namely the ambilingual, central and zero point to indicate a speaker's proficiency in the use of IE. Kachru quotes Quirk (1972) wherein Quirk states: "In the Indian and African countries, we find an even spectrum of kinds of English, extending from pidgin to standard English and adds that 'at the one end of the spectrum we have educated (or standard) Indian English, and at the other end we have Kitchen English with other varieties, such as Babu English, at various points on the spectrum'. Similarly, Daswani (1974) classifies the Indian speakers of English as adequate, inadequate and minimal bilinguals. The IE speech community is identified as inadequate bilinguals whose English is 'deviant by definition'. Likewise, Hosali (1984) posits a cline of sub-varieties with basilect, mesolect andacrolect. Shastri (1988) posits a cline with the heavily Indian to hardly Indian within the educated variety on the basis of genres of writing.

Indian English speech community comprises on the one hand, very highly educated people whose command is near-native, and on the other hand, several people whose overall competence in English is negligible but they can use the language in their restricted spheres of activity, for example, waiters, butlers and shopkeepers. Between these two extremes, there are several educated Indians — administrators, teachers, business executives, scientists, journalists who use English in a variety of professional and situational conditions. 'Educated' Indian English is the term used for
It is worth to quote again Quirk (1960) definition of educated BE English as: "Educated English is English that is recognized as such by educated native English speakers". Similarly, Kachru (1965, 1983) defines Standard Indian English as that used by standard (or educated) Indian English bilinguals, having pan-Indian intelligibility. This variety of English, which is used by educated Indians according to Subrahmanian (1977) is not 'superior or inferior' to the British or the American variety but 'different'. It has a special Indian tone, sensibility, vocabulary, and also to some extent syntax'. The brief analyses and descriptions of this 'educated' Indian English only can establish Indian English as a 'standard' variety.

1.2.1 The Socio-cultural context: Various facets of Indian English:

Indian English has emerged and developed as a distinct variety out of contact between English and Indian mother-tongue of the bilinguals who use it. Weinreich (1953) observes a mutual 'linguistic interference' that could be 'phonological, grammatical or lexical'. Kachru (1961) identifies IE as 'a transference variety' with four types of transfer viz: i) transfer of context, ii) transfer of speech functions, iii) transfer of formal items and iv) transfer of meaning from L1 to L2. Besides, the social and cultural context contribute to the identity of Indian English as a variety. Verma (1972) calls Indian English 'Swadeshi English', as its nature is closely related to the demands that we make on it, the functions it has to serve. Kachru (1961) lists the overall five-fold functions of IE viz: i) Administrative, ii) Commercial, iii) Educational, iv) Literary and v) Social. According to Kachru (1983), some of the social contexts in which
Indian English is used in India for: 1) religion, 2) ceremonies & rituals, 3) dress and ornaments, 4) food and food habits, 5) marriage and 6) politics. Hence IE may be described, as Strevens (1982) does, as a 'localized form of English'. Raja Rao (1938: Reprinted 1974) says that it is the language of the 'Intellectual make up' of the Indians. It symbolizes cultural and socio-political aspirations of Indians hence, it is culture-bound. English has become Indianized through a long process of acculturation. According to Earlier (1965) the more culture-bound Indian English becomes, the more distance is created between Indian English and other varieties of English. Earlier (1965) observes: "In India an idiom of English has developed which is Indian in the sense that there are formal and contextual exponents of Indianness in such writing; and the defining context of such idiom is the Indian setting". He cites examples of culture-bound meanings from creative writings in English. Thus, due to an extended range of uses in the Indian socio-linguistic context that IE has an extended register and style range leading to process of 'nativization' of the registers and styles in formal and contextual terms. It resulted in the nativized body of English literature with formal and contextual characteristics which mark Indian English localized.

1.2.2 Indian Writing in English:

Iyengar (1962, fourth Edition 1984) defines and describes Indian Writing in English as 'but one of the voices in which Indian speaks. It is a new voice, no doubt, but it is as much Indian as others'. The term, Indian Writing in English or Indian English literature (or Indo-Anglian writing -- is used for the work of 'those who are Indian and who have written in English' (Mukherjee, 1971). The term is used to describe the fast-growing body of literature which is written by Indians using English
McCutchion (1969) says that 'Indianness' in Indian Writing in English does not show in exotic content but in the mind behind the organization of that content. Mokashi-Punekar (1969) discovers Indianness in 'life attitudes' and 'modes of perception'. Indian Writing in English or Indian English literature is Indian in tone, temper and character; it is about India; the treatment is Indian and the language, has an Indian flavour. It is indianized in the hands of creative writers to suit the themes and characters in their writing. Indianization is a device they employ to give 'Indian flavour' to their writing.

Dastoor (1964) has highlighted flavour of Indian English reflected in the works of Tagore, Sarojini Naidu and Manmohan Ghose bearing the stamp of a national temperament. Raja Rao (1938, Second edition 1974) states: "We are instinctively bilingual. Many of us are writing in our own language and in English. We cannot write like English. We should not, we cannot write only as Indians. We have grown to look at the large world as part of us. Our method of expression therefore has to be a dialect which will some day prove to be as distinctive and colourful as the Irish or the American. Time alone will justify." Gokak (1964) maintains that 'Indo-Anglian writing is direct and spontaneous like creative writing in any other language'.

In the hands of many reputed writers like Mulk Raj Anand, Manohar Malgaonkar, Kamala Markandaya, R. K. Narayan, Raja Ro, Anita Desai, Nayantara Sehgal, Indian English fiction has now become a popular literary form. Similarly, Indian English poetry has been established on a par with British poetry in all respects by Manmohan Ghose, Toru Dutta, Naidu, Sri Aurobindo, Rabindranath Tagore, Nissim Ezekiel, Kamala Das, A. K.
Ramanujan, Jayant Mahapatra and many others. Hence Hulk Raj Anand (1971) rightly claims that English in India has the same advantages as those forms of English and similar disadvantages. English no longer remains the 'other' or 'alien' language, the language of a foreign culture. It has become our language, our English, Indian English. Kamala Das (1965) writes in her poem, 'An introduction':

I don't like politics, 
... 
The language I speak 
Becomes mine 
Its distortions, its queernesses 
all mine, mine, alone. 
It is half English, half Indian 
funny perhaps, but it is honest. 
It is as human as I am human 
Don't you see?

Daruwalla (1982) metaphorically described it as his mistress and remarks that "my love for her survives from night to night, even though each time I have to wrestle with her in bed". It is a kind of supplementary personality enjoyed by the Indian writers which T.S. Eliot (1957), says acquired by learning a foreign language well.

1.3 Levels of Language of Indian English:

Kachru, Verma, Daswani, Bansal, Parasher, Hosali, Nihalani et al. Shastri have remarkably contributed to establish Indian English as a viable variety. They have concentrated on phonological, lexico-semantic and stylistic features of Indian English. These levels may be briefed as follows:

1.3.1 Phonology:

Bansal's (1967, 1969, 1972) studies aimed at 'verifying or modifying' phonetic features of Indian English based on his analysis of
recorded specimens of English as used by Indian English speakers. It was an attempt to describe the phonemic and phonetic patterns of General Indian English like Colin’s study. Bansal claims that though English is not the L1 of many people in India, it is used all over India for a variety of purposes… as a language of administration, higher education, business, academic discussions and creative writing and therefore deserves to be described. His work in the field of phonology has been a major contribution to the description of Indian English as a distinct variety.

Bansal’s (1969) study shows that the average figure of intelligibility between educated Indian speakers and RP speakers is 70 per cent average. Kachru (1983, 1986) summarizes the main conclusions of Bansal’s study in the following table. He presents the results of tests for measuring intelligibility between the speakers of the varieties mentioned in the following table.

The Intelligibility of Indian English (Test Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No.</th>
<th>Participants in Test</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I.E. &amp; RP speakers (Group)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I.E. &amp; RP speakers (cline of intelligibility)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I.E. and American speakers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I.E. and German speakers of English</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I.E. and Nigerian speakers of English</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I.E. speakers with other I.E. speakers</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>RP speakers with other RP speakers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The highest and the average figures in the above table are of interest. Kachru claims that 'the concept of homogeneity can easily be applied to the English speech community.

However, Daswani (1974) discusses the factors which result in 'phonic interference' in Indian English from L1 in the English of inadequate bilinguals. Moreover, Kachru, the pioneering investigator of the Indianization of English discusses the important features under different heads such as: 1) systemic difference; 2) distributional difference, 3) series substitution and 4) prosodic transfer etc. It is seen that English is a stress-timed language while most of the Indian languages are syllable-timed. This is one of the linguistic factors obstructing intelligibility between an Indian speaker and a native English speaker.

Nihalani et al. (1979) recommend Educated Indian English as 'the model... well within the reach of Indian learners under normal school and college conditions'. They observe that 'it is essential that Indian learners adopt the features of British RP stress, rhythm and intonation'.

1.3.2 Syntax:

It is worth while laying the emphasis on 'deviations' in the syntactic studies in Indian English. Dastoor (1964) has noted some of the common divergences in the areas of articles, possessive pronouns, reflexive pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions, nouns, verbs, phrasal verbs and tenses. Moreover, Kachru (1969) discusses the characteristic syntactic features like: (1) In IE, there is a tendency towards complex sentence resulting in large scale embeddings; i.e. an excerpt in Raja Rao's Kanthapura and newspaper and administrative registers. (2) The verbs of perception do occur in progressive tenses
though they do not in native varieties. Thus, there is the absence of such
selection restriction in the Indian languages leading to violation of such
rules. (3) There is deviation in the use of articles, (4) Reduplication for
emphasis or to indicate continuation of a process. (5) Forming interroga-
tives without changing the position of subject and auxiliary items. Kachru
(1966) uses the term 'deviation' with reference to the linguistic and
contextual nativeness. He distinguishes between a 'deviation' and a
'mistake'. He asserts that a 'mistake' may be unacceptable to a native
speaker as it does not belong to the linguistic 'norm' of the English
language whereas, a 'deviation' is the result of the new 'un-English' a
system within a variety, and not idiosyncratic. Hence, Kachru states that
each deviation has an explanation within the context of situation.

Verma (1972) describes Indian English syntax in a variety of written
works 'handed in by CIEFL participants'. He cites some certain eleven
syntactic irregularities viz: Inter-clause sequence of tense, conditional
sentences, indirect or reported questions, tag questions, wh-questions,
tense and aspect, 'what' type of verb+sentence, response type sentences,
'know' type of verb in its progressive form, word order and relative
clauses followed by correlative pronouns with some examples. Even the 'non-
stylistic deviant syntactic patterns' are but typical not only of Indian
English but of all non-native second language varieties of English.

e.g. I have gone to the cinema yesterday.

When you will move into your new house?

Verma states that these syntactic irregularities cannot be removed by
setting up regular rules or systems. He also asserts that the deviant
syntactic patterns are limited in number, as a variety language cannot move
far away from the nuclear system of the main language.
Daswani (1974) comments on the erratic occurrence or non-occurrence of articles and prepositions and denies Indian English the position of a variety of British English on a par with other varieties.

Parasher (1979, 1983) states that educated Indian English (IE) does not differ much syntactically from British English (BE) as it conforms to major syntactic rules of BE and that as a non-native variety, it shows certain differences at the lexical and stylistic levels. Parasher (1983) gives the major syntactic deviations in the area of nominals, determiners and modifiers, word-order, verb patterns, auxiliaries, tense and aspect, prepositions, clause connectors and clause structure, subject-verb concord and constituent structure and categorical structure. These deviations establish Indian English as a non-native variety.

Similarly, Rubdy (1981) states that IE does not markedly differ from native varieties in grammatical system. The major syntactic difference occur only in certain restricted areas of lexis, collocation, style/register and cohesion taken together than in the areas of syntax. She provides statistics to conform the hypothesis. The total number of deviations found is 3236, out of these, there are 1520 deviations in syntax and 1716 deviations in lexis, collocation, style/register and cohesion. Of these, 1520 total syntactic deviations are in the areas of articles, prepositions, tense, modals and N+N type construction alone amount to 1158. The deviations in the remaining syntactic categories put together are only 362 in number.

Hosali (1984) has given certain syntactic features of Butler English spoken by the basilect/uneducated domestic staff, at the lowest point of the scale-known as a Pidgin English. It marginally differs in certain
grammatical categories like prepositions, articles, verbs, question-forms, the comparatives, etc. Even though Hosali refers to the lowest point of scale of cline, these syntactic features seem to be common to English used by the educated Indians as well.

In more recent years, there have been a few corpus based studies in which the investigators/researchers have concentrated on certain selected areas of Indian English. Katikar (1984) has interpreted the meaning of modals in Indian English. Rastirkar (1987) comments on the use of *some* and *any* in Indian English and Patil (1986) comments on 'If-conditionals in Indian English'. Salunkhe (1986) has dealt with a linguistic study of Indian English Newspaper headlines with special reference to speech reporting. Kesarkar (1990) has dealt with 'Indian Words in English'. Ronge (1992) has analysed 'Condensed Noun Phrases in English for Science and Technology with special reference to Indian English'. Shingate (1986) has commented on 'Verb particle constructions with *up* and *down* in Indian English. Shinde (1991) has interpreted 'Behaviour of a selected set of verbs in Indian English - A semantic study'. All these studies are based on the data from the Kolhapur Corpus of Indian English built in the Department of English, Shivaji University, Kolhapur.

Katikar (1984) is of interest to our topic in which she points out certain syntactic irregularities in the use of modals in IE, highlighting the most common slip in the area of the rules of the sequence of tense. She also points out the predominance of the past forms of the modals in Indian English and difficulty to cope with the complicated syntactic structure. Also of our interest is Patil (1986) which points out the difficulty and complexity in the use of If-conditionals. These studies, though restricted also have considerably contributed to the syntactic analysis and description of Indian English.
1.3.3 Lexico-Semantic Features:

Kachru (1965, 1966, 1969, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1982, 1983, 1986) in his series of research papers illustrates how a large number of lexical innovations developed in Indian English are contextually determined and can be better understood if one takes into consideration the linguistic and cultural setting in India. Kachru (1973) discusses IE lexicon basically of area-bound, context-bound and language-bound features that make English a variety of Indian English. These features are termed as 'Indianisms'.

A number of lexical lists are mainly to facilitate the work of administrators involved with Indian affairs. A mention may be made of Sir Charles Wilkin's glossary of such Indian words appended to the Fifth Report of the the Selected Committee submitted in 1912. Similarly, Brown's The 'Zillah' Dictionary in the Roman Character, Explaining the Various Words used in Business in India (1852) and Wilson's A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms Occurring in Official Documents Relating to the Administration of the Govt. of British India (1855) list register and culture-bound items needed by the British administrators for communication with the natives. Yule and Burnell's Hobson-Jobson (1886) is the monumental work in this regard. It is 'a Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discursive' types.

The second part of IE vocabulary consists of those items of the borrowed lexicons of other Englishes which might be termed as "assimilated terms". Nihalani et al.'s book (1979) is the best example of such 'assimilated' IE collocations. Even Kachru's (1961) thesis deals with formalization of IE Lexis in terms of lexical sets and ordered series of words. Kachru (1961) discusses 'Hybrid collocations' and even 'hybrid
Reduplications': like Purdah in IE precedes only woman, system, lady and lathi stick, cotton kapas, bazaar street, curved kukri. In Kachru (1983), he discusses 'Lexical diffusion and Hybridized items. He concludes by saying: "the distance between the natively used varieties of English and Indian English cannot be explained only by comparative studies of phonology and grammar; the deviations are an outcome of the Indianization of English that has, in due course, made IE culture-bound in the socio-cultural setting of India". Kachru (1976) recognizes and discusses four types of semantic features of Indian English viz: Semantic restriction of English words, Semantic extension of English words, Archaisms preserved in IE and Register shifts. These features, however, are further elaborated in his 1983 book. Like Kachru, Verma (1969) too assumes that Indian English is used as a component of Indian culture 'to express a culturally determined network of activities', that is typically Indian. Verma gives the example of the word 'co-brother' that has a precise culturally determined value in IE and has no value in English. He gives the example of the word 'colony' having additional dimension of meaning in IE.

Verma states that the collocations created by creative writers do not become a part of the language used by the speech community but are 'author-oriented' or 'text-oriented' and such idiosyncratic formations like 'flower-bed', 'rape-sister', 'sister-sleeper' are register-bound.

Daswani (1974) points out that the reasons for lexical interference differ from one type of bilingual to another. The Indo-Anglian writers use lexical interference as a 'literary device' to add 'Indian flavour' to their writing.

Parasher (1979, 1983) cites many examples of lexical innovations, deviations and semantic extensions like co-son-in-law, invite your
attention (draw your attention), enhance (increase), advise (communicate), presented to (informed) with effect from (starting from), to this effect (in this regard), the same (it), done (made), keep (stock/have), make (take), made (done/conducted), thankful (grateful), convent (a house in which nuns live), seat (desk/room). Thus, Parasher gives the corpus evidence of the lexical items that give Indian English an identity of its own.

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 Indian speakers of English'. This is useful both to the teachers and learners of English in India with entirely descriptive and informative approach. However, their lexicon contains 'those items which have impressed the compilers as worthy of commentary'. Each item is followed by 'commentary', highlighting the use of the item by Indians and native speakers, i.e. a source of warmth on cold nights is called 'a hot-water bag' by many IVE speakers; in BS it is always 'a hot-water bottle'. Nihalani et al have listed the items alphabetically and have given the specific feature in brackets at the end of the commentary as: G = grammar etc. The category-wise items like Nouns-count/Non-count number, L1 analogy, Extra-Redundancy, L1 transfer, condensed noun-phrases, semantic coverage, productive devices, loan-words show the specific Indian features of English in India termed as 'Indian Variants of English' (IVE).

Rubdy's (1981) study shows that in IE, deviations occur mainly in the areas of lexis, collocation, style, register and cohesion than in the areas of syntax.

Hosali (1984) discusses the sub-categories of IE lexis like loan-words: bandha, lakh, hybrid, compounds: lathi-charge, double-roti, idioms:
I have a soft corner for him, wrong collocatives: I had my ears bored so that I could wear my diamond ear-rings. Extension of meaning: out. Register range extension: I'm just going to find you three more covers for these cards'. Neologism: freeship, creation by analogy: chutney-green sari, creation demanded by culture: cousin-brother, co-brother etc.

Shastri (1968) discusses code-mixing with Indian languages in Indian English as an important contributory factor in the process of Indianization of English. He considers 'hybridization', 'absorption' and 'assimilation' as distinct stages in the process of borrowing in languages and gives the examples from Indian English corpus texts. For example: Lok Sabha, Khasdar (M.P.), brahman, brahmanic, brahmins. Shastri represented code-mixing as a cline based on the parameter of genres of writing. He further argues that code-mixing may be transparent at the level of phonology and morphology and opaque at the level of syntax and semantics. It may be said that Shastri's study (1968) may be looked upon as an extension of Kachru's pioneering work, only with different perspective.

1.3.4 Style:

So as to acknowledge the identity of Indian English, it is worth while to know how Indian English differs considerably in stylistic features from the native varieties. Kachru (1969, 1983) has mentioned some stylistic features such as: Lateniness: i.e. demise to death, polite diction: administration and law registers, phrase-mongering i.e. nation-building, initialisms i.e. The D.C. himself will visit the S.D.D., P.W.D. today at 10 A.M. S.T. (Goffin 1934). Moralistic tone: cliches i.e. do the neeful, each and every, deletion, rank reduction: i.e. an address of welcome (welcome addresses), a bunch of keys (key-bunch), yes-no 'confusion', reduplications of items and bookishness.
Similarly, Subrahmanian (1977) states that Indian students or users of English have 'a penchant for the florid' and indulge in a rhetorical and flowery style due to influence of regional literatures. 'Flowery expressions' and 'sentimentality' are and should be reflected in Indian English though native Englishes do not approve of them. He asserts that style is not a neutral thing; it embodies the characteristics of both the individual and the culture he belongs to.

Moreover, Nihalani et al. (1979) concentrated on the stylistic features of IE like: Formal/informal discourse, i.e. board (catch), buy (purchase) for further studies (to study), request (ask for), chum and mate (friend), place (house or place of residence), Dated/archaic usages: better-half, each and every, one's level best, human/non-human referents: group (batch), IVE/BS preference; i.e. gentleman (man), lady (woman). No, please (only please), thank you very much, mention not (not occur in BS). Nihalani et al. have given illustrative examples for the stylistic differences.

Parasher (1979, 1983) comments on certain stylistic tendencies noticed in his corpus, based on the acceptability-judgement given by native speaker groups and university level Indian teachers of English (ITS) with illustrative examples. The Indians have a tendency to use nominal forms instead of verbal forms, reject all split infinitives as unacceptable, prefer complex and compound sentences to simple ones, excessive use of the passive construction, preference for indirect and round about expressions, formal expressions to informal ones, extremely polite style etc.

Hosali (1984) points out the tendency to use double and periphrastic forms like mutton-gosht, Bible-book in Butler English reduplication like eat this hot, hot curry, fat, fat man, little, little, slowly, slowly.
The study shows that the stylistic deviations in Indian English are cultural, sociological and perhaps psychological as well.

1.4 Conclusion:

Kachru (1961) claims that he used a sort of 'corpus' for his 1961 study restricting the analysis only to the upper point on the cline of bilingualism, i.e., the ambi-lingual point. Kachru's investigations deal with the examples of Indianisms largely from creative writing in English and have been concentrated on 'author-oriented/restricted and text-specific'. (e.g. 'Salt-giver' by Mulk Raj Anand for 'artistic needs'). Kachru states that the language of the creative writer is very much a part of the total language.

Recently, the Kolhapur Corpus is being used at many places in India and also outside India for comparative research studies on different aspects of varieties of English (see Chapter III section 3.4.4). Mention may be made of Leitner (1990) who illustrates three metaphors of English in South Asia—'bad, different or new' by using the Kolhapur Corpus.

A number of researchers in the Department of English, Shivaji University, Kolhapur, have explored several areas of Indian English and have been using the corpus extensively. Shastri (1988, 1989), Katikar (1984), Salunkhe (1986), Patil (1986), Raatirthkar (1987), Shingate (1986), Shinde (1991) are the major studies already carried out/completed in the Department of English.

The present investigator explores into the area of 'Conditional Constructions in English: A corpus based study', based on all the three corpora viz: Brown, LOB and Kolhapur using all the corpora as source material for the study.
1.5 Concept of British and American English:

Christopher Dilke and Robert Godell have asserted in the foreword to *A Common Language British and American English* that for the past one hundred and fifty years or more both the British and the Americans have been talking about the rich and apparently numberless differences between the British and American English (Harckwardt A. and Randolph Quirk, 1965). This has been accepted world-wide where English is spoken or studied. As a result, the differences have quite raised one question may be sought by the view of English linguists given by the two eminent scholars Professor Harckwardt and Quirk. They have pointed out unmistakably that there are greater similarities and convergences than the others within the two varieties. As a clear cut evidence, we may note that their work is marked by their, ease of conversation and content. They have represented and discussed even the diversity in the English language in their talk. This talk has jointly been produced as the Harckwardt and Quirk conversations as a radio series by the British Broadcasting Corporation and the Voice of America. The points that emerge from their conversation are:

Two languages or one: Both the scholars accept to the Noah Webster's view (1800-1828) on the speed at which language changes where it is highly desirable to perpetuate that sameness in English spoken in two nations. As an evidence, Harckwardt refers to Mencken's *The American Language* (1919). Variations in spoken English were observed when the Americans were learning it on a massive scale. Mencken (1919) thought about the two varieties as drifting apart. In support of this, Harckwardt (preferred the term 'American English' to refer to it as a variety and) talks of the usages (peculiar to the American users) and 'Americanisms', peculiar to the people and things of the United States and the entire continent. However, Quirk
points out that the English in United Kingdom is called 'English' by too many people in Britain. But due to the widened perspective and awareness of the many varieties of English in the world, Quirk states that the term 'British' is linked with the commonwealth i.e., Australian, New Zealand and Indian English. Besides, Quirk prefers the term 'Anglicism'. Both Quirk and Marckwardt agree on the point that the scholars tend to dwell on the differences though they are only so slight. For instance, while addressing one by the bare surname makes one seem distant in United States, whereas in London, the use of surnames can be practised both politely and informally. Likewise, the word 'trade' to the American marks 'purchase', whereas, to the Britisher, it sounds as though he is selling things to them rather than buying. Same is the difference in the usage of the words 'store', 'shop', etc. These are the clear-cut examples of a great deal of overlap; hence, the need to note the differences.

1.5.1 Areas of Differences:

Sounds, words, inflectional forms, word orders and sentence construction are the areas of differences. They have given examples to justify the similarity in the inflectional forms, in pluralization of noun forms and verb forms which are regular and innumerable. They speak of only about a hundred and twenty irregular forms like can and could. Quirk points out the example of 'gotten' as a full form of the verb 'get' by the Americans. However, the Americans use 'gotten' to mean 'to acquire or obtain that is specific'. They have quoted the examples specifying the different pronunciation of the past form of the verb to shine and to eat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For example:</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To shine</td>
<td>s-h-o-n-e</td>
<td>/ʃən/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To eat</td>
<td>a-t-e</td>
<td>/eɪt/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even the order of words in phrases and sentences conveys so much of meaning with a slight possibility of difference. Moreover, there is potential overlapping mainly with the British expressions of time.

For example:

- The American expression 'five of eight' or 'five after eight';
- The British expression 'it's five to eight' or 'it's five past eight'.

Quirk then talks of pronunciation and takes the difference best known: the sounding or not sounding of r after vowels.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bird</td>
<td>/bɔːrd/</td>
<td>/bɔːd/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>/hɑːrt/</td>
<td>/hɑːt/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, Marckwardt speaks of some six hundred commonly used words in English going back to an /ɔ/ pronunciation in Shakespearean times that are four hundred and fifty.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sand</td>
<td>/sænd/</td>
<td>/sænd/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bat</td>
<td>/bæt/</td>
<td>/bæt/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>/bæd/</td>
<td>/bæd/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And at the same time, there are one hundred and fifty words like 'dance' having variation between /æ/ and /ɑː/.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dance</td>
<td>/dæns/</td>
<td>/dɑːns/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quirk suggests not to exaggerate the differences and finds the case of pronunciation as a straight simple line of distinction separating America from Britain.
Vocabulary: Both Marckwardt and Quirk refer to the great field of intercommunication wherein people communicate pretty freely. Marckwardt, in support, quotes Webster's (New International) Dictionary (1961), mainly the International vocabulary of Science, as an evidence. This is the best example of 'sameness' in vocabulary in Scientific Writing. The situation in industry and commerce is but quite unlike. The fields of general interest like humanities, 'criticism, art, theology and philosophy have areas of common discourse. Both varieties share a common literary tradition. Both varieties represent particular characteristic of a style in journals.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an art museum</td>
<td>art gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art gallery (for general)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>museums (specific)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most famous.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, they pay attention to the cases wherein the differences are noticeable as categorized into four classes, viz:

1. The 'realie' = real thing, i.e. the flora and the fauna (the plants and animals).

2. The second category of words for different ways of doing things and manipulating materials.

For example: The terms applicable to skill and crafts, food and cooking.

3. Thirdly, they refer to the field of education.

For example: They refer to the term a 'public school', 'school', 'college', 'staff', 'lecturer', 'reader', 'full professorship' etc.

4. The fourth category refers to new inventions. Following are the words referred to new inventions in United States and United Kingdom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sedan</td>
<td>saloon</td>
<td>windshield</td>
<td>windscreen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owing to the physical separation of three thousand miles since the time of this Shakespearean common language, both the British and the Americans have shared some linguistic changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bless</td>
<td>blesses</td>
<td>blesseth in Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drops</td>
<td>droppeth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall</td>
<td>fall (season) Shakespeare (autumn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pig pen</td>
<td>pig sty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creak</td>
<td>a stream</td>
<td>an inlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bug</td>
<td>any kind of insect</td>
<td>inpleasent kind of bug like a bed-bug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug</td>
<td>faucet</td>
<td>tap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homely = homely</td>
<td>(not very good looking)</td>
<td>homely: something rather pleasant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the varieties started diverging after that period of the fully common language which ended in Shakespeare's time.

1.5.2 Looking Back to London:

Thus, American English has had a continuous existence separately for
over 350 years. Both varieties have shown changes and differences in language in the course of time noted after 1735. Still, British English had its prestige which did keep the English of educated people diverging to any marked degree. Both had the common literary tradition but resulting to make changes mainly in vocabulary, pronunciation, etc. The spread of education and literacy are the factors to establish in Britain the concept of the Standard one language. The availability of dictionaries, grammars written on a large scale made the educated people give prime concern to standards in language. As a result, it encouraged the maintenance of one kind of English everywhere. Immobility of population preserved dialects, for example, the Yorkshire dales. However, the Americans had the social mobility ironing out differences. The American Revolution (1776), a movement with an emphasis upon independence tended to disrupt these unifying tendencies. Still, some aspects of independence itself aimed at effective stability of English and the preservation of the common language. The preservation of English as the official language in the United States was important politically from the very start that insisted on stability of standards of English. Thus, the two varieties of English, British and American kept closer together.

1.5.3 Political and Linguistic Independence:

Quirk states that Americans could not really do very much about differences before the revolution of 1776. With this political independence, there were moves towards cultural and therefore linguistic independence. On debate, a rather realistic view was taken in Congress to keep English in the United States, the sensible and only practical solution to stick to English. As a result, they wanted to have their own English. For example: Mencken's The American Language (1919) shows that
Americanisms really existed. Similarly, Webster's dictionary (1961) has deliberate cultivation of divergences signifying linguistic nationalism and rationalism.

For example the spelling of certain words like:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Humour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deaf</td>
<td>deaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>color</td>
<td>colour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Webster's view that British and American English would split into two languages was pretty reasonable in his time, shown going on for decades willing for separation in all respects. New words became familiar in due course, e.g. supply of u for v in very leading to drop the h as in 'Halbert, did you 'ear in?' charged for pomposity and long-wordedness. For example: location for place. Even the industrial revolution brought lots of new expressions. The words like:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rail-road</td>
<td>railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>track</td>
<td>line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>side track</td>
<td>platform/siding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>box-car</td>
<td>good van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lift elevator</td>
<td>elevator/lift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were known during the 19th century as the words brought by the steam age. Thus the differences (marginal) produced made people believe that there was everything to say about the British and American English in the form of divergence.
1.6 America’s coming of age:

1900 and 1920 are looked upon as the process of reunification, as the United States began to exercise a force in international affairs. The voyages, mechanical devices, etc., brought the British and American practices to adopt varieties of the language. As a result, American expressions have become so very common in Britain which genuinely are difficult to isolate. For example: To talk with instead of talk to, I wouldn’t know, to get something across, to get by play vital role in the study and structure of language over the years. The dictionaries, books on the American variety of English language written over the past fifty years, for example, Sir William Craigie’s Dictionary project of American English, give innumerable instances of common expressions and even the neutralizing of the differences in due course.

1.7 The Common Language:

Marckwardt and Quirk agreed on the fact that when Shakespeare was writing and America was being colonized, there were about five million English speakers in the world altogether. Whereas in the Seventies (of the 20th century), there were two hundred and seventy million people speaking English as their native language and a hundred million or so who used it as a foreign or a second language, which seems to be the miracle. Presently, there is no greater dialectal difference than there was among the five million in the year 1600.

Though differences are so slight, it is true that there is much freer and franker recognition of differences in linguistic usage today and acceptance of such differences signifies a credible unification and tolerance of English resulting in reducing differences. So there are
already several standard 'Englishes' in the world. As elsewhere, within
Britain and America, the status of standard British English and Standard
American English is recognized as wholly acceptable. The two varieties are
similar; however, the written form of English has a powerful effect on
spoken language. There are as many little differences as possible,
thoroughly enjoying the privilege of sharing a common language.

Kachru (1981: 23) reviews American English as a variety by quoting
Mathews (1931: 9) and Mencken (1919) in the form of witness where all
these varieties like AE, CE and IE etc. are being referred to as
transplanted, transported and twice-born etc. A transplanted language is
cut off from its traditional roots and begins to function in new
surroundings, in new roles and new context in social, cultural and
Geographical contexts. The newness initiates changes in language which
eventually results in certain characteristic linguistic manifestations
hence identified with labels such as 'Americanness' etc. These modifiers of
nationality are used to mark each variety different from the other
varieties at various levels viz: phonological, syntax, lexical and
morphological.

Kachru states that there are more similarities than differences
between the various varieties of English termed as 'other Englishes'. These
varieties naturally show a wide spectrum of uses. It is because of
linguistic 'emancipation'. However, he has stressed the point of more
similarities to mother English than differences even by referring to
Marckwardt and Quirk 1964. He refers to the two-well-documented and
generally acceptable forms of the native varieties of Received
Pronunciation (RP), and General American (GA) rather widely known and
marked as cousins on the two sides of the sea. The users of other
Englishes, using English as a second language tend to have one of the native varieties of English i.e. AE or BE as a model. Thus, in conclusion, he speaks of American English as slowly becoming today's world language, and its impact is all pervasive on the English speaking world for various reasons to mention. The linguistic wheel has turned full circle, and now the users of mother English are recognizing the legitimacy of the offspring. Thus, in a number of countries in Asia and Africa, the Englishization (Americanization) of the native languages has become a symbol of elitism and westernization.

1.6 Non-native Varieties of English:

Non-native varieties of English have also grown enormously. They are caused by interference from other varieties applying to speakers of English as a second or foreign language. The interferences, so widespread in a community, are varieties of English in their own right rather than stages on the way to a more native like English. There is an active debate on these issues in India, Pakistan and several African countries, where efficient and fairly stable varieties of English are prominent in educated use at the highest political and professional level and are beginning to acquire the status of national standards. The new cultural settings for the use of English have produced considerable changes: different notions of appropriate style and rhetoric, and an influx of loan words, changes of meanings, and new expressions.

Quirk et al (1985) speak of regional supranational varieties like South Asian English (the English of the Indian Subcontinent), East African English, the West African English, representing their characteristics. For example, in African and in South Asian English, 'yes' is commonly used in a
negative reply that confirms the speaker's assumption in a negative question, as in:

A: Isn't she in bed?
B: Yes (, she isn't)

African and South Asian English very frequently use isn't it? as a universal tag, They're late, isn't it? and often omit articles required in the major standard varieties, They gave us hard time.

Further, they also speak of the interference varieties known as 'Creole' and 'pidgin'. 'Pidgin' is essentially a second language used to replace a native language for restricted public purposes whereas 'Creole' is normally the principal or sole language of its speakers, being transmitted from parent to child like any other native language.

1.9 Conclusion:

In conclusion, Quirk et al. (1985) focus on the common core that is shared by standard British English and Standard American English. The metaphor of 'the common core' points to a distinction that applies to two other aspects of their description of English grammar. They distinguish between the central and the marginal, also for acceptability and frequency.