

Subject name: Language and Society
Professor name: Prof.Rajesh Kumar
Department: Department of Humanities and Social Sciences

Institute name: IIT Madras
Lecture number : Module -15
Lecture title: Languages – English in India

In the process of understanding relationship between Language and Society, we will look at the Situation of English in India. We will start look at topic and English appears to be one of the most significant languages not only in the country but also around the world. We will try to examine underline reasons and also will try to look at the significance of the language English in India and how such a thing helps us understand the complexity between language and society. That is ,complexities in terms of the relationship between language and society.

A discussion on English is an important one in the context of this course and also in the context of understanding such a complex relationship between language and society. Because it has a different status of its own in the society and like a mentioned not only in society but societies around the world. As a matter of coincidence it has acquired its status of prestige. It has acquired this status of upward mobility.

It is the symbol of the upward mobility and the ability to use English in the society has completely different connotation and meaning in terms of how we work with language in society. So we will want to look at these dynamics particularly when English comes in picture while understanding Language and Society.

(Refer Slide Time : 02:18)

Introduction

- Indian English
- Standard and non-standard
- Indian English, English in India, or English *OF* India (Singh and Agnihotri 2012)
- Native Speakers



We have heard terms like Indian English. Let us tied with the term Indian English. These are the English and we need to understand what this means in the technical context as a matter of coincidence once again just as English is a marker of prestige in the society. It is a marker of distinct identity in the society. The term Indian English is used as a stigmatised variety to the speakers of English in India. If it is pointed out that you are a speaker of Indian English they feel offended. That is, the speakers of Indian English would feel offended.

In the process, somehow the term Indian English has got a stigmatised symbol. Now this requires our understanding and such a understanding will help us understand language and society. Little bit more clarity, Why would this happen? If English is an important marker of distinction. English is the marker of superior identity and i am using these terms with responsibility. English is the marker of higher status symbol.

Why would Indian English term being considered a stigmatised one? Answer to this question opens many facets. And it helps us understand the idea of acquired mobility. We will get back to that also pretty soon. But the answer is located in the question of standard and non standard. Technically speaking, distinction between standard and non standard, when it comes to the question of language does not exist. It is it is not at all a matter of consideration. In technical understanding of language, however when we look at Language from social perspective, sociological perspective, it means a lot and it becomes an empirical fact that Languages are looked at with these two terms. Some are standard and some are non standard.

We have looked at the question of language and variety. We will be looking at the question of language and variety with one more perspective pretty soon.

But the question of a standard and non standard are going to exist within the varieties as well. Some certain varieties are considered more standard and some varieties are considered lesser standard rather non standard .Same thing applies to English, certain types of English is considered standard and rest of them are considered non standard, probably the term Indian English refers to non standard in at or it has been equidant with. What is considered non standard, we get back to that again into the point in combination of the two.

However a new perspective comes in while looking at the term Indian English, it means English in India, the language English the way it is spoken in India is referred to as Indian English. We can call it Indian English or we can call it English in India the next term English in India an equally so Indian English, tells us that it is one of the types of English es and definitely the fact we need in adjective Indian, English refers to something else to resolve this. An book land discussion on this topic Rajendra Singh and Amahan Agnihotri in 2012. They proposed a very significant point. Not so of legally but the point is very significant.

They saying, argues, that the term English in India should really be considered as English of India and he substantiates his point by a very strong argument. Which is like the argument of language acquisition device and universal grammar in the sense that it is pretty hard to refute. On the basis of varieties, evidence, he points of that after such a long presence of a language in the country or in the sub continent the English that has grown itself in this sub continent along with a layer number of languages spoken in the sub continent, has got a pretty distinct identity of its own.

Therefore such an English is called should be called English of India like
(Refer Slide Time : 08:20)

Introduction

- Indian English
- Standard and non-standard
- Indian English, English in India, or English *OF* India (Singh and Agnihotri 2012)
- Native Speakers



In the sense that English happens to be one of the languages of the sub continent like any other, so what we know is Indian English or English in India is has got a distinct identity from any other types of English that we know. Therefore the distinction between English in India and English of India is pretty significant and the fact that to quote Singh, the fact that Indian English gets its own identity.

In the linguistic Ecolorgium in a sub continent is not as even English in a new identity. Probably this will apply to all other English es as well, definitely argues that for Indian English therefore the term should be used as English of India it becomes even more interesting in the context of the term native speakers. And then again we will look at this list in the reverse order.

The term English native speakers is significant while understanding Language English pretty often we get a struck with the question, Who is the native speakers of English? and then to compare them with the significance of such a question in the context of the current discussion what is the status of speakers of English in India then this concept of native speakers of English becomes clear in the light of Singh's proposal Singh's and Agnihotri's proposal that English of India is an independent language of Indian sub continent and it has the identity of this sub continent like any other languages spoken in the sub continent.

So the speakers of Indian English are the native speakers of English in India or the native speakers of Indian English and this is the, this description is the sinked with the terms native speakers the way we have understood before in this course such an definition of native

speaker that we have tried to look at in this course so far follows from how people acquire language and then if we apply the same to Indian English we get to learn that the term native speaker once applied to Indian English is pretty much evident that the speakers of English in India are the native speakers of Indian English.

This gets pretty clear by looking at different parts of English in little bit details as the structure of Indian English will get to that part also but let us look at it in the reverse order to understand the question of standard and non standard in the context of Indian English if we bring in the points raised by Singh and Agnihotri in 2012. Then the term Indian English should not be looked at or should not be pointed to as in a stigmatised term however it is an important to mention as a footnote of this discussion.

Let the any kind of stigma to the term Indian English has not been added by anyone else but these speakers of Indian English themselves. So the term English of India and the rationale underlying the term genesis of India helps the speakers of Indian English get out of this and considered the term Indian English not only as one of the variants of different type, one of the variants among different types of English and one of the variants of one super structure called English rather it has its own identity in Indian Linguistic Scholarship.

Therefore no restraint. Therefore speakers, native speakers of Indian English are the speakers of English in India and there are sure bunch of evidence available for that we will look at some of them pretty soon and therefore the technical understanding of the terms standard and non standard remains theoretically applicable in the domains of social investors and social understanding of Language that they do not remain much once we look at the terms here. Hope this helps clarify the term in English. However, going a step back it is true that English spoken in and around Buckingham Palace in London was considered, "The English" and everything else was sub standard and non standard varieties of English.

So if speakers of English did not belong to the vicinity of Buckingham Palace of British Empire in London. They were speakers, non standard speakers of English and it was British Empire was not directly responsible for propagating English economy around the world. And this needs a careful understanding with a caution it happened along the way. That is, the spread of English happened along with the spread of empire. So what happens is speakers of English who try to speak like the representatives of empire always wanted to be speaking like

the empires, the representatives of the empires and therefore they considered, they accepted themselves as speakers of non standard English. So just like the term Indian English it is looked down upon not by anyone else but by speakers of Indian English themselves.

The speakers of English would not belong to the inner group or in and around areas of Buckingham Palace really believed themselves to be speakers of non standard English. This is pretty complex phenomenon but equally simple. To look at it in terms of its understanding and it becomes even simpler, did varieties of English around the world they not only looked down upon in terms of non standard only when they were spoken outside England in fact they were looked down upon within England itself.

Irish English or Scottish English still are not considered any kinds of prestige varieties of Spoken English. There are several varieties of English es spoken within and there is nothing surprising about that, that is the nature of the language, the variation, existing variation withiin language happens to be universal nature of language and these things happen.

Implications for politics and society of Europe and around the world but we do not have the mandate to do that. We will want to understand in the light of the background of the difference between English spoken by a handful of speakers in and around Buckingham Palace and rest of the speakers.

This debate was pretty significant for a long time, speakers and particularly researchers on this topic finally succeeded in treating rest of the varieties as varieties of English spoken around the world and in that one of the forefront comes one of the names of Braj Kachru and he comes up with a model called, which is called the Kachru's model of 1986.

(Refer Slide Time : 18:16)

Varieties of English around the World

- Three circles of Kachru's model (1986)
 - Inner circle (USA, UK, Canada, Australia)
 - Outer circle (India, Africa)
 - Expanding circle (China, Japan)



In which he proposes things that are pretty simple, pretty famous in phenomena that the terms inner circle, outer circle and expanding circle all known as three circle of the Lord Kachru and he points out that the countries like USA,UK,Canada,Australia are part of inner circles where English is spoken largely as the language of these places. He has more reasons to be putting countries in inner circle, outer circle or expanding circle but the division between these circles is also pretty interesting and is rational for putting these countries in these circles are relevant as well.

So India belongs to outer circle where it is spoken by lot of people and also it becomes part of the government function and then there are countries like China, Japan and many other around the world and particularly in East Asia where they are put in expanding circle because, the language English is not that significant for the functioning of the government as well. So this distinction is pretty clear based on certain assumptions and this scheme to be very significant, very powerful too for understanding English is around the world and also has huge contribution in the subtle different varieties of English.

Being considered not as a sub standard variety of English but a mere variety of English, so the language is spoken in Africa will be African English and language spoken in India will be called Indian English and Chinese English and Japanese English but they are not sub standard varieties of English. They have their own distinct varieties of English and it is not in direct contrast with anything else. The argument that I have tried to bring in this discussion from Singh and Agnihotri is not sink like this, where they take the argument a step further and they say because of the co existence of this language and take India as a case history for a long

period of time with other languages of the country or the sub continent it has developed in such a way that it has required in identity.

And therefore it is English of India and it should be looked as English of India and not in contrast with American English or British English, Canadian English, African English or Australian English or for that matter any English. It should not, it should not be looked at any, in terms of contrast it should, it should looked at as their independent identity. Of course there are similarities but it has got its own independent identity and that gives people independent identity. And therefore that their reduces the sub standard load from English spoken people are.

So we will move to the next part of this discussion, which is little bit more technical in understanding, in terms of understanding why the success that lies in Kachrurian model that English spoken around the world should be considered as independent varieties of English es. That is point of inner circle, that also, this substantial claim of Singh and Agnihotri, that is has acquired its own identity and located in the study of these four levels, phonological, morphological, syntactical and discourse study of one variety of English. That is Indian English. Similarly take a few examples to substantiate our point. When we look up phonological,

(Refer Slide Time : 22:47)

Phonological Features

- Retroflex Sounds
- Lack of aspiration at syllable initial position
- Dental or Retroflex in place of Alveolar
- First language influence
- Maturity of vocal tract



features of Indian English we find that retroflex sounds are part of Indian English. We have had a discussion in our understanding of language in terms of sounds, words and sentences even as part of discourse we have briefly looked at how language is a rule governed system;

and how it looks as a rule governed system when we look at language from perspective of understanding. It is at the level of sounds, words and sentences. So when we look at sounds, we find that sounds of Indian languages in particular and in our discussion of India as a linguistic carrier, we have seen how retroflex sounds are part of Indian sub continent and how it got spread into languages.

Several languages is spoken in the sub continent. Therefore its retroflex sounds are part of repertoire of every speaker of the sub continent and hence when English is spoken by these many people, the retroflex sounds became integral part of English as spoken in India the examples are instead of in the place of an alveolar we find either a dental or a retroflex in Indian English. So when we want to say a word like table, we end up saying table where the in Indian in Indian English would really become ta which is a retroflex sound.

It is not a surprising fact at all. It just marks Indian English at a phonological level, there is a rule as a part of English knowledge which says stop sound a voiceless stop like pa ta and ka would get aspirated syllable initial in English. So a sound aspirated initially and it would end as sounding like car. A word like pin would in English sound like pin however what we are looking at here is khar will never be aspirated in Indian English and will be spoken as car.

The phonological explanation for this is very simple. ka and ca are two distinct phonemes any language of the sub continent or many languages of the sub continent and definitely it is rare phonemes and independent phonemes in Hindi. However ka and ca could be two different allophones of the same phoneme in English.


And then we get to understand that why we have lack of aspiration and celebration in Indian English. Similarly so this can be explained in terms of first language influence and a more detailed discussion on second language acquisition helps us to understand that the maturity of vocal third is also responsible for why some of these things happen and why some of these things would not happen in Indian English at phonological level.

That is at the level of syntax, because the muscles and the movement of the muscles gets matured and then it is not one way we want to train it again. So Indian English is going to be full of retroflex sounds it is never going to aspirate a voiceless stop syllable initially and they will always be replaced by an alveolar sound and that can only be looked as first language

influence because most of the language is spoken in the sub continent have got retroflex sounds in depth and the two pairs that aspirated and unaspirated stop sounds are going to be duty state phonics in these languages. When we look at Lexical,

(Refer Slide Time : 27:58)

Lexical (Morphological)

- Plural markers
- Nasal Assimilation
- Lexical items
 - Invigilator Proctor
 - Angry Mad
 -  Colony Neighborhood

level or morphological level, to said with more clarity, that is, at the level of words we find a great thing on the level of plural information. Because we are looking at the written part of the languages we often tend to pronounce plural markers in a variety of things. However there are only two plural markers in English. One is sa and the other is za and the distinction between the two is voicing and while za is unmarked plural and sa is the devoiced variant of the plural marker which happens when a word ends with it stop sound.

Plural marker that it takes becomes devoiced and sounds as sa however .So we do not look at plural markers in English as sa or za rather we would want to we end up putting a sa sound where we should be putting za precisely because we too, we are looking at only the written aspects of this language and therefore as a part of Indian English ,the English spoken in India the English of India, a word like friends can be spoken as friends, that is, take a word friend. take a word flower, and when you have the plural marking on it the reason why orthographic symbol as is added to this we end up putting a plural marker in spoken language as well, which represents which gets represented as sa sound.


However that is not the case. But this explains why that phenomena would take place in English is spoken in Indian sub continent. Take examples of few words, it will have its own vocabulary and it is possible that they do not match with some of them in different variety of

English. So for the term proctor, we find in Indian English invigilator, the term mad we have angry in Indian English and for the term neighbourhood we have the term colony. But these are these are pretty insignificant examples of insignificant markers of why Indian English should be considered as English of India but rest of them are pretty strong pretty strong rational of why this has developed its independent identity. Finally when we look at (Refer Slide Time : 31:36)

Syntax

- Question Tags
 - He will win the election, won't he?
 - She writes well, doesn't she?

 - He will win the election, isn't it.
 - She writes well, no.



sentences and again there are examples available on all parts of it, for understanding of sentences, which is also called syntax but I would like to put only two examples here.

One first comes from question tag in place of take the example of this slide, he will win the election won't he? instead of this, or she writes well doesn't she? in our English, we will end up saying, he will win the election isn't it? or she writes well no?

Now look at the tags at the end, isn't it or no, they again come from the way , the way our languages are structured so it is a direct transfer at the level of syntax to the English spoken in this sub continent. And this is not, this should not be looked at again as problematic English as non standard English ,because this is not done by few speakers. this happens as a whole.

Therefore he will win the election isn't it? is a legitimate marker of how English spoken in this sub continent has got its independent identity and why it should be put in English of India. There are hundreds of examples of this type but again all of them put together would make the same point. Take one more example, it requires lot more details but the question


marking is a very important phenomenon in English. When we question anything, the question would appear at the sentence in the initial position.

And put it in a non technical sense, the tense marker also moves with the double wedged word and appears next to that. However in the imbedded clause this happens as an independent clause. However in an imbedded clause there is no auxiliary inversion that is allowed in English. So the sentences that will come in English are

(Refer Slide Time : 34:25)

- Aux inversion in embedded clauses
 - Ravi know what he is doing.
 - Ravi knows what is he doing. [Marked]

 - We do not know where we are headed to.
 - We do not where are we headed to/going to. [Marked]



Ravi knows what he is doing. Ravi knows, but in our variety which could be put at. For the time being I have put it as marked. So look at the set of examples. Ravi knows what he is doing in our variety in which I have put it as marked, Ravi knows what is he doing. Ravi knows what is he doing. This is a pretty common expression, pretty common phenomena that happens in such sentences in English. Now instead of putting it as marked the argument is this is the phenomena of Indian English just like in English spoken elsewhere, there is no aux inversion embedded clauses.

In Indian English, there is aux inversion embedded clauses. So there is, the distinction is not in terms of marked and unmarked, the distinction is in terms of how these things appear at large, where people speak this variety of English. We do not know where are we headed to or we do not know where are we going to in Indian English. It is technical thing to explain however the argument here is, why I have put as marked on the screen should be looked at. The phenomena of described as this is not aux inversion happens in Indian English in India.

That explains English that explains how Indian English has got its own identity at the level of sentences.

So we have looked at in technical sense with limited examples at the level of sounds, words and particularly I am referring to morphological example of pure information. And then the examples of Auxiliary inversion and question tag at the level of sentence and you should keep your ear hoping you will find hundreds of such examples when English in India at large. Therefore these things should be looked at as the markers of English which gives English of India a distinct identity.

And it helps us understand why it does not remain a variety of any other types of English rather it is of its own type. Please add the total number of speakers of Indian English in the country. In this country is much larger than the speakers of English, of the countries of inner circle that will be an of course an hypothesis but that will also help us understand that it is not the question of numbers of speakers.

It is therefore it is based on how English is spoken in a systematic measure. Anything that requires systematic explanation, anything that becomes part of systematic explanation, that can be explained in a systematic way, cannot and must not be looked at as something sub standard happening in the language. Thank You.