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English, in India, is now more than a couple of centuries old. In the process of being used by speakers here, it has been modified and re-modified to accommodate the needs of new generations of users. It has mingled with the Indian languages in the multicultural and multilingual setting of India. This interaction has given rise to a new identity of English – Indian English. The change English has undergone in India and is still undergoing has been sufficient to evince the interest of linguists in this area. A lot of work has been produced on the subject of IE till date, both in India as well as abroad. A retrospective of these studies was considered useful for the present research. It was felt necessary to highlight the work of earlier researches and place the present study on this groundwork. The following is a brief discussion of the work of leading researchers in the area of IE

i. KACHRU:

Kachru is one of the well known figures in the field of study relating to South Asian English (hereafter, SAE) and particularly, IE. He has devoted his work to a study of the processes of Indianisation of English and has come up with new insights and analyses of the rules operating in IE. His observations are commendable and mostly are the basis of any study conducted in this area. This research too has been undertaken with a look at Kachru’s work and has derived a lot from it, both in terms of inspiration as well as a sound background of the topic. A brief account of Kachru’s writings has been presented below.

In his book *The Alchemy of English*, Kachru traces the legacy of colonial rule in various parts of the globe to the existence of several transplanted varieties of English. These varieties have their own contexts of function and usage and have gone a long way

---

in bringing about the concept of 'New Englishes'. Kachru states that the end of colonial rule and the new 'power bases' in Africa and Asia have raised questions about traditional normative standards for these non-native varieties which have developed in their own linguistic and cultural ecologies or socio-cultural contexts which, in turn, give them new identities.

Innovations in non-native varieties have more often than not been looked upon with suspicion by native speakers. Kachru notes that nativisation has essentially been seen as deficiency, not as difference. He is of the opinion that nativisation must be seen as the result of those productive linguistic innovations which are determined by the localised functions of a SLV, the “culture of conversation”, communicative strategies in new situations and the “transfer” from local languages.

Kachru also reiterates that there may be other reasons for such innovations – for example, acquisitional limitations, inadequate teaching and the lack of a consistent model for practice.

In the same work, Kachru also states that while such reasons exist, one cannot overrule a “…subtle political reason – the desire to establish and maintain ‘language distance’.” He argues that:

…the colonizers insisted on not teaching their language too well to “non-ingroup” Asians or Africans, the underlying idea being that the colonizers’ code, if shared equally with the colonized, would reduce the distance between the rulers and the ruled. At the same time, the inevitable nativization of English by the brown and black sahibs (as the English-knowing natives were called) did not go unnoticed by the colonizers and provided a storehouse of hilarious linguistic anecdotes to be related in the “white only” clubs. In South Asia, the mythical “Babuji” became the source of such
linguistic entertainment. The second-language user never seemed to win in this seesaw of attitudes. If he gained "native-like" linguistic competence he was suspect; if he did not gain it he was an object of linguistic ridicule.²

From such a stage in their history of development, the non-native varieties of English have come a long way. And while being a supporter of such non-native varieties, Kachru favours "linguistic liberation" for them. He argues against linguistic chauvinism of the kinds of BE. While talking of 'deficit linguistics', Kachru says that "What is actually 'deficit linguistics' in one context may be a matter of 'difference' which is based on vital sociolinguistic realities of identity, creativity and linguistic and cultural contact in another context. The questions are: can sociolinguistic realities be negated?"³ This is the question posed by Kachru in his work based on various samples of IE which he draws mostly from the creative writing of Indians writing in English. The essential distinction he makes is between a 'deviation' and a 'mistake'. He says that:

In the case of each variety of English, the cultural and linguistic context is different from that of London, New York, Toronto or Sydney; therefore, the new setting determines the 'deviation' in language use. The context-determined linguistic innovations are productive and pragmatically essential...The productive aspect of such formations and their functional relationship to new contexts makes them formally and pragmatically a part of a specific variety. These formations are not idiosyncratic, and they have a role in what Firth terms 'the context of situation'. On the other hand, a 'mistake' is unacceptable on several counts. This term may be restricted to those uses of English which show early stages in language acquisition. One

² ibid. p. 22.
might outright reject some uses of language as unacceptable since they are 'unEnglish'. The term 'unEnglish' is rather tricky. One way to explain the 'unEnglishness' of a 'mistake' is to say that in systemic terms it is not a result of the productive processes which characterize a particular non-native variety of English. One might also state that in sociolinguistic terms a 'mistake' is not functionally related to the cultural context of a non-native variety.\(^4\)

Kachru talks of the phenomenon of linguistic transfer or interference in the acquisition of a second language in a bi/multilingual situation. This transfer takes place from a dominant language to a less dominant language and in few cases, the reverse is also possible. In the Indian context, the Indianisation of the English language is accompanied by the Englishisation of the Indian languages to a greater or lesser extent. The more the interference in a speaker's English, the lower will be his proficiency in English.

One of the most important observations Kachru presents is the cline of bilingualism with its three 'measuring points' – the zero point, the central point and the ambilingual point. In this study too, Kachru's cline of bilingualism has been followed in discussing the varying proficiency of IE users. According to Kachru, an English-speaking bilingual who ranks just above the zero point is considered a minimal bilingual. Such bilinguals may have some knowledge of the written and/or spoken media of English, but they will not be considered proficient in the language (for example, the competence of postmen, travel guides and 'bearers' in India).

The central point is again an arbitrary point: a bilingual who has adequate competence in one or more registers of IE (say, for instance, the register of the law
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courts, administration and science) may rank around the central point. The standard variety of IE, in Kachru’s observation, is used by those bilinguals who rank around the central point on the cline of bilingualism.

A standard (or educated) IE bilingual may be defined as one who is intelligible not only to other Indians in different parts of the country but, ideally speaking, to the educated native speakers of English too. But, intelligibility does not necessarily imply that the user’s command of English equals that of the native speaker. The term intelligibility may be used in a wider sense to imply an Indian bilingual’s capacity to use English effectively for social control in all those social activities in which English is used in India. And, most importantly, it does not mean that a person is ambilingual. The cline of bilingualism can be perceived in the various labels applied to the use of English in India. Kachru also traces this cline in the register of newspapers. On one hand, local papers are linguistically low on the cline while on the other hand, national papers with an international circulation are remarkably high on the cline.

In 1985, Kachru presented the model of three concentric circles which clearly divide the English-using world into three groups. This model has stood the test of time and is commonly referred to in any discussion on ‘World Englishes’. Of the three circles, the “inner circle” constitutes speakers who speak English as a first language; it refers to the traditional historical and sociolinguistic bases of English in the regions where it is the primary language; the “outer circle” being those places where speakers use it as a second or additional language; the term ‘New Englishes’ is often used for varieties which have developed in the “outer circle”; and the “expanding circle” comprising speakers of those regions where English is a foreign language. The circles are based on historical, sociolinguistic and literary contexts and have been classified as follows:

**Inner circle (ENL):** The United States of America, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Canada.

**Outer circle (ESL):** India, Ghana, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh.

**Expanding circle (EFL):** Japan, Egypt, Israel, Russia and so on.
The expanding Circle*

China 1,088,200,000
Egypt 50,273,000
Indonesia 175,904,000
Israel 4,512,000
Japan 122,620,000
Korea 42,593,000
Nepal 10,004,000
Saudi Arabia 12,972,000
Taiwan 19,813,000
USSR 285,796,000
Zimbabwe 8,878,000

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 2,641,000
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 3,566,000
The circles in the earlier page\(^5\) clearly show the spread of English and its subsequent use in different parts of the world.

The circles may need to be re-defined since many second language speakers of English claim to have a native speaker’s intuition. Kachru recognises this fact and has called for a distinction between “genetic nativeness” and “functional nativeness”. The condition for this is that the English language must penetrate the society extensively and deeply. Accordingly, the “outer circle” has been renamed as “functional ENL” and the “inner circle” as “genetic ENL”. In such a division, “native speaker’s intuition” has played a major role, this being the main factor in enabling linguists to make a distinction between native speakers and non-native ones. Kachru adds that ESL speakers are also as intuitive as native speakers for all functional purposes.

It has also been noted that in the “inner circle” too, the increase in the number of immigrants has blurred the area as a purely native-speaker area. So it is expected that though the distinction between “inner” and “outer” circles may be partially lost, that between the “outer” and the “expanding” circle will remain the same. Kachru further remarks that:

The institutionalization and continuously expanding functions of English in the Outer Circle depend on several factors which demand demythologizing the traditional English canon. The “invisible” and not often articulated factors are, for example: (1) The Outer Circle users’ emotional attachment to English. The result is that the our code vs. their code dichotomy becomes very blurred. This attachment is evident in response to questions asked to creative writers in English who write exclusively in English.

or in English and their "mother tongues". (2) The function of English as part of code extension in the verbal repertoire of a multilingual. It is not only a question of code alternation in the sense of switching between codes but also in "mixing" of codes (e.g., English and Indian languages). (3) Recognition of English as a nativized and acculturated code which has required local non-Judeo-Christian identities. (4) Recognition of English as a contact code for intranational function, the international functions being marginal.6

Kachru is of the opinion that because of deep social penetration and the extended range of functions of English in diverse sociolinguistic contexts, there now exist several varieties, localised registers and genres for articulating local social, cultural and religious identities. He feels that the features of the English language have changed in the Indian socio-cultural setting and that many features now operating in IE are culture-bound. He remarks: "...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 which has, gradually, made Indian English culture-bound in the socio-cultural setting of India. The phonological and grammatical deviations are only a part of the process of Indianization."7

Kachru has defined a linguistic innovation as a result of nativisation of English which, in turn, is the result of the new ecology in which a non-native variety of English functions. He emphasises the fact that in these ecologies the innovations acquire their communicative "meaning".

In The Alchemy of English, Kachru writes that the Indianisation of English may involve lexical transfer, local borrowings, translation, shift (or adaptation) or 'calques'.

---

6 Braj B. Kachru, supra note 3, p. 7.
and the “mixing” of elements of English with local languages. ‘Indianisms’, which have been the cause of a lot of controversy, may include the following types of formations:

(1) those expressions which are transferred from Indian languages into Indian English; e.g. dungwash (lepan), the confusion of caste (varnasankara);
(2) those which are not necessarily transferred but are only collocationally unusual according to a native speaker of English; e.g. salt-giver;
(3) those which are formed on the analogy of natively used forms of English and are collocationally deviant; e.g. black money on the analogy of black market;
(4) those which are formally non-deviant but are culture-bound; e.g. flower-bed (pushpasajya, ‘nuptial bed’); and
(5) hybridizations; e.g. janta meals, lathi charge, tiffin carrier. Hybrids may belong to an open-set (e.g. tonga driver) or a closed-system (cooliedom); some hybrids may involve ‘semantic reduplication’; e.g. lathi stick, potato bonda, religious diwan, cotton kapas, jibba pocket etc.8

In the area of lexis, Kachru includes two types of vocabulary – those items which are non-shared with the L1 varieties of English, and those which are a part of the borrowed lexicon of English. The items belonging to the first category are usually register-restricted and culture-bound.

In The Indianization of English – The English Language in India,9 Kachru categorises collocational deviation as an important aspect of SAE. He then states that:

...collocational deviation may be of three types. First, there may be grammatical deviations from the varieties of

---

8 Braj B. Kachru, supra note. 4, pp. 130-131.
English which are used as the first language. Second, there may be loan shifts or lexis-bound translations from SALs; thus in English these naturally appear deviant. Third, the deviation may be contextual and not formal. This involves a semantic shift of English lexical items. The most productive class consists of collocations which are formally nondeviant but are culture-bound, context-bound, or register-bound, e.g. brother-anointing ceremony, co-brother-in-law, cow-worship and so on.\(^\text{10}\)

Kachru underlines regular syntactic processes at work in the formation of such collocations. In one such process, a unit of higher rank is reduced to a lower rank. Thus, where a native speaker of English might use a clause or a nominal group, a SAE user prefers a formation with modifier+head+(qualifier) structure such as welcome address as opposed to an address of welcome and England-returned instead of one who has been to England.\(^\text{11}\)

In the same work, the use of hybridisation in SAE is described as another significant lexical feature. A hybrid is a formation which comprises two or more elements and in which at least one element is from a South Asian Language (hereafter, SAL) and one from English. There could be formations such as 1) Hybrid Collocations. 2) Hybrid Lexical Sets. 3) Hybrid Ordered Series of Words and 4) Hybrid Reduplication. The elements in a hybrid formation could be one where the SAL item is either the head or the modifier.\(^\text{12}\) Kachru cites examples for the linguistic devices and processes mainly from IE creative writing.

According to Kachru, the non-native varieties can be called Institutionalised Varieties if they:

\begin{itemize}
  \item a) Have a long history of acculturation in new cultural and geographical contexts,
\end{itemize}

\(^{10}\) Braj B. Kachru. \textit{supra note}. 4, p. 135.
\(^{11}\) ibid. p. 136.
\(^{12}\) ibid. p. 138.
b) Perform a large range of functions and therefore,
c) Have developed nativized discourse and style types and functionally determined sub languages (registers) and
d) Are used as a linguistic vehicle for creative writing in various genres.

Kachru feels that these are the four features which establish them in their own right. They are not the “performance varieties” which are mainly used as foreign languages.

As far as linguistic attitudes are concerned, Kachru advocates a more pragmatic approach to language, which takes into consideration the non-English setting, the need to use contextually appropriate lexis and above all, the importance of language as a vehicle of communication. This is a functionalist approach which views an institutionalised second language as a living and changing system, naturally acquiring new identities in new socio-cultural contexts. The context provides “meaning”, and as the cultural and linguistic contexts change, the language acquires new meanings. In new contexts, therefore, new uses and users of English have developed appropriate linguistic tools.

While IE as a variety of English does exist, Kachru agrees that there are many sub-varieties and registers of IE, and by extension, that of SAE. These are directly related to language function. One must, therefore, consider the functions that English performs in the multilingual and multicultural contexts of South Asia.

The work done by Kachru on IE is commendable. However, it cannot be applicable to all forms of writing since the “Indianisms” he mentions are mostly drawn from the creative writing of Indian writers. In Kachru’s view (1971), “Mulk Raj Anand, Raja Rao, R K Narayan and Khushwant Singh are among others, standard Indian English writers. Their use of words such as spoiler of my salt, sister sleeper etc. does not make their English substandard nor does it mean that these words necessarily have a high frequency in Indian English (spoken or written). What I claim is that Indian writers in English are using such words as a stylistic device for creating contextually and
linguistically typical Indian plot and character types. Such expressions are not part of normal IE usage.”

ii. PROBAL DASGUPTA:

Probal Dasgupta talks of the position of English in India in his book *India's Auntie Tongue Syndrome*. Through his discussion in this book, Probal Dasgupta relates the status English has acquired in India to the use of the word *Auntie* (spelled ‘Aunty’ in IE) by middle- and upper-middle-class children (who go to English-medium schools) to address their friends’ mothers. Probal Dasgupta remarks that:

> We are dealing not only with the ethnographic contrast between such behaviour and the habits of British, American, Anglophone-Canadian, Australian, and other metropolitan Anglophone children (who would normally use either a formal *Mrs. So-and-So* or a non-relational *madam* [or some variant thereof] or an informal first name), but with the fact that this tongue in which people tend to say *Auntie* is an Auntie Tongue placed in an awkward, instrumentalized position vis-à-vis India’s mother tongues. As a point of departure, we have chosen a title for this volume which presents this auntie status for the language in India in the context of Braj Kachru’s contrast between English, the worldwide Other Tongue, and the sub-stratum Mother-Tongues on which it is superimposed in so many diaglossias.¹³

Such a situation reflects that IE is still caught in the mire of its colonial masters. English is, thus, still the Other, and Probal Dasgupta acknowledges that Braj Kachru and

---

others before him had realized the power of the Otherness of English which is a powerful image of the English language. Here it is important to note how Indian speakers constructing an “other-English” create and sustain the otherness or auxiliary status for English. This, in itself, is relevant for the study of linguistics.

English in India stands in a very awkward position with respect to the Indian languages. Its alien presence is felt in the nature of words used to convey meanings in the Indian social context. While voicing such opinion, Probal Dasgupta asserts that:

The use of *auntie* and *uncle* in Indian English – overwhelmingly preferred over abstract forms of address, ... is a carry-over from Indian languages....That Indian English usage patterns reflect FESH (Formal Elaboration of Social Hierarchy) rather than the metropolitan English social alternatives indicates that the Indian social setting in which the language functions treats it as an Auntie Tongue, as a non-member of the family being given the formal position of an auntie since that is the only available style of constructing an affiliation. If English as a language of identity was really moving in, one would expect its elite users in India to adjust their address habits to metropolitan norms... That expectation is not met. We conclude that English is not ‘one of us’, but an important presence that one must be polite to; and *Auntie* is the way we express our politeness in our current social conjuncture; so the term ‘Auntie Tongue’ best expresses what English is to its users in India.  

He remarks that contemporary linguistics stresses more on the learning part of second language acquisition than the teaching aspect. With regard to IE, Nigerian English

---

and so on, he states that one is "...seeking a set of nationally differentiated norms...which will be more suitable than a metropolitan standard for the task of textbook production."\(^\text{15}\)

In the same work, the author places English in a diaglossic situation in India. English here is in the position of H (‘high’) and particularly that of Fishman’s definition of the H variety. “This is a case of H/Foreign rather than H/Archaic. In the case of India, the L (‘low’) variety is suppressed not by the domination of the otherness of the past time, but by that of the otherness of a foreign space whose global power English embodies.”\(^\text{16}\) This linguistic situation departs from Ferguson’s initial description of diaglossia where H “…belonged morphologically to an older period of the language, so that one could say that the dead hand of that period continues to dominate and stifle the spontaneity of the younger L variety.”\(^\text{17}\)

Probal Dasgupta underlines the significant reality that IE, as a medium of creative expression, has not been very effective. Any effort made in this field is reminiscent of the creativity of metropolitan English and is quite devoid of independent creativity. It holds a place unlike that of Sanskrit in the Gupta Empire which had exhibited “independent, substantial creativity”.

Probal Dasgupta asserts that undeniably the native speakers of English are its “owners”. He tries to explain the reasons behind the eagerness of Indians to gain native-like competence. He reiterates that the “owners” are still the ones who:

…enforce normative spelling, punctuation, grammar, and phonological and lexical limits (within which accents and diction may vary) throughout the domains of English discourse. Indian use of English will forever remain a tolerated, degenerate variant of the norm in the eyes of the

\(^{15}\) ibid. p. 67.
\(^{16}\) ibid. p. 72.
\(^{17}\) ibid. p. 72.
owners. Hence the striving by Indians to attain near-native command, to count as individuals who may be co-opted into the metropolitan Herrenvolk.

This is why the distance remains stable. Those managers of English in India who represent the wishes of its proprietors are quite strict — and for good structural reasons, independent of their wishes as individuals — about 'maintaining standards' in the most distinctly proprietary domains of orthography and phonology. These screening devices effectively distinguish the few insiders, welcomed into the fold of the managers of English in India, from the many outsiders excluded from this fold. This massive fact, kept in place by factors far more powerful than the voices favouring the demarginalization of creoles and non-standard accents, undermines the naturalistic and equalitarian rhetoric associated with the discourse that the English language carries.18

Language is compared to an image which is clearest among its native speakers. There is a centre of the image and non-native speakers are far from this centre to feel secure about their intuitions. So,

If, as in the community of Indian speakers of English, some of them manage the language machine and thus need to speak and write with authority and a semblance of co-ownership rights, they must mask this insecurity and pretend that they are authoritative native speakers of some hybrid object, call it Indian English...The mainsprings of the creativity that constitutes English, renews its slang and

18 ibid. p. 203.
sense of innovation from one generation to the next, etc., remain in Anglo-America; consequently, non-native creativity in the language is necessarily anaphoric to native Anglophone canons and evaluations. and necessarily brushes aside Indian nursery rhymes, etc., in favour of the culturally inappropriate Anglophone ones as a basis for the socialization of English-medium school-children in India. This fact is explicable on the basis of the view that a language is an image and thus, unlike a conceptual system such as mathematics, unavailable for neutral universal use independent of the identity of the community where it originated.¹⁹

Probal Dasgupta has given the discourse on IE a different dimension altogether. His views are difficult to ignore and have the ability to provoke any person working in this area to rethink, if not rephrase his opinion on the subject.

iii. DASWANI:

Daswani also refers to Kachru’s cline of bilingualism and emphasises on the English usage of inadequate bilinguals – those speakers of IE who are situated between the two extremes of minimal bilinguals at one end and the adequate bilinguals at the other end, that is, at the top. Daswani reiterates that “…an extensive study of the inadequate bilinguals in its total socio-linguistic context²⁰ needs to be done to establish the ‘viability’ of IE. He argues that the English of adequate and minimal bilinguals do not constitute IE but states that a study underlying the reasons for such characterisation of IE is required which should also show that what could qualify as IE is the English of the inadequate bilinguals. He says. “It is the English of the inadequate bilinguals that can bear any examination as IE...Indeed, it may be theoretically possible to identify more

than one variety of English of inadequate bilinguals, each variety exhibiting a unique set of divergent features from SE.”

The existence of more than one variety of IE brings forth questions regarding the idea of a SE in India, since SIE will have to be the English used by the adequate bilinguals. To quote from Daswani’s article “Some Theoretical Implications for Investigating Indian English”:

Any claim that seeks a viable status for IE must be supported by evidence to show that IE is either a regional or a social dialect of SE. Specifically, it must be demonstrated that, one, IE shares a specified (or specifiable) number of features with SE, and, two, the divergences between SE and IE are systematic.

In an earlier paper (Daswani 1969) I have attempted to show that there is no way of setting up any systematic relationship between SE and some attested deviations in the English of Indians. In that paper I examined some of the examples of Indian deviations listed by Dustoor (1968). In a number of nouns and verbs used wrongly in IE, all attempts at finding syntactic-semantic features to account for the erratic behaviour of the attested examples were unsuccessful. Specifically, I could find no linguistic grounds for the presence or absence of an article before the noun in the examples from Dustoor (1968); similarly, examples of nouns wrongly inflected for plural number could not be analysed in any way to justify the plural number. It was discovered, that in order to accommodate the deviant examples, noun subcategorization rules for SE

21 ibid. p. 118.
would have to be violated. In the case of the deviant examples of verbs, it was discovered that the SE distinction between transitive-intransitive was lost in the case of many lexical verbs... The divergences in the English are so varied and numerous that, it is impossible to formulate any rules to relate the divergences to the rules of SE grammar.

Daswani has also looked at the register of newspapers in India to build on his description of IE. This is relevant since the register coincides with the area of study of the present work. Quoting Daswani from the same article “Some Theoretical Implications for Investigating Indian English”:

Another tendency which has been observed largely in newspaper English has to do with the use of modals and aspect (i.e. have-en and be-ing). Newspaper English uses would for will (pure futurity); should for ought to (obligation); past perfect (had gone) for simple past (went).

Are these tendencies the unique features of IE that we are looking for? It would be difficult to make any judgement until further research is done on sub-varieties of IE such as newspaper English. Looking for IE in the English of the press restricts us to the written language which presumably is edited. How far would it be justified to base our judgements about IE entirely on written data? Other examples of written English are provided by the great bulk of noncreative writing in India...

Daswani, however, lets the problem of IE linger and leaves it open-ended when he states in the same article:

The problem of identifying IE still remains. At the level of written language, much of the noncreative IE writing is no different from SE. Where there is some evidence of
consistent divergence from SE, as in newspaper English, there is also counter evidence to suggest that perhaps the deviation, after all, is erratic. This is borne out by the fact that not all of the newspaper English is syntactically deviant. In other words, syntactic deviance in newspaper English may be idiosyncratic. However, it would be difficult to arrive at any conclusion before several of the written sub-varieties of IE are thoroughly studied.

iv. SHIVENDRA KUMAR VERMA:

Shivendra Kumar Verma’s study of IE underlines the sociolinguistic reality behind its identity as a separate variety of English. He remarks, “It (IE) is used as a vehicle of Indian culture to express culturally determined networks of activities that are typically Indian; for example, the social stratification in India, the caste systems, and a complex network of personal and societal faiths and beliefs.” For Verma, IE means ‘English in India’, which exists as a set of coherent, homogeneous linguistic systems and is describable as the speech of an identifiable social group. Verma in his article “Swadeshi English: Form and Function” states that:

The nature of Indian English is closely related to the demands that we make on it, the functions it has to serve. It interacts with a variety of Indian languages and yet it is not a regional or state language, it is an all-India language (India as a whole may be treated as its region). It is quite natural for it to have a marked Indian colour. Every dialect is a spatioculturally determined variety of a language: it is marked by socio-regional features...What makes a variety a non-native, second language variety is not individual
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linguistic variations or idiosyncrasies of writers but mother
tongue variations reflected in the use of that dialect...

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. The Englishness of this socio-regional
dialect lies in the fact that its basic linguistic systems are
the same as those of English English. Its Indianness lies in
the fact that, within the overall general framework of the
systems of English English, it displays certain
distinguishing phonological, lexicosemantic, and also
syntactic features. In terms of linguistic efficiency these
patterns are as good as any other. They are not corrupt, but
different forms of the same language.

Dialects and individual variations share a large number of
underlying similarities. By studying the deeper underlying
principles of syntax we are in a better position to appreciate
how minor the differences among the variants of the same
language are. There is a vast body of sentence formation
principles common to English and Indian English. Both the
dialects consider the following patterns ungrammatical:
I done have work my.
They goes there every morning.
Mohan reached at Patna today.

It is quite common today for speakers of Hindi and other
Indian languages to switch to English when talking about
scientific principles or describing the working of some
complex machinery. They use different varieties of their
mother tongue in various situations in life, but when they
have to use a technical register, they usually switch to English. This kind of register-oriented bilingualism may be labeled 'registral bilingualism'.

Verma (1974) presents the concept of swadeshi grammar to account for the structural and meaning deviations in IE. He has worked on the syntactic systems and subsystems of IE and come up with the notion that "English in India represents a cline extending from non-educated varieties of English at one end (which are not at all intelligible) to an internationally accepted standard form of English at the other. In between these two ends we have a great range of language variations" (Verma, 1982, p.185).

In his work *Aspects of English Language Teaching – Focus on Functions*, Verma underlines some of the forms of IE which are different from those found in native varieties of English. Some of these are as follows:

**Complex sentence formation:**

When a sentence is (or a number of sentences are) subordinated to function as constituents of a matrix sentence, we get a complex sentence. English imposes certain tense and pronominal restrictions on the choices in the embedded sentences; Indian English tends to relax these restrictions.

I.E. When I saw him two days ago, he told me that he is coming.

E. When I saw him two days ago, he told me that he was coming.

In English the subject-auxiliary inversion rule applies only to the free type of interrogatives. In embedded interrogative sentences, the interrogative transformation is not applied. In Indian English, the distinction between embedded and non-embedded interrogatives is not maintained. Embedding in I.E. is accomplished not by the use of *whether* or *if*, but by means of a flip-flop in the embedded sentence instead.
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I.E. If they will be here by this evening, we may go out.
E. If they are here by this evening, we may go out.

English has a complex system of rules to generate question-tags; Indian English has reduced this complex network of rules to one simple rule i.e., suffixation of *isn't* or 'no'.

I.E. You went there yesterday, isn’t it? (no?)
You are coming this evening, isn’t it? (no?)
E. You went there yesterday, didn’t you?
You are coming this evening, aren’t you?
He will come tomorrow, won’t he?

**Interrogative transformations:**

The interrogative transformation in English shifts the first constituent of the auxiliary to the pre-Subject NP position. If the auxiliary is not present, it creates the dummy ‘do’ and gives it all the features of the first constituent of the auxiliary. The Wh-question transformation replaces the item to be questioned by an appropriate Wh-word and shifts it to the front. Indian English has a much simpler system of transformations. It does not use the Subject Aux. inversion rule, but rather intonation + the structure of a statement.

I.E. What you are leaving?
E. Are you leaving?
I.E. Where you are going?
E. Where are you going?

**The perfective forms:**

In English the present perfect establishes a link between the past and the present. It is not used in the environment of the 'simple past'. In Indian English this distinction is neutralized.
Indian English, according to Verma, tends to favour the use of the present continuous both for the present perfect continuous and the present continuous and does not maintain any marked distinction between 'since' and 'for'.

I.E. I am writing this essay since two hours.
E. I have been writing this essay for two hours.

**Complementation:**

Complementation is a syntactic mechanism by which a sentence is subordinated to function as a complement of one of the constituents of another sentence. It is the nouns or verbs of the recipient sentences that impose constraints on complement types. Want-type of verb in English, for example, does not take a that-sentence. Indian English does not impose any such constraints.

I.E. Mohan wants that you should go there.
E. Mohan wants you to go there.

Verma notes this pattern in IE and remarks that IE uses a set of syntactic rules to generate the above sentence types. He adds that it might seem tempting to dismiss these patterns as nothing more than accumulation of errors or foreignisms caused by the failure of the speakers to master SE.

But the plain fact is that such patterns have become so well established in IE that they get passed on from one generation to the next. Verma emphasises that they have assumed such stability and continuity that they can be seen more like dialectal innovations than foreign coinages. He feels that such sentences are part of the grammar of many educated speakers of English; this variety does not prevent effective communication – it is capable of clarity, complexity, power, and tenderness. Verma underlines that what is correct and what is not correct is ultimately only a matter of conventions within a society.
According to Verma, IE does not mean a mixture of English and Indian languages. While it is true that IE has drawn words from the Indian languages and has created translation equivalents of concepts deeply rooted in Indian culture, it is also true that it has simplified a number of grammatical patterns of English. And yet IE is not just a ‘mixture’, it has a rule-governed system and serves as an auxiliary all India link language:

Native varieties of a language do not permit any marked non-stylistic syntactic deviance. This reinforces the point made earlier on that Indian English is a non-native variety of English. It is a highly structured system. When we say that it is a system, we mean that it differs from other dialects in rule-governed ways. Indian English, for example, does not use Wh + Aux + Subject + NP patterns in Wh-questions but the meaning is preserved by the formal device of Wh + Subject + NP + Aux + Mv + ... One might say that these two patterns represent two dialectally variant surface manifestations of the same deep structure. These differences show up in the transformational component of grammar. Underlying both dialects there is a network of semantically significant syntactic relations. We are interested both in the vast body of syntactic principles which are common to all varieties of English and in those surface features which are peculiar to particular dialects. Indian English is adapted to the needs, interests, and cultural pressures of the speech community that uses it while at the same time making use of the main features of the structures and systems that constitute the common language. It does have – like all dialectal variations – its own idiosyncratic rules that make it distinct from English English both linguistically and culturally.²⁴

²⁴ ibid. p. 54.
In the same work *Aspects of English Language Teaching – Focus on Functions*, Verma writes that:

When people try to use a language to which they are not native, the opportunities for their first language to influence their second are almost limitless. New words are certainly needed to identify things and processes for which there is no name in British or American culture...

The real issue here is not that Indian English cannot be used as a tool of culture but that it cannot and is surely not designed to be a component of British, American or Canadian culture.25

As we have mentioned before, Verma holds the view that English in India represents a cline extending from non-educated varieties of English at one end (which are not at all intelligible) to an internationally accepted standard form of English at the other. In between these two ends, there is a great range of language variations. The two ends do not represent IE. Educated IE is between the two ends and is marked by the presence of a number of syntactic patterns which, when compared with the surface patterns of English, may be called ‘deviant’, but a deep analysis of the syntactic systems of IE reveals that they are not oddities but rather rule-governed dialectal variations. Linguistically speaking, it cannot be considered a corrupt language; it is just different. To interpret its difference as its limitation is to miss the point.

v. BANSAL:

Bansal’s General Indian (hereafter, GI) model for IE is based on the criterion of international intelligibility. With this perspective, he emphasises on those features of sound, stress and intonation which can be understood internationally and rejects certain accepted features of IE. Such an understanding of the subject is questionable. The reason
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being that even in the case of the native varieties differing in pronunciation to a great extent, there is no loss of mutual intelligibility. Bansal considers the ‘deviations’ referred to by Kachru, Verma and Daswani as mere functional mistakes.

In 1972, R K Bansal and J B Harrison published a manual of speech and phonetics called *Spoken English for India*, which delineated the Indian variants of spoken English. Bansal (1983) provided a brief account of the phonology of IE and presented this analysis as part of his findings – that against the 12 pure vowels and 9 diphthongal glides of RP, IE has 11 pure vowels and 6 vowel glides.

vi. AGNIHOTRI:

Agnihotri has worked on the phonological structure of IE in collaboration with Sahgal (1985 and 1987). They have come up with the analysis that this structure can be seen in terms of the social and psychological background of its speakers. In their work in 1985, it was shown that retroflexion cannot be considered a pan-Indian feature of IE. This observation was based on the fact that the educated middle-class speakers of Delhi frequently used a non-retroflexed variety. Agnihotri’s research on IE continued and in 1987 he stated that the objective was to:

...examine the nature of four phonological features generally associated with Indian English, namely, the retroflexion of alveolar stops, r-pronunciation, use of an open vowel instead of RP / ə / and the use of the frictionless continuant /u/ instead of the labio-velar semi-vowel /w/. First a sample of 45 informants representative of educated Indian English was selected at random from the master-lists of some South Delhi areas. Questionnaire was prepared to elicit detailed socio-psychological data and indepth interviews were conducted to collect formal and
informal speech. In fact, before actually conducting the interviews a good deal of time was spent talking informally with informants to identify what topics would interest them. A quantitative analysis of our data showed that all the four phonological variables traditionally associated with Indian English were involved in significant sociolinguistic variation which was not a replication of variability patterns obtaining in the USA or England. The use or otherwise of 'r' turned out to be the most diagnostic of all the variables. It differentiated the old and the young and males and females most clearly. The fact that the speech of young girls is more r-less is suggestive of a language change in progress. The analysis of the variable (5) shows very interesting stylistic differentiation. If one looks only at informal speech, it would appear that there is no prestige attached to this variable's RP variant; but the formal style scores indicate that there is some awareness of using [5] in formal situations. The RP variant [w] seems to have no prestige attached to it in India and the [u/] pronunciation appears to have gained stability at the moment. We concluded that these variables could be seen in terms of a cline. In the case of (t), the pronunciation in Indian English was becoming increasingly non-retroflexed and therefore more native English like, variable (r) and (5) appeared to be in a state of flux- r-lessness being associated with young females and [5] pronunciation being associated with formal style, while (w) appeared to be absent from Indian English altogether. It is clear that the speakers of Indian English are creating the phonological structures of their English in their own way. In spite of the
pressures of prestige attached to r-pronunciation in the USA and of spelling pronunciation, the young educated Indians decide to keep their speech r-less; on the other hand it is not considered important to maintain the RP distinction between /v/ and /w/. It is thus clear that the underlying factors determining the phonological structures of a variety can be deciphered only in a sociolinguistic framework.26

vii. REVIEW OF EXISTING RESEARCH

Kachru envisages a new world of Second Language varieties of English which derive their identity from the “culture of conversation”, new communicative strategies and “transfer” from local languages. He creates a separate group for such varieties wherein any linguistic innovation is an example of “difference” and not “mistake” – a view which does not find acceptance among native speakers of the language. The term “non-native” Englishes applies to these varieties, which, in turn, are the transplanted varieties that are acquired primarily as second languages. IE belongs to this category of the English language; its characteristic features are markers of the new ecology in which it is used and reflect the indigenisation of an ‘alien’ tongue to the needs of the people. English in India has undergone linguistic and cultural adaptation and has acquired a position of prestige and authority in the country. It has now become an integral part of the linguistic ecology of India. This particular research proceeds with similar notions and attempts to place IE in the context of SLV of English. The study reflects Kachru’s opinion that linguistic interference or transfer has taken place in the multilingual setting of India in the case of English and the phonological and grammatical deviations seen in the use of IE are a result of the processes of Indianisation of English. The socio-cultural context in which IE is used gives this variety its “meaning” and gives its features uniqueness.

geographical proximity, and attitude towards a variety." In India too, BE continues to be the pedagogical model and textbooks follow this exo-normative model. It is only when English is used in different domains that changes in the model can be seen. IE has gradually developed typically Indian registers of legal system, newspapers and creative writing.

Linguistic innovations invariably constitute a part of the identity of IE. These innovations are a result of the Indianisation of English, "...which in turn is the result of the new ecology in which a non-native variety of English functions...Such innovations are not only lexical but also involve distinct culture-bound strategies for writing personal or official letters, invitations, obituaries, newspaper reports, and other discourse types." Kachru’s opinion reflects the linguistic reality of IE which is marked by such linguistic innovations as local borrowings, translations, loan shifts, collocational deviations and so on. Most of these innovations in IE are contextually determined.

Interestingly, Kachru also notes the changing attitudes towards these localised models of English. Innovations in these varieties have gained popularity as Africanisms and Indianisms. Though phonetics and phonology are mostly taken into account in any attitudinal study, lexical, grammatical and discoursal features also mark a particular variety. These features reflect various degrees of deviation. The deviation at various levels is directly related to the degree of nativisation. Kachru characterises his ‘Indianisms’ as deviant from “mother English”. In this particular research, the structures of IE have not simply been characterised as deviant but as features of IE.

Kachru’s argument reflects the socio-linguistic reality of the non-native varieties. “The nativized formal characteristics acquire a new pragmatic context, a new defining context, culturally very remote from that of Britain or America.” The formal markers in

29 Braj B. Kachru, supra note. 1, p. 92.
a variety provide a regional and national identity. Kachru marks the new trend in addressing non-native varieties as "different" and not as "deficient" varieties.

Whether an exonormative or an endonormative model should be followed has to be decided based on the fact that nativisation of these Second Language varieties has been so deep (as in the case of India) that a native model of English such as BE may not be appropriate or even desirable.

Linguistic patterns in IE are a result of the functions English performs in India. Kachru upholds this view when he says that:

We must, therefore, use a theoretically and pragmatically dynamic approach to account for the deviations that we find in such Englishes. One way of explaining these deviations is in terms of various types of nativization which a Western language has undergone in non-Western contexts...English is as culture-bound as is any other Indian language. Therefore, the modifier Indian with English is both linguistically and culturally indicative of the unique role that it plays in the Indian context of situation.\(^{30}\)

Kachru’s work, however, is based on the creative writing of IE writers and cannot be said to be applicable to all kinds of IE usage.

Kachru’s work has been continually referred to in this study and has provided the insight necessary for an understanding of the topic. However, the register is different and so are the examples. While Kachru’s data comes mainly from texts of Indian creative writing in English, the data collected for the present study is limited to newspapers, journals, bulletins and notifications. The findings do not overrule those of Kachru’s; they have, in fact, provided further insights into the topic. The researcher is in agreement with

\(^{30}\) ibid., pp. 119-121.
two observations made by Kachru regarding IE. “First, that the users of Indian English form a distinct speech community who use a variety of English which is by and large formally distinct because it performs functions which are different from the other varieties of English. Second, that Indian English functions in the Indian socio-cultural context in order to perform those roles which are relevant and appropriate to the social, educational and administrative network of India.”

Daswani also takes off from Kachru and refers to the latter’s *cline of bilingualism* while emphasising that it is the English of the inadequate bilinguals that should be the reference point for any statement made on IE. This research also proceeds along similar lines – that the English of the minimal and the adequate bilinguals cannot be said to describe IE. However, it is possible that there exists more than one variety of English of the inadequate bilinguals. In this study, the variety used by the educated section of society and especially that used in the register of national newspapers and journals is under investigation and the assumption is that SIE is the variety found in such writings.

Daswani too cites a few examples of IE from newspapers. He, however, also acknowledges the fact that a thorough study of the register of newspapers must be done before any feature of English found in newspapers can be claimed to constitute a general feature of IE. Daswani notes that written data is not enough to base our opinion of IE. Here, unlike Kachru, he points to noncreative writing in English in India as a good storehouse of data for a study of IE. The problem, however, does not end there. This is because noncreative IE writing shows a remarkable similarity to SE.

Moreover, while there are instances of divergence from SE, as in newspaper English, there are also claims to show that such deviation is “idiosyncratic”. To remove such confusion, Daswani concludes that several of the written sub-varieties of IE must be examined. Daswani’s model of *inadequate grammar* however fails to cope with the full complexity of IE. He notes the English of inadequate bilinguals and provides some
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examples. He notes the deviance in terms of the presence/absence of the indefinite article *a*, for instance:

1) …we had radio talk… (Absence of *a*)
2) …there was a short production… (Presence of *a*)

There is also the wrong use of plural –*s* in:

1) …who in turn will give it to the panchayats and commissioners for the disbursements. (*Underline is mine.*)

Instances of deletion of object noun phrases after transitive verbs can be seen too:

1) But I have not seen.
2) So, at 80p we sold.32

Daswani’s examples may reflect IE at the syntactic level. But he does not analyse the areas of lexis and semantics and neither that of phonology to be able to give a complete critical description of IE. What he instead offers to state is that one should, perhaps, “….examine the phenomenon of IE as a product of a language contact situation…We may be able to account for the IE divergences in terms of L2 learning techniques…It may turn out that the peculiarities of IE are a result of an intricate blending of the semantic-syntactic systems of English and Indian L1s; and the pan-Indian features of IE, if there are any, may be more easily traceable to the areal features of Indian languages.”33

**Shivendra Kumar Verma** upholds the identity of IE as a separate SLV with its own set of rules and identifiable as such. He claims that the systems operating in IE are as good as any other: they are not corrupt but different forms of one language. As mentioned

32 Daswani, *supra note.* 18, p. 121.
33 *ibid.* p. 125.
earlier, Verma makes an important observation when he says that “Every dialect is a spatioculturally determined variety of a language: it is marked by socio-regional features...What makes a variety a non-native, second language variety is not individual linguistic variations or idiosyncrasies of writers but mother tongue variations reflected in the use of that dialect...”

Verma’s concept of *swadeshi grammar* underlines the structural and meaning deviations of IE. He notes some of the forms of IE which are different from those used in native varieties of English. They, however, still clearly reveal that IE and BE are different forms of the same language sharing a core grammar.

Kachru’s cline is again referred to by Verma, with uneducated English at one end and an internationally accepted form at the other end and a large range of language variations in the middle. The use of IE shows how it has simplified some of the grammatical patterns of English. Important to this study is Verma’s assertion that “Indian English is adapted to the needs, interests, and cultural pressures of the speech community that uses it while at the same time making use of the main features of the structures and systems that constitute the common language. It does have – like all dialectal variations – its own idiosyncratic rules that make it distinct from English English both linguistically and culturally.” Verma also shares Kachru’s view that to regard the differences in IE as its limitation is to totally ignore the uniqueness of this variety.

**Bansal** describes some of the phonological features of IE. He, however, stresses on international intelligibility, hence, accepting those features which fall in this category and rejecting some already accepted ones in IE. His model (GI) is not a part of this research since intelligibility of IE is not a part of this study. It is, however, worth noting that Bansal considers Kachru’s “deviations” as “functional mistakes”.
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Agnihotri's work on the phonological structure of IE has been mentioned in this section since it is one of the few studies conducted in this area.

Scholars and academicians working in the area of IE have been analysing and presenting their findings for further research. It is not within the purview of this study to describe all such studies conducted, which may be both in India as well as abroad. The above discussion has been an endeavour to highlight the work of leading linguists and to place this research in the background of earlier research done in the field of IE. The next chapter will present the findings of this study with regard to lexico-semantics of IE and at the same time put forth an analysis of the same.